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Comments and Responses

Topical Comment Responses:

No. 1 - White Avenue Widening

Background

Widening of White Ave between 1st and 6th Streets in the City of La Verne was proposed as a mitigation measure in the Draft SEIR to eliminate a significant safety condition that exists today and is anticipated to worsen in the future once the Gold Line begins passenger service. At today’s traffic levels and train frequencies, vehicles traveling northbound on White Ave back up and across the existing at-grade railroad crossing during the peak commuting periods. These conditions are expected to worsen in the future, as traffic increases and train frequencies increase with the Gold Line beginning service. To address the safety problems at this crossing, the California Public Utilities Commission has required additional northbound capacity be added.

The proposed mitigation measure in the Draft SEIR would have widened White Avenue between 1st and 6th Street to add lane capacity in both northbound and southbound directions, as well as provide additional street width to add a new bicycle lane in each direction. That measure, as originally proposed, included what was required to mitigate both the traffic and safety conditions, as described above, but added additional capacity beyond the minimum necessary to address these conditions.

However, numerous comments were received during public circulation from local residents in the City of La Verne expressing concerns and opposition to the proposed mitigation measure. The comments expressed concerns regarding traffic, safety, and aesthetic; community impacts of widening White Avenue, including changes to the visual character of White Avenue, and the removal of parkway trees and vegetation; and issues associated with the ability for pedestrians and vehicles to cross White Avenue following the widening.

The Authority has reviewed the Draft SEIR comments in detail and has identified a revised solution that would allow for increased northbound capacity on White Avenue from just north of the railroad corridor to 6th Street to mitigate the traffic and safety condition without the need to widen the roadway. See details below.

Revisions to White Avenue Widening Mitigation Measure.

The Authority has revised the features of mitigation measure LTR-9, thereby shifting from a widening to a restriping of the roadway. As described in the Draft SEIR, Section 1.2.2.3, the previously proposed widening would have included the physical modification of White Avenue, including removal of the existing curbs, gutters, and parkway strip to accommodate two northbound and two southbound lanes, a median turn lane, and room for bike lanes in both directions. This previously proposed widening also included minor right-of-way acquisitions on three private properties. The Authority conducted a reassessment of the design features associated with the previously proposed traffic mitigation measure (LTR-9) to address the identified traffic and safety issues, including AM and PM peak-period traffic volumes using White Avenue to access the La Verne Station and existing traffic volumes in the northbound direction backing up onto and across the existing at-grade railroad crossing. As a result of this reassessment, the Authority is proposing a revision to this mitigation measure.

As part of good engineering practice and in coordination with the proposed Metrolink double tracking project from White to Lone Hill the Authority performed a multi-locational traffic study to determine potential impacts to traffic. The study looked at the intersections of D and E Streets where LRT and FRT will operate, the proposed driveway into the La Verne station parking facility adjacent to the Metrolink at-grade crossing, Arrow Highway/White Avenue and White Avenue and Bonita Avenue. The later includes the Metrolink/LRT/FRT crossings. The study identified a queuing issue on northbound White Avenue across the grade crossing due to insufficient storage space from the grade crossing to Bonita Avenue based on the 2035 projected traffic volumes. The proposed dual northbound lanes eliminated the queuing issue.
Therefore, the revised mitigation measure would not require the physical widening of White Ave; and would only involve restriping White Avenue within the same limits as the originally proposed measure (from 1st Street to 6th Street). To allow for the needed increased capacity in the northbound direction, the restriping would add a second northbound lane, resulting in the final configuration for the street to be two northbound lanes, one southbound lane, a dedicated median turn lane and room for bike lane(s). The revised mitigation measure is the minimum required to mitigate the identified traffic and safety impacts and will be implemented within the existing roadway pavement limits, thereby preserving the curbs, gutters, planted roadway strip, and sidewalks in their present location.

Additionally, the three minor property easements identified would no longer be required (see Figure 1-3 and Tables 2-15 and 2-16 of this Final SEIR for additional supporting information).

The revised mitigation measure will also allow for more gaps in traffic for local travelers turning onto or crossing over White Avenue. Pedestrian access will be preserved in current conditions, although increased gaps in traffic will likely support easier pedestrian crossing as well.

The revised traffic mitigation measure is based on post-2013 FEIR and advanced design (Draft SEIR, Section 2, Transportation) traffic analysis and builds on the 2013 FEIR and Addendum No. 2. The mitigation measure revision is consistent with and in addition to the mitigation measures (LTR-1 through LTR-8) presented in the 2013 FEIR. Implementation of this revised mitigation measure would require the approval of the City of La Verne. The text of the Final SEIR has been revised to reflect the modifications to the White Avenue widening mitigation measure described above (see Final SEIR, Section 1.2.2.3.)

Traffic Signals and 2nd and 3rd Streets.

Several comments suggested that traffic signals be installed at 2nd and 3rd Streets to facilitate east-west movement across White Avenue. The comments expressed concern that the increase in the number of lanes on White Avenue would make it difficult for pedestrians to cross White Avenue at 2nd and 3rd Streets; as well as for vehicles to exit the immediate neighborhood. The Project approved in 2013 included a mitigation measure (LTR-2) that requires the Authority to "cooperatively work 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, Arrow Highway at the Metrolink crossing, Arrow Highway and E Street, and La Verne Avenue and Arrow Highway when warranted" (2013 FEIR, Section 2.0, Traffic). The Authority is not proposing any change to Measure LTR-2. LTR-2; however, these measures do not address the intersection of White Avenue/3rd Street.

The Authority evaluated whether the traffic impacts of the Project Modifications at the White Avenue/3rd Street intersection require signalization of this intersection using the standards for signalization applicable in the City of La Verne. The projected traffic volumes at this intersection from both White Avenue and 3rd Street are below the standards established by the City of La Verne. Therefore, the approved mitigation measure, LTR-2, will remain in place from the 2013 FEIR, and as warranted by the City of La Verne, traffic signals would be added in the future at these other intersections.

No. 2 - Pomona Station Parking Facility – Southern Location and Parking Operations.

Several comments identified issues associated with the proposed Project Modification to move the parking facility at the Pomona Station from the north side of the station to the south side of the station. The comments raised issues regarding parking impacts within neighborhoods adjacent to the proposed south side parking facility, increased traffic on local streets, limitations on truck access routes, and the economic impacts of acquiring private property for the south side parking location. In response to these comments, the Authority has determined to eliminate the south side location from the list of Project Modifications. As a result, there is no proposed change to the parking facility at the Pomona Station parking facility at the north side location as approved in 2013 and, therefore, impacts associated with the south side parking facility will not occur. The total number of parking spaces proposed (1,000 spaces) within the Pomona Station parking facility would remain the same, consistent with the approved 2013 FEIR.

Some comments raised an issue regarding potential impacts if Metro decides to charge for parking at the Pomona Station and the corresponding shift to increased parking by transit users on local...
streets. The operation of the parking facilities for the Phase 2B stations remains unchanged from the Project analyzed in the 2013 FEIR. The Authority does not implement nor administer any changes to station parking facility operations. However, under Metro’s existing Parking Ordinance (Chapter 8-01, General; Section 8-01-040), Metro has the discretion to charge for parking if there is a significant increase in parking demand observed and recorded during operations. Metro will evaluate whether the change in parking policy requires an additional California Environmental Quality Act evaluation.

The text of the Final SEIR is revised to reflect that the south side parking location at the Pomona Station is removed from the proposed Project Modifications (see Section 1.2.2.3.).

No. 3 - Fairplex Traffic Analysis

One comment raised an issue regarding the potential traffic impacts associated with events at the Los Angeles County Fair facilities (also known as the Fairplex) in Pomona. The Fairplex is operated by the Los Angeles County Fair Association on land leased from the County of Los Angeles that includes the County Fairgrounds and several other event venues. The Fair Association has operated the annual county fair and certain other events at the Fairplex for decades pursuant to a lease from the County of Los Angeles. Approximately 500 events per year occur at the Fairplex. As a facility operated pursuant to lease from a public agency, the approval of events at the Fairplex is subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, and the County of Los Angeles has the jurisdiction and responsibility to mitigate the traffic impacts of Fairplex events. Because events attract visitors to the Fairplex, the Fairplex generates traffic with the potential to impact traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Fairplex. As discussed below, for many years, the Fair Association and cities in the vicinity of the Fairplex have implemented traffic management measures to minimize the transportation impacts of Fairplex events. The traffic generated by the Fairplex was known at the time of the approval of the Project in 2013. Neither the Fairplex nor any other person submitted comments on the Draft EIR that the Project would have transportation impacts related to Fairplex operations. The proposed Project Modifications analyzed as part of the Draft SEIR do not introduce any changes to the operational parameters (LRT headways and gate operations) analyzed in the Project in 2013.

The Project is a key component of the Southern California Regional Transportation Plan and is intended to reduce traffic congestion by providing an alternative to the private automobile in the San Gabriel Valley. The 2013 FEIR evaluated the localized transportation impacts of the Project associated with changes in local traffic circulation, access to station parking facilities, and light rail trains crossing at at-grade intersections. The 2013 FEIR includes several measures (enhanced multi-modal facilities as a result of the Project and associated with the stations, traffic signal systemwide coordination and synchronization) and Project features/programs to minimize transportation impacts. The referenced features/programs include grade separations (when warranted), four-quadrant and pedestrian gates, traffic signal preemption, anti-queuing controls, and comprehensive education programs for local schools.

The Authority assessed the potential that the Project Modifications will create a new significant transportation impact, or more severe significant impacts associated with Fairplex events. Based on the assessment, the Authority concludes that the Project Modifications will not cause nor contribute to any significant or more severe transportation impact. The facts in support of this conclusion include the following:

- The Project Modifications are not proposing to change any of the operational elements of the Project evaluated in the 2013 FEIR.
- The Project Modifications do not include any new or revised at-grade crossings that would impede or delay traffic associated with Fairplex events.
- The Project Modifications include an interim terminus at the Pomona Station. The Interim Pomona terminus will reduce Fairplex-related traffic by providing Fairplex customers an alternative to driving to Fairplex events.
- The Authority is implementing mitigation measure LTR-9, which will provide improvements to the segment of White Avenue between 1st Street and 6th Street. These improvements will
include two lanes in the northbound direction, one lane in the southbound direction, and a dedicated median turn lane. The respective impact analysis, determination, and mitigation can be found in Section 2 of this Final SEIR.

- Foothill Transit (the bus service in the San Gabriel Valley) provides bus connections to the Fairplex from Azusa, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair along Transit Line 196. Patrons can get from Union Station to the Fairplex using Transit Line 197.

- Fairplex events occur on average over only 27 percent of the mid-weekdays (Monday -Friday) and most Fairplex events during those midweek periods generate little or no traffic during the AM/PM commuter peak periods. The Authority consulted with the Fair Association, the Cities of La Verne and Pomona, Metrolink, and Foothill Transit regarding traffic management measures implemented by these entities to address Fairplex-related event traffic impacts. Each of these entities have special event management services that are implemented during Fairplex events, including the annual Los Angeles County Fair (County Fair). Those services include traffic management, alternative arrival and departure travel options, and extensive public notifications. Additional details regarding traffic generation and management related to these event-specific activities include:

  **Fair Association:**
  The Fair Association confirmed that on an annual basis they work directly with the local and state agencies (City of Pomona and City of La Verne Police Departments, Caltrans, and California Highway Patrol) to mitigate traffic impacts of Fairplex events. The Authority also confirmed that Fairplex events, on average, only take place on or within days during the middle of the work week only 27 percent of the time, and most midweek events generate little or no traffic during the AM/PM commuter peak periods (Fairplex Business Center and Self-Storage Project, City of Pomona; LLG, October 2011). It is standard in the traffic engineering practice to avoid conducting traffic counts on event days as the resulting traffic analysis would represent atypical conditions (Fairplex Business Center and Self-Storage Project, City of Pomona; LLG, October 2011). During the County Fair, one of the larger Fairplex events, the primary paths of travel for vehicles (based on car counts and attendance information) involves 70 percent of the traffic arriving/departing from the south and 30 percent arriving/departing from the north where the Foothill Gold Line station is located. Therefore, the bulk of the traffic effects occur on the south side of the Fairplex, away from the Project Modifications.

  **City of La Verne:**
  The City of La Verne has and continues to actively coordinate with the Fairplex to ensure safe access to special events, such as the 2019 report prepared by the City of La Verne Police Department (Pomona, George Cross Swap Meet and Classic Car Show) that includes specific incident objectives to manage traffic both arriving and exiting this event (Special Events Division, Incident Objectives, Pomona Swap Meet and Classic Car Show, 2019).

  **City of Pomona:**
  The City of Pomona actively coordinates with the Fair Association during special events and implements specific traffic management plans, including the use of detailed traffic control plan and temporary restriping or approaching roadways during the County Fair.

  **Metrolink:**
  Metrolink has been providing special event service during the County Fair at the dedicated Fairplex Station on the San Bernardino Line since 1993. Metrolink also offers late-night service on its Riverside Line to the County Fair from Union Station in Los Angeles. From Union Station patrons can board the Foothill Transit Line 197 to the Fairplex.

  **Foothill Transit:**
  Foothill Transit Line 196 makes stops at the Fairplex from Azusa, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair. During the weekdays, patrons using Metrolink to the Pomona Station can use Foothill Transit Line 479, which offers service to just outside of the Fairplex property. This service involves a 2-mile trip from the station that occurs every 5 to 10 minutes.

**No. 4 – Construction and Operation Phasing:**
Several comments raised issues regarding Project funding and construction phasing, and regarding the Authority’s plans to complete the Project to Montclair as approved in 2013. In response to these comments, the Authority is proposing to modify the phasing
of the Project to construct and operate the Project in three phases (as opposed to four phases as proposed in the Draft SEIR). The proposals to build and operate the Project in three phases (as contrasted with two phases as evaluated in the 2013 FEIR and Addenda) is the result of the Authority’s ongoing efforts to manage, identify, and secure funding to complete the Project to Montclair as evaluated in the 2013 FEIR. Section 1.2.2.1 of this Final SEIR describes the revised three-phase construction approach with the first phase of construction extending from the Azusa-Citrus Station to the Pomona Station; the second phase, as analyzed and approved in Addendum No. 2 to the 2013 FEIR, would extend from the Pomona Station to the Claremont Station; and the third and final phase would extend from the Claremont Station to the Phase 2B terminus at the Montclair Transcenter Station. Sections 1.2.2.1 and 1.2.2.2 of the Final SEIR provide detailed discussion of how construction phasing provides the Authority the ability to match construction phasing to the planned and identified construction funding, and the flexibility to build and operate the Project as funding becomes available. These sections also document the facts supporting the Authority’s conclusion that adequate funding will be available to complete the construction of the Project in accordance with the phasing plan proposed by the Authority.

No. 5 – Traffic Analysis:

Comments and concerns were received regarding an increase in traffic and how property owners on White Avenue will be able to access property, specifically with expressed concerns of driving in and out of driveways, high speeds along White Avenue, and potential for accidents. Increasing the number of lanes on White Avenue will generally make it easier for drivers to access White Avenue from 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Streets. A second lane on northbound White Avenue will double the roadway capacity, but the Project Modifications (and approved 2013 FEIR Project) will have only a small effect on traffic volumes (a slight increase due to station demand, and a slight decrease due to regional shifts from automobile to transit usage). The capacity increase will provide for longer and more frequent gaps in northbound traffic, making it easier for vehicles to turn onto White Avenue. With these increased gaps, there will be fewer conflicts between through and turning vehicles, improving vehicular safety. Additionally, no modifications to the speed limit on White Avenue are proposed with the Project Modifications.

Comments that traffic impacts weren’t evaluated at “current conditions” (specifically referencing the intersection of White and Bonita) were received. Analysis was conducted for the existing year, and future years, with and without the proposed improvements, following the standard approach for traffic analysis. The same approach was used for the Project Modifications analyzed in this Final SEIR.

Comments were also received suggesting that other or alternate change be made to White Avenue, including shifting White Avenue to a one-way configuration and making a parallel street one way in a different direction. Implementing the suggested changes and creating a one-way couplet would likely improve traffic operations, but it would reduce access for residents and increase vehicle miles traveled because of out-of-direction travel.

Comments were received asking why rerouting of the traffic flow to Wheeler and Garey Avenues was not possible, as they already can handle the traffic flow. Drivers using the local and regional roadway network select routes that minimize their travel times, in other words there is no way to force traffic to use other streets.

A number of additional concerns over increases in traffic with new additional lanes, pedestrian crossing and biking safety, and cars “racing” from one signal to the next signal (thus putting nonvehicle users in danger) were also received. In regard to traffic increases, projected changes in traffic volume were evaluated, assessed, and documented in the FEIR and SEIR with the respective impact determinations provided. For concerns regarding vehicular speed, the speed limit will not be changed on White Avenue. With improved operations, drivers will have less delay at the signalized intersections and more opportunity for signal coordination to maintain speeds at the signed speed limit.

Finally, a number of comments were received on the modeling that was conducted in support of this Final SEIR, specifically regarding ridership and parking. First, the model was used to provide and maintain consistency with the original analysis conducted in the 2013 FEIR, including a constrained parking analysis scenario consistent with the number of station spaces already identified in the approved
2013 FEIR. The model is documented in the report *Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report*, by Parsons Brinckerhoff, June 2011. The socioeconomic and demographic data are based on the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan data developed and maintained by SCAG. The model used the socioeconomic and demographic data updated in 2014 as an input to reflect the 2035 horizon year.

While the modeling process and assumptions, including the constrained parking conditions, are standard traffic engineering practice. The Authority also conducted a field investigation around the Pomona North Station to assess and identify additional and publicly available parking resources. The field investigation was conducted in an attempt to address the excess demand identified at this station and based on the phased implementation/interim station termini scenario. The result show that there are additional resources available that would accommodate the projected excess demand. See Chapter 2, Section 2.3 Transportation Analysis and Impact Results, for additional detail and Appendix A-1 for a technical memorandum prepared to document the field investigations conducted.

**No. 6 – First/Last Mile Improvements**

In response to comments regarding first/last mile improvements and according to Metro Board Motion 14.1 Section B, Metro is leading the development of first/last mile station area plans for five stations on the Project (Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, and Claremont). The Project Modifications do not change any aspects of the Approved Project regarding first/last mile station access issues or station plans. The development of first mile/last mile station plans is within the authority and jurisdiction of the LA Metro. LA Metro will develop the station plans in coordination with the Authority and coordination with the five cities around the station areas. First/last mile projects typically fall outside Metro-controlled right-of-way and instead under the purview of local jurisdictions. For this reason, Metro Board approved Motion 14.2 that states Metro would negotiate with the respective contributing jurisdiction(s) that would allow first/last mile improvements and projects be counted towards the 3 percent local contribution for rail projects from local jurisdictions. For example, the City of Inglewood has committed $6 million towards implementing first/last mile projects as part of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor. The Metro Foothill Gold Line 2B Extension First/Last Mile Plan will identify pathways and physical improvements that will help people walk and bike to, and otherwise access, the future stations. Metro will be presenting this plan to the Metro Board this summer and will begin to identify strategies toward implementation with local jurisdictions.

**No. 7 – Safety and Security**

In response to local agency and public input regarding public services, in particular the concerns for increased criminal activity and homelessness, Metro has established a Homeless Task Force and has developed the *Metro Transit Homeless Action Plan* to address the increase in homelessness on Metro’s system throughout Los Angeles County. To ensure compliance with all regulations governing the safe construction and operation of the projects, Metro will implement a comprehensive outreach and engagement plan providing homeless individuals with resources and services while maintaining a clean environment and a high level of public safety for Metro transit patrons.

In addition, Metro is working with the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, and deputies from the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department to coordinate their efforts of county-wide homelessness strategic plans, providing multi-disciplinary homeless outreach teams to engage and educate individuals regarding public services and homeless housing programs. Thus far the program has successfully housed approximately 12 percent of homeless individuals and families contacted into permanent solutions.

Furthermore, concerns regarding increased criminal activity and homelessness as a result of the Project would be addressed by Metro’s multi-agency law enforcement system. Security concerns surrounding the potential for criminal activities at Metro stations and parking facilities would be addressed with video surveillance systems and security personnel. Occurrence of crimes associated with parking facilities have significantly decreased as Metro continues to expand its law enforcement system, including an 80 percent decrease in grand theft auto from 110 reported cases in 2016 to 21 cases in 2018 within the Metro system. The increased police
presence across the Metro system since the implementation of the multi-policing model have shown significant improvements in the safety and security conditions.

With the deployment of the Homeless Task Force, implementation of the *Metro Transit Homeless Action Plan*, and specific measures and programs to enhance safety for transit riders, employees, and the community which includes, but are not limited to video surveillance, direct communication between operators and Metro Transit Security dispatch/emergency response centers, safety awareness programs and campaigns, emergency response training, and other integrated security measures installed at Metro facilities, and with Metro’s successful multi-agency law enforcement system, concerns over increased criminal activity and homelessness would be proactively addressed.
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As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, the Authority has revised the features of this mitigation measure thereby shifting from a widening to a restriping of the roadway. All of these changes to the configuration of White Avenue will be implemented within the existing roadway pavement limits, thereby preserving the curbs, gutters, planted parkway strip, and sidewalks in their present location.

Response 2

See Topical Response No. 1.

Stevan Johnson
2020 Arrow Hwy
La Verne, CA 91750-5413

Stevan Johnson
 Former Council Member City of La Verne 2003-2011
Letter 2

Response 2-1

The Authority originally evaluated the Gold Line in two phases: a first phase of 11.5 miles from Pasadena to Azusa. The Pasadena to Azusa Extension was called Phase 2A. A second phase currently under construction included an additional extension of 12.3 miles between Azusa and Montclair, or the Azusa to Montclair Extension – Phase 2B. Phase 2A was completed in 2015 and is currently in operation. In 2013, the Authority certified a Final Environmental Impact Report (2013 FEIR) for the Azusa to Montclair – Phase 2B project. As indicated above construction of Phase 2B is underway and began in December 2017. A detailed description of the Phase 2B Project, including information on the Phase 2B segment of the larger corridor and updates on the construction, is provided in the SEIR, Chapter 1 – Project Description.

Response 2-2

See comment Response 2-1.

Response 2-3

Parking at the Pomona North station will involve shared utilization of both parking facilities for both Metrolink and Gold Line patrons. See Topical Response No. 2 for additional and updated information regarding the parking facility at this station.
Response 2-4

See comment Response 2-3 and Topical Response No. 2 for additional and updated information regarding the parking facility identified at this station and approved as part of the approved 2013 FEIR.

Response 2-5

A detailed discussion on the traffic impact analysis methodology employed, including level of service calculations, and how the potential traffic impact determinations were reach is provided in this Final SEIR – Section 2.1, Methodology.

Response 2-6

See comment Response 2-5.

Response 2-7

Comment noted – the City of Pomona, Public Works Department (http://www.ci.pomona.ca.us/index.php/public-works-home / 909-620-2261) should be contacted for any concerns regarding existing roadway conditions.

Response 2-8

As the Metro transit service develops and identified shuttle service is implemented it is estimated that the primary east-west route to be used will be along Arrow Highway. The actual travel times will vary based on the time of day, the route identified and selected for the shuttle service, and the traffic conditions at the time of shuttle operations. Specific timelines for the shuttle services have not been identified at this time; however, they will be time competitive to single occupancy vehicle times. Additionally, fare collection will be incorporated into and use the existing ticketing systems and be conducted at the origination location (Montclair - TransCenter).
Response 2-9

Public noticing of the new shuttle service will be conducted using the existing Foothill Gold Line and Transcenter public information sharing/notification platforms (websites, social media, and electronic messaging services).
Letter #3

March 29, 2019

Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, California 91016-3633

SENT VIA EMAIL TO: LLevyBuch@foothillgoldline.org

Dear Gold Line Authority:

This is a submittal of comments by an individual (author) regarding the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report dated March 2019. The due date for public comments is May 6, 2019. This submission is being sent via email to Lisa Levy Buch, the Chief Communications Officer for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Parsons Brinckerhoff (Parsons) is a multinational engineering and design firm with approximately 14,000 employees. The company was founded in 1885 in New York City by William Barclay Parsons. Parsons’ credentials and engineering expertise with transportation projects are first-rate and world-renowned. There are two reports at issue in this letter that were prepared by Parsons for the Metro Gold Line Authority Construction Authority: the 2013 Environmental Impact Report and the Draft Supplemental EIR dated March 2019 (collectively referred herein as “Reports”). The Reports were prepared pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code 21000–21180) for the Gold Line Extension from Azusa to Montclair, which will extend a light-rail train route from Azusa to Montclair, California (the Project). The train route for the light-rail has been previously completed from downtown Los Angeles, California at Union Station east to Azusa, California and is in operation. This extension will continue that line of travel eastward to Montclair.

The Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority (Foothill Gold Line) is responsible for the management of the Project. The Foothill Gold Line is governed by a nine-member board of directors. Five members are voting members, while four are non-voting. Each member is appointed by a city or other government entity, as directed in the legislation that created the agency, Senate Bill 1847. The chairman of the Construction Authority is Tim Sandoval, who is also the Mayor for the City of Pomona, and the vice chair is Robin Curder, who also serves as a council member for the City of La Verne.

In conducting the review of the scope of the Project, Parsons decided to study the traffic counts in the month of May (2010). This was an interesting choice.
The busiest time of the year is September in the Project Area (Azusa to Montclair). In September, the schools are in session and the Los Angeles County Fair operates at the Fairplex. There is no mention in the Reports of the traffic generated from the Fairplex, which is located in both Pomona and La Verne and immediately adjacent to the proposed Gold Line tracks and station proposed for La Verne, California. Apparently, Parsons believes the Fairplex’s traffic is a minor issue and is therefore de minimis.\(^1\)

In the draft Supplemental EIR, Parsons has proposed widening White Avenue and First Street in La Verne, which is north of the Fairplex, by adding two lanes of traffic and a turn lane. The Gold Line and Parsons hired a new engineering firm, Jacobs Engineering Group (Jacobs), to perform traffic studies on White Avenue, and once again, Jacobs Engineering has refused to consider the traffic flows from the Fairplex. Jacobs selected several different months to analyze the traffic flows, but did not select September.

Jacobs was founded in 1947 by Joseph J. Jacobs. The company is publicly traded as a Fortune 500 company. As of October 2018, Jacobs had more than 77,000 employees globally, and more than 400 offices in North America, South America, Europe, the Middle East, Australia, Africa, and Asia. Jacobs was headquartered in Pasadena for many years, and so Jacobs is intimately aware of the Fairplex property. Apparently, Jacobs believes the Fairplex’s traffic is a minor issue and is therefore de minimis. And they claim implicitly that not one of Jacobs’ 77,000 employees picked September as the month to study traffic. They picked July, and they picked December (two vacation months). September never came up for discussion.

**SUPPORT FOR A TRAFFIC STUDY**

There are many people and organizations that support a traffic study for the Fairplex.

- I join with residents who support U.S. Congresswoman Norma Torres’ motion for a traffic study to be prepared for the Fairplex. See Exhibit “1” – Two-page letter dated 08/04/2015 addressed to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors from Norma Torres.

- I join with the Fairplex, Mayor Tim Sandoval, and the City of Pomona’s motion to prepare a traffic study for the area. See Exhibit “2” – Three-page letter dated 11/13/2018 addressed to Mayor Tim Sandoval and the Pomona City Council from Miguel Santana, President and CEO Fairplex, and two pages from the Fairplex’s 2018 Strategic Plan.


\(^1\) Parsons did reference the parking lots at the Fairplex in an earlier report. See Gold Line Foothill Extension – Pasadena to Montclair Final EIR February 2007, Table 3-19, p. 3-15-66.
I join with Dwight Richards, vice president of operations at the Los Angeles County Fair, and his motion to improve the traffic flow for the one million visitors to the Los Angeles County Fair. See Exhibit “4” – copy of five page article by Liset Marquez, “LA County Fair 2018: More Parking, New Uber/Lyft Drop-Off Created To Alleviate Traffic Woes”, Daily Bulletin (08/11/2018). “Nearly half of Fairplex’s 487 acres are parking lots with about 28,000 spaces. By comparison, Disneyland might handle about 15,000 vehicles a day.”

I join with the City of La Verne and their concern that the biggest traffic issue facing the City of La Verne is the Los Angeles County Fair. See Exhibit “5” – copy of select four pages from Pomona Valley ITS Project for City of La Verne from Kinley-Horn and Associates, Inc. dated 04/19/2002.

I concur with California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) that the Fairplex is a significant trip generator in the I-10 corridor. See Exhibit “6” – copy of select four pages from Caltrans Transportation Concept Report – Interstate 10, District 7, dated June 2013.

I join with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) in their support and funding for the Los Angeles County Fair under the Major Center Transportation Program. See Exhibit “7” – copy of three select pages AQMD Board Meeting dated 10/06/2017.

I join with AQMD in their support and participation as a major sponsor at the Los Angeles County Fair that attracted more than one million people. See Exhibit “8” – copy of three pages from SCAQMD - Advisor, Vol. 15, No. 6, dated Nov. 2008.


I join with the Mayor of Pomona Tim Sandoval (Cal Poly Pomona Alumni), the President of Cal Poly Sonaya M. Coley, and PolyPlex in their valiant efforts to bring the Amazon second headquarters to the Fairplex. See Exhibit “10” – copy of three pages from PolyPlex proposal (https://fairplex.com/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/polyplex/amazon-faq-final-1024.pdf?sfvrsn=2 (given the Escape from New York, maybe it’s worth scheduling a property tour for Jeff Bezos and Lauren Sanchez (a USC alumni)).

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The California Supreme Court explained the purpose of a supplemental EIR and what can and cannot be reviewed. In Friends of College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist. (2016) 1 Cal.5th 937, 949, the Court said:
Response 3-4

As provided and described in the Draft SEIR, Introduction – Legal Requirements the Gold Line Foothill Extension from Azusa to Montclair Project environmental document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.). California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21166 states that once an environmental impact report (EIR) has been prepared for a project, no subsequent or supplemental EIR is to be prepared unless one of the following circumstances occurs:

a) Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revision to the environmental impact report.

b) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken, which will require major revisions to the environmental impact report.

c) New information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time of the environmental impact report was certified as completed, has become available.

This Draft SEIR was prepared and this Final SEIR has been prepared due to the need for revisions to the 2013 FEIR as a result of the Project Modifications. The Draft and Final SEIR’s compared the potential effects of the Project Modifications to the effects of the Project evaluated in the 2013 FEIR and approved by the Authority Board. To help inform reviewers of this Final SEIR and for comparison purposes a summary table (Table S-1) has been prepared and is provided as part of this Executive Summary. Table S-1 provides a listing of the impact determinations presented in the 2013 FEIR and this 2019 Final SEIR. This table demonstrates the limited nature of impacts associated with the Project Modifications.
and confirms that preparation of a Supplemental EIR was the appropriate and applicable document.

Response 3-5
See Topical Response No. 3.

Response 3-6
See Topical Response No. 3.

Response 3-7
The criteria used and supporting documentation referenced for traffic analysis was not changed for the evaluation of impacts. A detailed discussion on the rationale for the analysis methodology employed is provided in the Draft SEIR – Chapter 2, Transportation, Section 2.1 - Methodology. The recent CEQA Guideline updates as of December 2018, included the inclusion of VMT based analysis in response to the December 2018 amendments to the CEQA Guidelines. A summary of VMT was included in the traffic analysis conducted and that discussion can be found in Draft SEIR – Chapter 2, Transportation, Section 2.1 - Methodology.

Response 3-8
Traffic analysis associated with the Phase 2B Draft SEIR was conducted by Jacobs. See comment Response 3-7.

Response 3-9
See Topical Response No. 3 and Response 3-7. The potential use of the Fairplex parking lot for overflow Gold Line parking was not a part of the SEIR or the proposed project modifications.

Response 3-10
See Topical Response No. 3 and Response 3-7.

Response 3-11
The potential use of the Fairplex parking lot for overflow Gold Line parking was not a part of the SEIR proposed Project Modifications. The original traffic analysis and conclusions, including parking, from the 2013 FEIR are still valid, along with the relevant parking analysis provided as part of this Final SEIR.
Response 3-12

See Topical Response No. 3 and commentee Response 3-4.

Response 3-13

See Topical Response No. 3.

Response 3-14

See Topical Response No. 3.

Response 3-15

See Topical Response No. 3. Updated air quality analysis was conducted as part of the proposed project modifications and the results, as indicated in the Draft SEIR, Section 3-1, Air Quality, conclude that no new impacts would result. In addition, the proposed project modifications do not introduce any changes to the operational parameters (LRT headways and gate operations) analyzed in the approved 2013 FEIR.
UNRESOLVED ISSUES

There are two questions that remain unanswered from reading the Reports:

1. whether the Board of Directors for the Construction Authority and their experts will listen to two members of Congress, the Fairplex, the Mayor of the City of Pomona, the City of La Verne, LA County Public Works, two state agencies (Caltrans and AOMD), and concerned citizens, and agree that the Fairplex is a major employer in the region, and a significant trip generating serving over one million visitors annually; and

2. whether the same Board of Directors will require that Jacobs/Parsons incorporate the traffic generated by the Fairplex into the design of the Project particularly with the potential design and installation of a flyover structure and bridge at White Avenue.

In May 2014, Parsons agreed to install a flyover structure and bridge for Garey Avenue as part of the first amendment to the 2013 EIR based upon demands from the City of Pomona. The amendment to the plans took no more than a year to accomplish.

CONCLUSION

Fairplex and the County of Los Angeles Public Works Department need to file a lawsuit to protect their respective interests in the Fairplex property. The statute of limitations for a CEQA claim is extremely short at thirty (30) days from the filing of the Notice of Determination of the Final Supplemental EIR. Fairplex and the County of Los Angeles have a paramount need to have the Supplemental EIR updated with the traffic studies for the Fairplex.

If these two entities choose to do nothing, in my opinion, the Los Angeles County Fair will have to close and relocate once the Gold Line Extension becomes operational. Then it will be painfully obvious that the future development of the 487 acres at the Fairplex will be seriously impaired and burdened by significant traffic issues.

Amazon HQ II Redux would want the flyover and bridge.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Hill
Charlie E. Hill Esq.
La Verne, CA 91750

Response 3-16

In concert with the preparation of this Final SEIR, the Authority has considered and responded to all comments.

Response 3-17

See Topical Response No. 3.

Response 3-18

The enclosures that were included as part of this comment letter are provided as an attachment to this comment response matrix.
Response 4-1

Based on local agency and public input during the Draft SEIR public circulation period (March 22 – May 6, 2019), the proposed location change of the Pomona Station parking facility has been removed from the Project Modifications and the new traffic mitigation measures, widening of White Avenue, has been revised to no longer contain ground disturbance. Ground disturbance for the Project Modifications would be limited to the areas previously analyzed as part of the 2013 FEIR with addenda and Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2, as detailed in the 2013 FEIR, would be implemented to minimize construction impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources.
On Thu, Mar 21, 2019 at 6:27 PM Lisa Levy Buch <llevybuch@foothillgoldline.org> wrote:

This email is to let you know that the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B (Azusa to Montclair) Project (also known as the Foothill Gold Line from Glendora to Montclair) is now available. The document is being circulated for a 45-day review and comment period. Attached is the Notice of Availability, and here is a link to the Draft SEIR on the Construction Authority website.

Comments on the Draft SEIR will be accepted from now through May 6, 2019. Comments will not be accepted after May 6, 2019.

If you have any questions regarding this matter or the Glendora to Montclair Project, feel free to contact me.

Thank you for your interest in the Foothill Gold Line.

Lisa

Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer

Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension—Azusa to Montclair
435 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202, Monrovia, CA 91016
(626) 330-7004 / (626) 331-5944 / 213-267-9161
llevybuch@foothillgoldline.org
www.foothillgoldline.org
April 15, 2019

Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, California 91016-3633

SENT VIA EMAIL TO: LLevyBuch@foothillgoldline.org

Dear Gold Line Authority:

This is a supplement to the six-page comment letter with ten exhibits dated March 29, 2019 that I previously submitted to the Gold Line Authority via email. The comment letter relates to the Gold Line Extension Project Azusa to Montclair (Project).

There is no mention of the Fairplex in either the 2013 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Gold Line Extension or the draft Supplemental EIR dated March 22, 2109. In the 2013 EIR, there is a reference to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan on page 3.10-1, and to the Auto Club Raceway on page 3.10-33. See Exhibit “11”.

In an earlier Gold Line report entitled “TOD Corridor Development Assessment Study” that was prepared by the IBI Group (Dec. 2007), there are several references to the Fairplex. See page 30, 33, and two charts (one of which shows the Fairplex as a “Regional Attraction”). See Exhibit “12”. This report is part of the SCAG 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan. See http://tpwes.scag.ca.gov/Pages/2008-RTP.aspx (Appendix F - Implementation Plan – Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension). Hence, both SCAG and the Gold Line Authority admit to the fact that the Fairplex is an important existing condition of the Project, and this knowledge was known in 2008, and well before the 2013 EIR for the Project was prepared.

The Fairplex and its traffic plan need to be incorporated in the planning of the Gold Line Extension project. After all, Los Angeles County has paid for the traffic study, which is currently underway.

In the 2013 EIR, the intersection just north of the Fairplex property (White Avenue and Arrow Highway) was given a grade of “F” by Parsons. See Exhibit “13”, page 2-18. What will be the grade be when the Fairplex traffic of 1.5 million guests is included?

The Gold Line trains will pass through La Verne every 5 minutes. See Exhibit “14” – a copy of comments March 2011 from City of San Dimas Mayor Curtis Morris – who is also an attorney and Loyola Law School graduate (1/29/2011) - e.g., the same number of Gold Line trains will pass through San Dimas and La Verne. This figure does not include the eighty Metrolink trains and the two freight trains that already pass through La Verne on the adjoining tracks.
Response 5-3

See Topical Response No. 3.

Response 5-4

See Topical Response No. 3. The Final SEIR complies with the holding in Friends of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist. The California Supreme Court did not conclude that an agency, when preparing a supplemental EIR, is required to reconsider all issues not evaluated in the original EIR. Rather, the Court stated that “If the original environmental document retains some informational value despite the proposed changes, then the agency proceeds to decide under CEQA’s subsequent review provisions whether project changes will require major revisions to the original environmental document because of the involvement of new, previously unconsidered significant environmental effects.” If the original environmental document retains some informational value despite the proposed changes, then the agency proceeds to decide under CEQA’s subsequent review provisions whether project changes will require major revisions to the original environmental document because of the involvement of new, previously unconsidered significant environmental effects. The Authority determined on the basis of substantial evidence that the 2013 FEIR retains informational value despite the Project Modifications. Thus, consistent with Friends of San Mateo Gardens and other CEQA precedent, the Final SEIR focuses on the impacts of the Project Modifications to determine whether those impacts require major revisions to the 2013 FEIR.

Response 5-5

See Topical Response No. 3. Comments posed regarding land use planning issues are outside of the Authority’s purview or discretionary authority and were not analyzed as part of the Draft SEIR.
Response 5-6

The Construction Authority is not in possession of the requested photos.

Response 5-7

The enclosures that were included as part of this comment letter are provided as an attachment to this comment response matrix.
Response 6-1

See Topical Response No. 1. Additionally, see Topical Response No. 5 for information regarding access, safety, and increases in traffic. The White Avenue mitigation measure does not result in a doubling of traffic. Safety will be improved because traffic queues will be shorter and more gaps in traffic will be available for local travelers turning onto or crossing over White Avenue. Noise analysis was conducted and no new impacts were identified along White Avenue. See Section 3.8 of the 2019 Final Supplemental EIR for more information on the noise analysis conducted.

Response 6-2

See Topical Response No. 1 above.

Response 6-3

See Topical Response No. 1. The use of signage was not identified as an effective solution to address traffic impacts. Drivers using the local and regional roadway network select routes that minimize their travel times, in other words there is no way to force traffic to use other streets.

Response 6-4

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5. The use of signal timing adjustments was not identified as an effective solution to address traffic impacts.

Response 6-5

Noise and visual analysis were conducted as part of this Final SEIR, Please see Sections 3.8 – Noise and Vibration, and Section 3.10 – Visual Quality of this Final SEIR for detailed analysis and impact determinations. Also, see Topical Response No. 1 for detailed the revised White Avenue mitigation measure. In addition, the Project Modifications analyzed as part of this Final SEIR do not include any new lighting features.
First, let me quote directly from the Foothill Gold Line’s website description of LaVerne

“As one of the most desirable communities in metropolitan Southern California, La Verne is a progressive city that has retained much of its small town charm.”

This much-touted small-town charm is at grave risk with the plan to widen White Avenue.

As residents on or near White Avenue, we have given you all our logical reasons that widening White is not a good idea because of safety, noise, access, quality of life, etc. etc. I would like for this letter to reiterate that but to go further to say that if you do allow, albeit almost encourage, the widening of White Avenue I can guarantee you that you will DESTROY much of what makes LaVerne unique and a desirable place to live.

Instead, we will just be disconnected dilapidated homes along near freeways of Arrow, White and Foothill. The sense of tree-lined community will be lost as the historic section will be bifurcated with buzzing traffic much worse than we have made workable now with traffic calming devices and a narrower section from 1st through sixth.

The old adage "If you build it, they will come." could not be truer in this case.

If you widen White Avenue it will ENCOURAGE MORE THROUGH TRAFFIC to go through the residential corridor of our city.

Ask yourself the question—Are our streets for our use or just a passageway for people to fly through us?

I cannot imagine that the 1st-8th widening of White will subtract more than SECONDS from a transit car’s commute. Are those seconds of other’s transit time really worth what it will cost the taxpaying, voting citizens of historic LaVerne?

**Why not explore every other alternative before this widening?**

What about waiting to see? Some indicate that the Foothill Gold Line will actually LESSEN the traffic on White.

It will save time and budget in completing the Foothill Goldline project. You can always widen—you can’t UNWIDEN after destroying the feeling of the town.

What about signage to direct commuters down Arrow to Wheeler and out on Foothill to 210, especially for trucks because most will be going West?

What about working with the signals to make White traffic move more between lights?

Much ado is made by the Foothill Gold Line about mitigating intrusive lights and sounds which could disturb the LaVerne neighborhood and yet it is the Gold Line who will absolutely add a lot of light and noise to White Avenue. This approach defies logic for any thinking person.

I sincerely ask you to rethink the necessity of this widening and the toll it will take on “one of the most desirable communities in metropolitan Southern California.”

Respectfully yours,

Kathryn B Butler
2513 3rd Street (at 3rd and White)
Response 7-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 7-2

The traffic analysis methodology employed used LOS based analysis consistent with the 2013 FEIR. Based on the proposed project modifications the first mile/last mile benefits would be marginal and would not have a measurable effect on reducing the identified traffic impacts. See Topical Response No. 5 and No. 6 for more information.
Letter 8

Response 8-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

-----

Letter #8

From: Lisa Levy Buch
To: Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
Cc: Lisa Levy Buch
Subject: Re: Letter 8

See below. He is a city councilman from La Verne.

Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer

Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority

408 East Huntington Drive, Suite 362, Monrovia, CA 91016
p 626.354.7004 f 626.471.8049 m 626.267.0181
llevybuch@foothillgoldline.org
www.foothillgoldline.org

-----

From: Tim Hapbum
To: Lisa Levy Buch
Cc: Tim Hapbum
Subject: Daniel

Hi Lisa, Thanks for the meeting on Tuesday this week. I feel we need a traffic signal at 2nd street and 3rd street as the residents losing more of white street due to the widening and increased traffic they need to be able to get out of those areas. These 2 signals would solve this problem. It may even alleviate some traffic as people will not want to wait for the signal and will take other routes out of town. Thanks, Tim
Response 9-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 9-2

See comment Response 9-1, above.

Response 9-3

See comment Response 9-1, above. Additionally, and in response to comment on other modes being considered, the potential for bicycle facilities is being evaluated for this stretch of White Avenue. The ultimate configuration/location of bike facility(s) will be subject to approval by the City of La Verne.

Response 9-4

See comment Response 9-1, above. The Final SEIR analysis of traffic impacts follows the direction of the December 2018 amendments to the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3. Because this is a supplemental EIR, it also evaluated the potential for the Project Modifications to have a significant impact on traffic delay using methodologies consistent with those used in the 2013 FEIR.

The Authority should remove the White Avenue widening mitigation from its plan. This area of La Verne is a quiet neighborhood with nearby churches, schools, parks, and homes. The widening will encourage drivers to use White as a throughfare rather than the neighborhood street that it is now. The city recently added measures to increase the safety of White by slowing down traffic in the same location that the Authority proposes to widen. The widening will increase the potential for vehicle collisions at a higher speed. Leaving White with the current number of vehicle lanes will encourage drivers to use alternative existing wider roads.

Rather than widening, the Authority should examine ways to encourage other modes of transportation by adding such infrastructure as protected bicycle lanes.

The Authority should follow the guidance of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research by presuming a “less-than-significant impact on transportation” and eliminate this unnecessary mitigation.

Thank you,
Ruben Soto
La Verne resident
Hi Lisa,

Thanks so much for providing this forum for feedback, as well as the Foothill Gold Line staff resources at the community meeting last night. I skimmed through the draft SEIR and attended the La Verne meeting on 4/16 to listen to my neighbors and discuss plans with your engineers.

After taking in this information, I wanted to share with you my concerns about the proposed widening of White Avenue. As a local resident (I live on Bonsuca Ave. just a few houses east of White), my family uses White Ave. daily; my husband walks to work at the University of La Verne and we walk to restaurants and shops in La Verne’s downtown as well as north on White to the park, to the post office, and to the shopping centers on Foothill. Of course we frequently drive on White as well; it’s our main road to and from the 10 and 210 freeways and for more local trips.

1. All of this is to say that I am familiar with White Avenue, and I understand that traffic on White has increased in recent years. However, I cannot support your proposal to widen White Ave. Your engineers appear to be putting vehicle traffic flow first in their concerns, which makes me wonder about their plans to accommodate the other types of transport I regularly use in my neighborhood: walkers and bikers. Removing the easement between the road and the sidewalk in order to widen the
road is a terrible idea. That cushion between the sidewalk and the cars is what makes this section of White Ave. walkable and safe. Too, adding lanes to White Ave. will speed up traffic in our neighborhood, making the street more dangerous for all who are not in their cars. Perhaps slowing down traffic in this stretch between 2nd and 6th Streets is a better idea—this is a residential neighborhood after all, not an industrial or retail zone.

This afternoon I attended a meeting at Chapman University; to get there I exited the 57 east onto Orangewood, a 5 lane road until it enters a residential neighborhood [and turns into Walnut Ave.] and narrows to one lane in each direction. Stop signs force cars on Orangewood to slow and slow down as they enter Walnut. The experience of driving on Orangewood/Walnut seemed perfectly reasonable to me as a driver—of course I don’t want to speed through someone’s neighborhood. Our neighborhood in La Verne would benefit from similar treatment, especially due to our old town alleys. — unfamiliar drivers should be slowed down further—not sped up—as they enter our neighborhood as a signal to remind them to be aware of local car traffic coming from the streets and alleys, and of local foot and bike traffic on sidewalks and crosswalks.

I fully support the Gold Line extension and look forward to being able to walk to the La Verne and Pomona stations and ride the train to Los Angeles and beyond. However, as a proponent of mass transit and alternative modes (walking, biking) of transportation, I am having a hard time understanding why the proposed expansion also requires a widening of White Avenue to accommodate additional car traffic. As far as I can tell from the SEIR and the presentation, White Ave. is not clearly connected to the station parking lots or main roads. How do the proposed Gold Line Stations impact White Ave.? And shouldn’t the expansion of the rail line ultimately bring less vehicle traffic, not more? I hope you will reconsider your proposed plan to widen White Ave. and give credence to me and my neighbors who experience White Ave. in a myriad of ways—as drivers, walkers, bikers, and homeowners—and on a daily basis. The widening of this street will have numerous local and aesthetic drawbacks (not to mention it’ll cost a lot of money!), and will benefit only a certain demographic: the zippy commuter rushing though my neighborhood in his car on his way somewhere else. Let’s put him on the train, instead.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Kaplan
2550 Bonita Ave.
La Verne, CA. 91750

—

Genevieve Kaplan
poet, book-maker, literary friend
https://genevievekaplan.com

Response 10-3

See comment Response 10-1, above.

Response 10-4

See Chapter 2 of the 2019 Final Supplemental EIR for analysis specific to White Avenue as an access route to the Gold Line stations. Additionally, commuters/rail patrons will use White Avenue as an access route to either the La Verne or the Pomona stations.

Response 10-5

See comment Response 10-1, above. Additionally, the Gold Line will decrease regional traffic but will increase local traffic around the station locations. The net effect is an increase in traffic on White Avenue, which coupled with the at-grade crossing results in the identified traffic impacts and the respective mitigation measure.
Letter #11

Response 11-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 11-2

See comment Response 11-2, above.

---

From: Curtis McPherson <cmtyrant@gmail.com>
To: Lisa Levy-Buch <LLevyBuch@metro.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 4:04 PM
Subject: White Ave

To whom it may concern,

I was unable to attend the public meeting at the La Verne Community Center last night but I was told there is time for public input. I would like to strongly encourage the Foothill Gold Line to look for alternatives rather than follow through with widening White Ave to 4 lanes. I do not support widening White Ave as it would be a major change to a small town. I am looking forward to the Gold Line as an additional option for transportation. To recommend such a car focused change seems to be the opposite of what the Gold Line is supposed to help with. I would recommend looking to alternatives for transportation, especially within the First Mile Last Mile workshops or with the one of the many local active transportation groups such as the La Verne Bicycle Coalition (http://lvbikecoalition.org), the Pomona Valley Bicycle Coalition (https://pvbikes.org), or the San Gabriel Valley Bicycle Coalition (http://www.adtbike.org).

Thank you for your time.

-Curtis McPherson
626-567-3082
Letter 12

Response 12-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5. Additionally, the White Avenue mitigation measure will improve safety and access, because traffic queues will be shorter and more gaps in traffic will be available for local travelers turning onto or crossing over White Avenue.

Comments to the Draft SEIR
Foothill Gold Line - Glendora to Montclair - Extension Phase 2B

April 19, 2019
Roger Hanawalt
2509 3rd Street
La Verne, CA 91750
rogerhanawalt@me.com
909-229-3309

1 The proposed widening of White Avenue will be a dangerous change to a difficult traffic situation.

I live in an area of La Verne that will be immediately and detrimentally affected by the proposed widening of White Avenue. The area concerned is a 2 block by 2 block area comprising 2nd and 3rd Streets East of White Avenue. This area has been home to my family for almost 100 years, and will continue to be home for many more.

- We have only 3 entry and exit points for auto and foot traffic in this neighborhood: Intersections at (1) Bonita and 1st Street, (2) 2nd Street and White Ave, and (3) 3rd Street and White Ave. Both Eastern ends of 2nd and 3rd Streets end in cul-de-sacs.
During morning and evening commutes, as well as during Fairplex events and train traffic events, these exit points are currently very difficult to navigate due to congestion.

In 2016, our neighborhood in partnership with the City of La Verne successfully created striping on White Avenue that eliminated the room for a "4 lane highway", creating a traffic pattern with one lane north, one lane south, and a common left turn lane in the center. This was an enormously popular and successful response to numerous auto accidents, bike and pedestrian injuries, and a generally dangerous exit experience. The current striping at least allows a way to slow down at the intersections of 2nd/White and 3rd/White. Being able to cross White Avenue also removes the sense of isolation this neighborhood feels when there is a freeway between us and the rest of La Verne.

Widening White Avenue to 4 lanes will bring back a huge problem that we have already experienced – it will be next to impossible to cross or enter a four lane highway during congested hours. And yet we do need to be able to leave our neighborhood, so the consequences may be fatal. Our only other choice is exiting onto Bonita Ave. from "T" Street, but this is a major East-West artery with similar problems.

This area of town was never designed for a 4 lane highway. We won't even be able to walk to a Gold Line Station without a death defying experience.

**ANY Gold Line modification in this area MUST consider new traffic signals at 2nd/White and 3rd/White.**

Response 12-2

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.
Dear Lisa Levy Buch,

I am commenting on the new draft SEIR, which proposes to widen White Avenue in order to improve motor vehicle circulation at First and Second Street. I strongly oppose this proposal, which appears to be based on Level-of-Service Criteria that are outdated and inappropriate for a transit project. New CDA Rules state clearly that "a project's effect on automobile delay shall "not" constitute a significant environmental impact."

The Gold Line extension is intended to make non-automobile travel more attractive. Widing White Avenue would have the opposite effect, inviting more cars to use the street and jeopardizing current conditions that encourage walking and biking, such as the existing parks ways and lane configuration.

Please reconsider the street widening plan. Instead, I would urge you to consider measures that enhance the environment for non-motorized transport, such as bike share options near the La Verne station. The goal should not be to maintain the status quo for cars, but rather to improve human mobility and livable neighborhoods for everyone.

Best wishes,
Allan Pecora
See below.

-----Original Message-----
From: Hugh <hjkelley1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 3:02 PM
To: Lisa Levy-Boch <llevyboch@footgollline.org>
Subject: White Avenue Widening

Greetings,

My name is Hugh Kelly and am Administrator of The La Verne Coalition of Concerned Citizens, a group of 630 households in La Verne. Our group spans the entire City of La Verne and several of our members live on or near White Avenue.

We protest the small town feel of Old Town La Verne. This should not be a thoroughfare. There is Wheeler, Cherry and Towne Avenue and Arrow Highway to get to the Gold Line. Don't ruin a whole neighborhood. Make traffic harder on White, let them find a faster route. After the Montclair Station opens the White Avenue widening will no longer be needed. It is an unnecessary expense.

Hugh J. Kelly
Administrator of The La Verne Coalition of Concerned Citizens
Response 15-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5. New signals at these intersections would increase delay for drivers, so these were not identified as mitigation measures.
Gold Line White Ave Widening Mitigation

Request for Traffic lights at 2nd and 3rd street and White Avenue

As a resident living East of White Avenue and South of Bronte Avenue, I will be adversely impacted by the proposed 4 lanes on White Avenue. I request that the Goldline install traffic signals and cross walks on both intersections of 2nd and 3rd Street at White Avenue so that we may exit the neighborhood safely.

Please email the above statement to: Lisa Levy Bush, CDO Foothill Gold Line, LLevyBush@foothillgoldline.org

And / Or sign & return this flyer.

Name: [Signature]

[Handwritten signatures]

Please Email or sign and return to Steve Johnson, 3578 3rd Street. This is on a fast track and your input is needed! Now!!

City Council meets Monday, [date] at 4:30 for a special study session.
Response 15-2

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5. New signals at these intersections would increase delay for drivers, so these were not identified as mitigation measures.
Gold Line White Ave Widening Mitigation

Request for Traffic lights at 2nd and 3rd Street and White Avenue

As a resident living East of White Avenue and South of Banta Avenue, I will be adversely impacted by the proposed 4 lanes on White Avenue. I request that the Goldline install traffic signals and cross walks on both intersections of 2nd and 3rd Street at White Avenue so that we may exit the neighborhood safely.

Please email the above statement to Lisa Levy Bush, COO Foothill Gold Line: llevyBush@foothillgoldline.org

And / Or sign & return this flyer.

Name        Address        Signature

Please Email or sign and Return to Steve Johnson, 2575 3rd Street. This is on a fast track and your input is needed now!

City Council meets Monday at 4:30 for a special study session.
Gold Line White Ave Widening Mitigation

Request for Traffic lights at 2nd and 3rd Street and White Avenue

As a resident living east of White Avenue and South of Bonita Avenue, I will be adversely impacted by the proposed 4 lanes on White Avenue. I request that that the Gold Line install traffic signals and cross walks on both intersections of 2nd and 3rd Street at White Avenue so that we may exit the neighborhood safely.

Please email the above statement to Lisa Levy Bush, CDO Foothill Gold Line: LLevyBush@FoothillGoldLine.org

And/or sign & return this flyer:

Name                      Address                      Signature
Deseree Lyngard          2017 3rd St, Ca Verne CA 91730
Graham Lyngard           2017 3rd St, Ca Verne CA 91730
Olivia Lyngard           2017 3rd St, Ca Verne CA 91730
Addison Lyngard          2017 3rd St, Ca Verne CA 91730
STEVE JOHNSON            2571 3rd St
Stephanie Johnson        2571 3rd St

Please Email or sign and Return to Steve Johnson, 2571 3rd Street. This is on a fast track and your input is needed now!

City Council meets Monday, May 20, at 4:30 for a special study session.
Gold Line White Ave Widening Mitigation

Request for Traffic lights at 2nd and 3rd Street and White Avenue

As a resident living East of White Avenue and South of Bonita Avenue, I will be adversely impacted by the proposed 4 lanes on White Avenue. I request that the Goldline install traffic signals and crosswalks on both intersections of 2nd and 3rd Street at White Avenue so that we may exit the neighborhood safely.

Please email the above statement to Lisa Levy Bush, COO Foothill Gold Line: LevyBush@FoothillGoldline.com
And sign & return this flyer.

Name: Renette Boardman

Address: 2634 Second St

Signature: Renette Boardman

El Rio Boardman 2634 Second St

Eilene Boardman

Please Email or sign and return to Steve Johnson, 2571 3rd Street. This is on a fast track and your input is needed! New City Council meets Monday 4/29 at 4:30 for a special study session

4/29
Gold Line White Ave Widening Mitigation

Request for Traffic lights at 2nd and 3rd Street and White Avenue

As a resident living East of White Avenue and South of Bonita Avenue, I will be adversely impacted by the proposed 4 lanes on White Avenue. I request that the Goldline install traffic signals and cross walks on both intersections of 2nd and 3rd Street at White Avenue so that we may exit the neighborhood safely.

Please email the above statement to: Lisa Levy Bush, CEO Foothill Gold Line, LLevyBush@foothillgoldline.org
And Or sign & return this flyer.

Name

Address

Signature

Please sign and return to Steve Johnson, 2571 3rd Street. This is on a fast track and your input is needed now!

City Council meets Monday 7/19 at 4:30 for a special study session.
Gold Line White Ave Widening Mitigation

Request for Traffic lights at 2nd and 3rd Street and White Avenue

As a resident living East of White Avenue and South of Bonita Avenue, I will be adversely impacted by the proposed 4 lanes on White Avenue. I request that the Goldline install traffic signals and cross walks on both intersections of 2nd and 3rd Street at White Avenue so that we may exit the neighborhood safely.

Please email the above statement to: Lisa Levy Bush. CEO Foothill Gold Line. LLevyBush@foothillgoldline.org

And or sign & return this flyer.

Name: Hendrie, Jilb. Address: 2797 8th St. Signature: 3/20

Please Email or sign and return to Steve Johnson, 1571 3rd Street. This is on a fast track and your input is needed Now!

City Council meets Monday at 4:30 for a special study session
Gold Line White Ave Widening Mitigation

Request for Traffic lights at 2nd and 3rd Street and White Avenue

As a resident living East of White Avenue and South of Monte Avenue, I will be adversely impacted by the proposed 4 lanes on White Avenue. I request that the Goldline install traffic signals and cross walks on both intersections of 2nd and 3rd Street at White Avenue, so that we may exit the neighborhood safely.

Please email the above statement to: Lisa Levy Bush, LCO Foothill Gold Line: l levyBush@foothillgoldline.org
And Or sign & return this flyer

Name  Address  Signature

Robert Hoover  2665 3rd St.  Robert Hoover
Vera Hoover  3665 3rd St.  Vera Hoover

Please Email or sign and return to Stew Johnson, 3571 5th Street. This is on a fast track and your input is needed now!
City Council meets Monday 8/29 at 4:30 for a special study session.
April 21, 2019

City of La Verne, City Council and Mayor Kendrick
360 E. St., La Verne, CA 91750

Dear City Council members and Mayor Kendrick,

Our neighbors have been voicing our concerns for over two years. The City is aware that most of our neighbors are

1.

After reviewing the impact report (SEIR), it does not mention that there is an impact at White Ave. and Bonita Ave. When they did the study was it 2:00 a.m. in the morning? If the intersection is not impacted, then why are they recommending to widen White Ave.

I have lived at the corner of White and Bonita since 1975. I drive to work in Azusa and bowling for almost 30 years. I have witnessed more accidents in my front yard (Bonita) and my side yard (White) than in all the accidents I saw while commuting to work for 30 years.

Since the road was stupid, the intersection has improved somewhat. So don't change it.

The City of La Verne should try other solutions to the traffic problems before widening White Ave. We want a safe neighborhood with less accidents, not more! It will cost millions to tear up White Ave., - the street, curbs, telephone poles, old deerer trees, etc.
Response 16-3

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5. Impacts. New signals at these intersections would increase delay for drivers, so these were not identified as mitigation measures.

Response 16-4

Changing the signal timing to favor White Avenue would create an impact on Bonita Avenue and was therefore not considered.

Response 16-5

Changing truck routes will create impacts to other routes and also increase travel time for trucks.

Response 16-6

The comment addresses issues regarding freeway interchange operations that are not impacted by the Project Modifications. See Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR for detailed traffic analysis. The Project is an important element of the Regional Transportation Plan that is designed to provide a regional alternative to the freeways in the San Gabriel Valley, and thus contribute to improvements in regional mobility. The Regional Transportation Plan also includes various state highway improvements that are within the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation. These other projects address transportation issues related to freeway operations. Comments regarding freeway access and placement should be directed to California Department of Transportation – Public Affairs Office, specifically District 7 in Los Angeles County and District 8 in San Bernardino. See [http://www.dot.ca.gov/contactus.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/contactus.html) for more information.
Response 16-7

The planned inclusion of a bike lane as part of the Project Modifications is consistent with coordination with the City of La Verne and consistent with the City’s Old Town La Verne Specific Plan which, with respect to the Project, identifies portions of Arrow Highway and White Avenue as either primary or secondary bikeways. The Specific Plan itself promotes bicycling and identifies the need to establish a bike route “that connects the University of La Verne Campus with Old Town La Verne, the Gold Line Station, and the Fairplex” (quoted from Section 6.5 of the Old Town La Verne Specific Plan, which can be found here: https://www.cityoflavere.org/otlvsp.pdf).

Response 16-8

See Topical Response No. 5.

Response 16-9

See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 16-10

See Topical Response No. 1.
Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension

Comments and Responses

Letter 17

Response 17-1

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 17-2

See comment Response 17-1, above.

Response 17-3

See comment Response 17-1, above.
Letter 18

Response 18-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.

-----Original Message-----

From: Roy Halberg <rahalberg@usa.com>
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2019 8:19 PM
To: Lisa Levy Bush <LLevyBush@laurelgoldline.org>
Subject: Gold Line in LaVerne

Re: widening of White Ave

I am opposed to widening White Ave, it's already too busy and cars drive way too fast. If safety is a priority, then this idea is bad.

The impact on a street that is essentially a residential area will not be good. This is true for White Ave as well as for nearby neighborhoods.

Roy Halberg
909-660-9655
Letter #19

Response 19-1

See Topical Response No.1.

From: Otto Leon <ottusio2@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 8:44 PM
To: Lisa Levy Buch <llevybach@foothillgoldline.org>
Subject: WHITE AVENUE WIDENING

Greetings,

My name is Otto Leon and as a member of The La Verne Coalition of Concerned Citizens, a group of 630 households in La Verne. Our group spans the entire City of La Verne and several of our members live on or near White Avenue.

We protest ruining the small town feel of Old Town La Verne. This should not be a thoroughfare. There is Wheeler, Garey and Towne Avenues and Arrow Highway to get to the Gold Line. Don’t ruin a whole neighborhood. Make traffic safer on White, let them find a faster route. After the Montclair Station spans the White Avenue widening will no longer be needed. It is an unnecessary expense.

Please stop pursuing the widening of White Avenue.

Otto Leon / La Verne 91750
Letter 20

Response 20-1

See Topical Response No. 1.
Councilman Tim Hepburn provided the comment below.

Lisa Levy Buch  
Chief Communications Officer

Foothill Gold Line  
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority  
450 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202, Monrovia, CA 91016  
p 626.395.7884 f 626.471.9849 m 909.267.0161  
infofoh@foothillgoldline.org  
www.foothillgoldline.org

From: Tim Hepburn <tjh@gehled.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 01, 2019 3:15 PM  
To: Lisa Levy Buch <LLevyBuch@foothillgoldline.org>  
Cc: Tim Hepburn <tjh@gehled.com>  
Subject: white street widening

Hey Lisa, I would like to see 2 lanes north, 1 center turn lane and 1 southbound lane. If we can squeeze a bike lane on 1 side or 2 without widening would be a good solution for the residents.  
Thanks Lisa, Tim

Letter 21

Response 21-1

See Topical Response No. 1.
Response 22-1

Based on the Sacred Land File (SLF) search completed by the Native American Heritage Commission as part of the SEIR, the Authority understands that Native American cultural resources recorded in the SLF are located in the Project Modifications area environs. Due to local agency and public input during the Draft SEIR public circulation period (March 22 – May 6, 2019), the proposed location change of the Pomona Station parking facility has been removed from the Project Modifications and the new traffic mitigation measures, widening of White Avenue, has been revised to no longer contain ground disturbance. Ground disturbance for the Project Modifications would be limited to the areas previously analyzed as part of the 2013 FEIR with addenda and Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2, as detailed in the 2013 FEIR, would be implemented to minimize construction impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources.

See email comment below.

-----Original Message-----
From: Julie Sevelov <julie.s206@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2019 2:28 PM
To: Lisa Levy Bach <LLevybach@foothillgoldline.org>
Subject: I have been contacted by the Tongva-Gabrielino Tribe, of San Gabriel, CA, regarding the
meadow/greenbelt between S. Vermont Ave. and Glendora Blvd. in Glendora.

Dear Mr. Bach, I am contacting you today, on behalf of Mr. Anthony Morales, Chief of the Tongva-
Gabrielino Tribe, based in San Gabriel, CA. He plans to contact you regarding the area I mentioned to you
located along the tracks where my late friend Scott Kelley passed away last summer. He can be reached directly
at his cell phone: (626) 463-3564. I just spoke with him a few minutes ago, as well as getting a call from the
Glendora Historical Society, who phoned me before him, today. They are going to look at the Rancho Il Chino
slab today. Both parties will be contacting your office shortly. I thought since the May 6th deadline is
coming up you would want to be informed. I was surprised to get calls today from them. Mr. Morales tells me
the area is culturally sensitive and should not be dug into or altered just yet. They must examine it first.
Long before 2018 I wondered about that spot. So all this does make sense. I’ll bet that the tracks can go in
without digging up the side south of the tracks there between S. Vermont and Glendora Ave. since the land area
next to Albertsons and the condos across from them, is wide and flat. Thank you again for your meeting in La Verne,
and answering my questions! Have a great week. Sincerely, Julie Sevelov, aka Sevelov
Response 23-1

See Topical Response No. 1. No property acquisition is proposed in the revised mitigation measure.

Response 23-2

See Topical Response No. 1; the revised mitigation measure for White Avenue is shifting the features to a restriping of the roadway and not a widening. As described in Section 3.8 of the Final SEIR, no new or increased noise and vibration impacts were predicted due to the Proposed Modifications. Therefore, the existing approved noise mitigation measures as described in detail in Section 3.11.9.2 of the 2013 FEIR would still be applicable without changes or revisions, and are summarized in the Final SEIR, Section 3.8.7.
Obviously if there is an attempt to condemn Ms. Geerken’s property it will be met with vigorous opposition from the declaration of necessity to a lengthy trial as to the value of the 27 square feet that you hope to condemn. That 27 + square feet is crucial to the property and therefore it would be a very substantial economic impact to Ms. Geerken which we would seek to recover in court.

In order to avoid problems like the one outlined in this letter, I would hope that the Gold Line Authority would figure out a way to not widen White Avenue and deal with the issues you want addressed in another way.

Finally, enclosed are comments by my client why the taking of her property is wrong and a petition signed by numerous residents of La Verne (with more to come) urging the City to stop the widening of White Avenue. Hopefully common sense will prevail and we can avoid a very extensive legal battle.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Paul M. Mahoney
MAHONEY & SOLL LLP
PMM.dll

Enclosures
COMMENTS FROM CATHERINE GEERKEN

- For the past 9 years, I have lived on the corner of Bonita and White Avenue. In that time, I have invested significantly in improvements to the home as its value is the cornerstone of my retirement plan. The proposed widening will have a significant and negative impact upon the value of my home, and subsequently to my retirement.

- City council knew in 2016-17 that the historic section of La Verne opposed the widening of White Avenue as there were at least two city council meetings that I attended where a large number of residents united to oppose the proposed widening. As a result, White Avenue was re-striped through the intersection of Bonita Avenue. Traffic was essentially “calmed” as cars had been turning it into a four-lane road without the striping.
  - Informal observations from residents note that there has appeared to be less accidents and “near misses” with the traffic calming lanes between the area around the Railroad tracks through to around 6th St.
  - Councilman Robin Carder stated at the special session (4/29/19) that she had lost her own home when the 210 expanded. She stated, “homes won’t be taken, we’re talking about property.” If we don’t take advantage (of the Foothill Goldline paying for the street widening and street improvements such as bringing the intersections up to code), Foothill Goldline won’t come back later and pay for it.” “White is perfect for going either way to the freeway...they’re (commuters) not going to take Wheeler.” She then asked for information to be gathered from other cities on the effects of the Gold line going through.
  - Mayor Don Kendrick (4/29/19):
    - “Quality of life the most important thing” but issue started 37 years ago when White Avenue was connected to Fruit Street.
  - Councilman Tim Hepburn (4/29/19):
    - Lived here 37 years; “not an easy process;” thanked the Goldline for the opportunity to have a station; he believes we have a solution
    - “Historical values are the most important values.”
    - “Habits (driving habits referred to as a solution earlier) can be changed.
      Start with 1-Making changes through paint 2-Retain historical value 3-Safety.
  - Councilman Marc Davis (4/29/19):
    - Have to fight the urge to say, ‘Not in my backyard.’ He said to show up and speak up at the July meeting with Caltrans.
  - Mayor Pro Tem Charlie Rosales (4/29/19):
    - “I hear the passion for the Old Town area.”

Response 23-5

See Topical Response No. 1.
As described in Chapter 4 of the Final Supplemental EIR, the Authority provided public notices including publication in newspapers of general circulation, notices on the Authority, E-news, social media, and other methods of communication to inform the public of the meetings regarding the Draft Supplemental EIR. A summary report for the scoping process conducted in concert with the Draft SEIR is provided in Appendix H of this Final SEIR. Additionally, see Topical Response No. 1.

Response 23-7

See comment Response 23-1, above.

Response 23-8

As part of the Draft Supplemental EIR, a visual assessment was conducted, see section 3.10 for more detailed information. However, as reflected in Topical Response No. 1, the White Avenue mitigation measure has been revised to address the comments regarding aesthetics impacts of widening. Regarding the soundproofing comments, additional analysis regarding noise impacts are provided in Section 3.8 of the Final Supplemental EIR, and no new or more severe significant impacts were identified.
Response 23-9

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 23-10

See Topical Response No. 5 and Chapter 2 of the Supplemental EIR regarding methodology of the traffic analysis.

Response 23-11

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 23-12

The publicly owned right of way on White Avenue extends to the back of the parkway strip, however as discussed in Topical Response No. 1, the White Avenue mitigation measure has been modified to not include widening.

Response 23-13

See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 23-14

See Topical Response No. 5.

Response 23-15

See Topical Response No. 1 – The Project Modifications do not include any changes that would occur on Bonita Avenue.
Letter 24

Petition attached is a comment on the Draft SEIR.

Liza Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer

From: Stefanie Sza-Lalua <stefanie@gahled.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2019 11:36 AM
To: Lisa Levy Buch <LisaLevyBuch@FoothillGoldline.org>
Cc: Tim Hapburn <tim@gahled.com>
Subject: RE: signatories

Sorry about that. Here you go.

From: Lisa Levy Buch <LisaLevyBuch@FoothillGoldline.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 11:34 AM
To: Stefanie Sza-Lalua <stefanie@gahled.com>
Cc: Tim Hapburn <tim@gahled.com>
Subject: RE: signatories

Nothing is attached. Can you please resend?
From: Stefanie Sue-Leilua <Stefanie@gethied.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2019 8:33 AM
To: Lisa Levy Buch <LLevyBuch@foothillgoldline.com>
Cc: Tim Hepburn <tjhe@gghied.com>
Subject: Signatures

Good morning Lisa,

Tim asked me to scan and send these signatures to you.

Thanks,

Stefanie Leilua
Office Manager
Gehl Electric, Inc
(714)257-1081
Response 24-1

See Topical Response No. 1
### Petition to

**La Verne Residents Opposing the Widening of White Avenue**

**We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to stop the widening of White Ave.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roy Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td>2422 2nd St</td>
<td>Not Welcome</td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td></td>
<td>2055 Arroway</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>3525 3rd St</td>
<td>Not Welcome</td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 3rd St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td></td>
<td>2581 Bonita</td>
<td>Not Welcome</td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Trout</td>
<td></td>
<td>2581 Bonita</td>
<td>Not Welcome</td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Roll</td>
<td></td>
<td>2819 2nd St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td>2554 2nd St</td>
<td>Not Welcome</td>
<td>4-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td>2475 Bonita</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td>2240 5th St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye Chow</td>
<td></td>
<td>2263 Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-29/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Petition to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Huang</td>
<td></td>
<td>2446 7th St, La Verne</td>
<td>Keep La Verne Safe</td>
<td>4/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Vincent</td>
<td></td>
<td>2546 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2138 White Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>2509 Bonita Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Painter</td>
<td></td>
<td>2549 Third</td>
<td>Don’t do it!</td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Kline</td>
<td></td>
<td>2481 Bonita Ave</td>
<td>Please leave as is</td>
<td>4/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>2509 Bonita Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2509 Bonita Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders Voss</td>
<td></td>
<td>2478 Bonita Ave</td>
<td>4 lanes = Less safety!</td>
<td>4/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>3515 B Street</td>
<td>Safety &amp; Community 1”</td>
<td>4/20/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Petition to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition summary and background</th>
<th>La Verne Residents Opposing the Widening of White Avenue</th>
<th>Action petitioned for</th>
<th>We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to stop the widening of White Ave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hansen</td>
<td></td>
<td>2500 2nd St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Redman</td>
<td></td>
<td>2410 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Yajson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2550 Bande Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Marie Ramirez</td>
<td></td>
<td>2487 3rd St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Oliva</td>
<td></td>
<td>2520 White Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/22/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Sjol</td>
<td></td>
<td>2419 Second St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/23/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Sjol</td>
<td></td>
<td>2619 Second St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Enqvist</td>
<td></td>
<td>2505 Bonita Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2474 2nd St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/27/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Petition to

La Verne Residents Opposing the Widening of White Avenue

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to stop the widening of White Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>2517 N North</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lon Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2522 3rd St, LV</td>
<td>Keep our neighborhood safe</td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Haslam</td>
<td></td>
<td>2850 2nd St, LV</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2571 3rd St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>2930 3rd St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Avila</td>
<td></td>
<td>2540 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td>2800 3rd St, LV</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Haslam</td>
<td></td>
<td>2570 3rd St, LV</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Haslam</td>
<td></td>
<td>2850 Second St, LV</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Petition to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td></td>
<td>8721 3rd St.</td>
<td>4/8/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td>2515 St.</td>
<td>4/9/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response 25-1

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 25-2

See comment Response 25-1, above.
April 30, 2019

Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, California 91016

Subject: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension – Azusa to Montclair

Dear Ms. Levy Buch,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority (Construction Authority) with comments related to the scope and content of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) for Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension, Azusa to Montclair.

In response to the Construction Authority’s Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the DSEIR, the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) provided comment letters dated December 28, 2018 and January 04, 2019. While Section 5.2, Regional Agencies, of the DSEIR indicates SBCTA was consulted during preparation of the document, the written comments submitted during the NOP period have not been addressed and no formal consultation regarding SBCTA’s concerns relating to the DSEIR have been done.

SBCTA requests the Construction Authority to take these concerns into consideration and revise the DSEIR to evaluate the impacts that the Gold Line Extension could have on Metrolink San Bernardino Line ridership and how the potential changes in ridership patterns could indirectly cause increases in vehicle traffic and vehicle miles traveled. In addition, it could potentially have a negative impact on air quality, greenhouse gas and noise pollutants in the community.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at (909) 884-8276.

Sincerely,

Carrie Schindler, PE
Director of Transit and Rail Programs

Cc: Ots Green, SBCTA

Letter 26

Response 26-1

Responses to the NOP comments have been incorporated below. The Authority looks forward to our continuing partnership, including active coordination and evaluation during the San Bernardino Line and Foothill Gold Line meetings. As represented in our latest Task Force meeting on May 13, 2019 our efforts on coordination are ongoing and the Authority again will continue to work in a collaborative manner with SBCTA, as the phased implementation of the Foothill Gold Line Phase 2B Project progresses.

Response 26-2

The Construction Authority has been and continues to coordinate in partnership with Metrolink, including recent participation in the Metrolink San Bernardino Line and Gold Line Task Force meeting, which included representatives from the Authority, SCRRRA, SBCTA, and LA Metro. The Construction Authority consulted with the group present about this Final SEIR, including a detailed discussion on ridership and the active evaluation of this topic amongst the agencies present. A presentation on the continuing evaluation of ridership methodology, travel demand analysis, and fare sensitivity (see Appendix A-3, Conceptual Design/Planning in Support of the Metrolink San Bernardino Line/Gold Line Task Force) was made and reviewed by the agency attendees. No questions or comments regarding the ridership for further consideration were posed. The questions asked focused on the timing of the Final SEIR and hiring the design-builder to continue with Gold Line implementation.

Additionally, the system of travel options within the project corridor and available to commuters is diverse, including personal vehicles, multiple transit options, car/van-pools, ride sharing services and other non-motorized options, such as bikes. These mode choices are all present within one of the busiest and most congested commuting corridors in the country. So, for the transit services, including Foothill Transit, OmniTrans, Metrolink and the Foothill Gold Line, ridership is subject to a number of factors. Those factors may include individually or in various combinations the economy, routes, station locations,
hours of operation, destinations, and timing, as well as personal preferences. Each of these factors weigh into the mode choice people make as part of their commuting options. A comment suggesting that there is a direct causal effect between the introduction of Foothill Gold Line operation and corresponding reductions in Metrolink ridership, does not take into account the range of factors described above or the range of influences they can have on ridership.

Therefore, the Project Modifications, as presented and analyzed in this Final SEIR, will not have a significant impact on Metrolink ridership. The phasing and interim terminus locations are limited in nature. In addition, Metrolink provides inter-regional transit service that connects travelers to stations in San Bernardino County and those connections and services will not be impacted by the phasing included in the Project Modifications. The Project Modifications also do not change the already approved Phase 2B limits as evaluated in the 2013 FEIR, including the transportation analysis showing completion of Phase 2B to Montclair.

Response 26-3

Air quality, greenhouse gas and noise impacts were analyzed in the Draft Supplemental EIR document. See Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.8 for the respective analysis.

Response 26-4

See comment Response 26-2. Additionally, the approved Foothill Gold Line – Phase 2B Project and Metrolink are both elements of Regional Transportation designed to expand inter- and intra-regional rail transit alternatives in both Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties. The addition of additional transit options provides benefits to regional mobility, including where some passengers elect to take or alter their transit choice to meet individual destination needs. The Foothill Gold Line Project is an important element of the Regional Transportation Plan that is designed to provide a regional alternative in the San Gabriel Valley, and thus contribute to improvements in regional mobility.
Response 26-5

The Final SEIR evaluates the impacts of the Project Modifications. Regional and local level planning analysis was conducted as part of the approved 2013 FEIR, including the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Section 3.10 Land Use and Planning of the 2013 FEIR for more detailed discussions and impact determinations. The Project Modifications do not conflict with the Regional Transportation Plan because the Project Modifications allow for early operation of the previously approved Phase 2B Project which is a key element of the Regional Transportation Plan to improve mobility in San Gabriel Valley.

Response 26-6

See comment Response 26-2
Response 26-7

See Topical Response No. 3. Also, a detailed discussion on the rationale for the proposed construction phasing modification is provided in Section 1.2.2 of this Final SEIR. Additionally, the project funding history, agreements, and thorough discussions regarding the funding, phasing and the corresponding linkage between as part of the project implementation strategies can be found in Section 1.2.2.2 of this Final SEIR. In the context of the Authority, local agencies along the corridor, and their respective roles as both partners and contributors to the funding needs, SBCTA has and continues to be a contributing member with agreed upon funding commitments for the last mile segment of the corridor from the Claremont to Montclair Transcenter Station. Regular coordination meetings are held with each of the local agencies and the Authority, again as partners in the ongoing implementation of the Foothill Gold Line Project. The comment components related to funding responsibilities is an item that would be best discussed as part of our continuing coordination and during our regular meetings.
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR METRO GOLD LINE FOOTHILL EXTENSION

Comments and Responses

Notice of Public Scoping Meeting

This notice is being provided to announce and solicit input on proposed project changes to the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B Project, also known as the Foothill Gold Line light rail project from Glendora to Montclair.

You are invited to attend a Public Scoping Meeting hosted by the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority (also known as the Foothill Gold Line Construction Authority). The purpose of this meeting is to discuss proposed modifications to the original Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and to gather input on potential impacts from constructing and operating the project.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING:
Monday, December 10, 2018
5:30 PM – 7:30 PM
La Verne Community Center
3680 D Street, La Verne CA 91750

The Construction Authority proposes to modify the Alternative Scott Project to allow for the potential to construct and operate the Project in five phases (instead of two phases, as previously approved). See map below for details on the proposed changes to the Construction Authority. The project will require the preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to evaluate the potential for significant impacts that may result from the additional construction and operation phases, as compared to the original EIR. A Public Scoping Meeting will be held to allow the affected community to learn about the proposed changes and to provide comments and concerns related to the proposed changes.

The proposed possible construction and operation phasing is necessary to match with both existing funding and operating/future funding, and provide the Construction Authority the flexibility to build and operate the phases as funding becomes available. The purpose of this public scoping meeting is to solicit input on potential issues to be considered and address any questions from the community.

If you are unable to attend the scoping meeting in person, written comments will be accepted if received on or before January 4, 2019. Please address written comments to:

Lisa Levy Buch, Chief Communications Officer
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
465 E Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, California 91016-3603
Email: lisa.buch@foothillgoldline.org

Questions: (626) 471-9050 Learn more: www.foothillgoldline.org
Letter #27

Response 27-1

See Topical Response No. 2.

From: Mark Marcus <mark.marcus@Centrepacres.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2019 11:02 AM
To: Lisa Levy Buch <LisaLevyBuch@MetroGoldLine.org>
Cc: priscilla@city-commercial.com
Subject: Comments on proposed relocation of Pomona Station Parking Facility

Ms. Buch,

Please accept this email as an official comment sheet regarding the proposed alternative location for the Pomona Station Parking Facility.

The proposed relocation of the parking facility to 200 West Santa Fe Street is problematic for many reasons.

I am an original owner of the building at 115 Gentry Street in Pomona which is located in the Pomona Business Park. I operate a small family business - Centrepacres, Inc.- in this building, and share in the expenses of the Association’s streets including Supply Street and Santa Fe Street. These streets were appropriately designed to serve the buildings in the business park.

The proposed alternative location would dramatically negatively impact all property owners in the area between Garvey Avenue, Arrow Highway, Santa Fe Street and Supply Street for the following reasons:

1. If the proposed lot changes for parking, there will be tremendous overflow parking on all surrounding streets for those avoiding the parking fee.

It is my understanding that due to the ownership status of the streets referenced, the Pomona...
police will not cite or tow for cars parked overnight on these streets. This creates many safety
concerns for citizens as well as surrounding businesses. Crime has increased in our business
park and with the addition of thousands of cars there is concern about property safety.

- With the exception of Fulton Road from the North, there is no direct access to the alternative
  location than roads that are owned by the Association. The small businesses located in this area
  are currently financially responsible for the maintenance and repair of these roads - which is
  equitable as current traffic solely serves these small businesses. The addition of thousands of
cars on these roads will dramatically increase the expense and frequency of major road repair -
which certainly should not be borne by the small business owners.

- The currently approved parking facility location will serve the community far better than the
  alternative. It is directly adjacent to Garey Avenue with easy access on appropriately designed
  streets. The alternative location primarily provides narrow, private streets through a small
  business park. These streets are used daily for deliveries and heavy daily traffic will cause safety
  issues for drivers as well as local workers.

I urge you to continue with the currently approved parking facility location and reject the proposed
alternative location on Santa Fe Street. The current location allows traffic to enter directly from a public
well traveled street. The alternative would cause parking and safety issues. In addition, small
businesses surely cannot be expected to pay for the repair and maintenance of roads that would be used
for public access.

The expansion of the Gold line is a wonderful thing for our community, however, the increased traffic
should have direct and easily accessible paths to the new structure - and that can only happen if it is
located in the currently approved location.

Again, please consider the safety concerns as well as the negative impacts of this relocation to business
owners that proudly make Pomona our base of business.

I appreciate your consideration of my comments.

Mark Marcus
Owner of CentreScapes, Inc.
165 Gentry Street
Pomona, CA
mark.marcus@centrescapes.com
909 206 5414

Response 27-2
See comment Response 27-2, above.

Response 27-3
See comment Response 27-2, above.

Response 27-4
See comment Response 27-2, above.

Response 27-5
See comment Response 27-2, above.

Response 27-6
See comment Response 27-2, above.
Response 28-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 28-2

See Topical Response No. 1. Additionally, Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of this Final SEIR discuss traffic demand forecasting results both regionally and at the Project level.

I am writing to provide input to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the La Verne Gold Line Station. Specifically to express my disapproval of converting White Avenue to a 2 lanes, with a center turn lane.

While I do not live in the area immediately impacted, I am a long term resident of La Verne. I also commute regularly around the city via bicycle, and to the Metrolink station. I am very much looking forward to the Gold Line, and the ability to connect via bicycle with additional regional transportation, reducing the need for a vehicle.

I recognize that the crossing of White creates bottlenecks and challenges. I do not believe these will be resolved by adding lanes, (either widening or within the existing roadway), as this will simply draw more cars into the area, creating the same challenges of greater volume. While the benefit will be low, the non-project OISIS will be great. While the reconfigured roadway will draw more vehicles into the area during peak times, it will create a wide underutilized roadway the balance (majority) of the time, leading to higher speeds and reduced safety. The change will forever change the characteristics of this historical neighborhood, the same features that make it desirable for both humans and the Gold Line. The areas surrounding the reconfigured road will decline in desirability and value, creating an area of underperforming...
A far better alternative would be to continue to use the roadway to constrain the number of vehicles that can be in the area and in conflict with the Gold Line operations. While this may create longer wait times for vehicles, and a lower LOS, it is trading the community is willing to make.

Additionally, any reconfiguration of the roadway must accommodate and improve non-vehicle access to the station. This must be via clear, low-stress, safe pathways into/exit from the station area.

Response 28-3
See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 28-4
See Topical Response No. 5.
Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29

Response 29-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Letter 29
Response 29-2

See Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR for the detailed traffic analysis conducted. See also Topical Response No. 5 and 6.

Response 29-3

See Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5.

The Project Benefits that are being proposed are all questionable and should be challenged:

- **Better Level of Service (LOS)** - this is an outdated metric being dropped at the state level. Do we really want to live in neighborhoods where a high LOS is more important than livability/desirability?
- **Safety** - this also seems highly questionable. Realistically, cars that are moving more slowly have many fewer injury crashes, with themselves, and vulnerable users like kids, pedestrians, bicyclists, etc.
- **Queueing into intersections** - we are skeptical about this assumed “benefit”. It seems more likely that widening the street will draw even more cars, which will then queue 2 lanes wide across the same intersections. (This is what is commonly been experienced as “Induced Demand” or “unintended consequences”)

Non Construction Costs that need be considered include the following:

- **Neighborhood Liveability** - The proposed changes will make the neighborhood less human accessible/relatable; both along the changed road and when crossing it.
- **Safety** - Adding more vehicles will be less safe for anyone not in a vehicle. Cars will alternate between “stuck” and racing to the next signal, or when traffic is light, speeds will increase as the broad road is an invitation to speed.
- **Desirability** - Living on or near a 4 lane road (even within the current road width) will be less appealing no way around it. Once this is done it will likely never revert.
- **Property Values** - Homes along the new roadway (and near it) will be devalued, and will not appreciate at the same rate if they were not on a 4 lane road.
- **Income to the City** - Property values have a direct impact on the City in terms of income. In the end, this will become an underperforming street from a revenue perspective.
- **Maintenance** - Widening or adding lanes will increase the cost of maintenance for that street, which, combined with the above, will have less revenue generated to pay for that maintenance.

**Summary Regarding This Proposal**

- We believe that this proposal to widen White Avenue fails the Cost/Benefit outlined above.
- Old Town is arguably our greatest asset, now and in the future. We should be intensely protective of what makes it special.
- Here is a great video on this if you have time:
  
  https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2016-4-27/conversations-with-an-engineer
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MS. LEVY BUCH: So the first two names are Kathryn Butler -- I'm sorry if I said that wrong -- and Catherine Geerkin.

MS. BUTLER: My name is Kathryn Butler, and I live at the corner of White and Third. So, clearly, the topic is critical to me.

While I'm decidedly in favor of mass transit options and their value to the overall air quality and reduction of additional traffic, the request of the Foothill Gold Line to increase the size of the street rather than reducing the street -- or reducing the traffic as a result of its inception strikes a wrong cord with me.

White Avenue is the unhappy recipient of much through traffic on the streets of Laverne and not Laverne residents.

Those through folks would have been more beneficially handled by a street such as Wheeler Avenue which is already industrial and already aptly laned.

In contrast, White Avenue goes through cross streets and tree-lined well-cared for vintage bungalows.
Response 30-1

The evaluation of traffic operations on White Avenue, and the determination of impacts, was based on an assessment of both a decrease in trips from shifts from automobile to transit and an increase in trips associated with riders driving to and from the stations. See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 30-2

See Topical Response No. 1.
Response 30-3

See Topical Response No. 1. No property acquisition is proposed in the revised mitigation measure.

Response 30-4

See Topical Response No. 5.

Response 30-5

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 4.

Response 30-6

See Topical Response No. 1.

Thank you.

MS. GEEKIN: My name is Catherine Geerkin, and I live at the corner of Bonita and White.

So I do not have the graciousness that our former speaker just had because I only found out tonight about the proposal to remove 15 square feet of the corner of my front yard, where there happens to be a brass historic plaque denoting my 1921 historic home.

So I'm a little bit in shock. I haven't had time to prepare an eloquent speech.

But as I hear you talking about environmental impacts, you can't put a price tag on the inability to have a conversation in my own backyard on my patio because the traffic is so loud.

You can't put a price tag on the inability to pull out of my garage because my access is now a major four-lane freeway.

So there's been no discussion of making it, perhaps, a one-way only street, perhaps putting in some speed bumps. There hasn't been consideration of what it will be like to see the value of our historic property be incredibly diminished.

As the former speaker said, there's no way to put this narrow road back once it is widened. So I would agree that if we could possibly delay this, look
Response 30-7

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 30-8

Additional transit services within the project corridor include Metrolink and Foothill Goldline transit. The Project is an additional transit mode of choice that is being implemented and will offer a different option for travelers to choose from. Further, as the Metro transit service develops and identified shuttle service is implemented it is estimated that the primary east-west route to be used will be along Arrow Highway. More information is provided in comment Response 2-8.
you're going to get.

Not only that, it's -- you know, the purpose of it is trying to reduce that traffic, trying to get those cars off the freeway, which you can't do without, you know, public transportation such as the Metrolink, bus lines and stuff.

So I implore you to look for financing available to get it -- get the line all the way to Montclair in the first couple phases and sooner than 2028. Otherwise, these cities are going to be suffering.

You'll save money, but they're going to be spending tens of millions of dollars trying to widen their streets and traffic safety and the additional accidents that are going to happen on these, you know, on the kids going to school.

And a lot of, you know, things are going to increase in these little cities; whereas, Montclair has the ability. Every street in the city of Montclair is a four-lane street that goes straight into the -- straight into the trans center.

We've got three bus lines going as far away as the city of Riverside, San Bernardino. Metrolink, they'll increase their riderships just by simply everybody wanting to get off the freeway, starting their
commute out in the -- you know, out in the far end of the valley and being able to get off in Montclair and get on -- get back right on the Gold Line and go straight to where they work at in the city of Pasadena.

So I just ask that you guys really work to find the financing available to the City of Montclair sooner. And give these folks here that live in the city here a break because they're just going to be inundated by those thousands of cars parking all over their small and narrow streets and taking up their -- you know, taking up their available time and resources.

Thank you.

MS. GLADDEN: Hello. My name is Sue Gladden. I live at 2510 Bonita. It's on the southeast corner of White and Bonita. I've lived there since 1975, one of the old dinosaurs that live there.

And I've probably seen more accidents than any of you maybe possibly in this whole room because a lot of the accident have come through my hedges. They've hit my trees. They've pulled out -- taken out the rose gardens at all hours of the night.

And I -- instead of wasting my time on that, I just want to tell you that when you widen White Avenue, you're going to increase accidents. And there's probably going to be fatalities. It's not a matter of

Response 30-10

See Topical Response No. 4.

Response 30-11

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.
Response 30-12

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5. The revised White Avenue mitigation measure (LTR-9) and in coordination with the City of La Verne has taken into account the need for and will include bike facility(s). The location, northbound and/or southbound side of White Avenue, will be part of a pending determination and approval by the City of La Verne.
Response 30-13

See Topical Responses No. 1, No. 3, and No. 5.

Response 30-14

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.
Response 30-15

See comment Response 16-7.

Response 30-16

The Authority does not have jurisdiction over traffic enforcement. Traffic enforcement is within the jurisdiction and authority of the local policing authority. See Topical Response No. 5.
and I live in La Verne.

I’ve submitted two letters to the Gold Line authority, to you Lisa, one dated March 29 and one dated yesterday. I’m here to speak about what is not in the 2019 EIR report or the 2019 supplemental.

The California Supreme Court said in Friends of College versus San Mateo County that the purpose of a supplemental EIR is to explore new environmental impacts that were not considered in the original EIR.

I’ve looked at the documents, and I can find no mention in the original EIR of the environmental impact of the Fairplex traffic.

There are 28,000 parking spaces at the Fairplex. I learned that from reading an article in the Daily Bulletin.

There are only 15,000 parking spaces at Disneyland. Would the City of Anaheim build a railroad through town and not take into consideration the traffic from Disneyland?

I’ve got to shorten this up because I only have three minutes.

The people from Parsons came and took photos of the Fairplex parking lot in 2006 and 2007. It’s mentioned in one of the earlier EIR reports. I’d like to see those site inspection photos because I think

Response 30-17

See Topical Response No. 3.

Response 30-18

See Topical Response No. 3. As to the public records act request, the Construction Authority is not in possession of the requested photos.
those show the Fairplex parking lots.
    I can't even find on the photos that are
provided in the reports a good shot that shows all of
these parking spots.
    So I've asked under the California Public
Records Request to see copies of those photos, Lisa.
    The -- you said there's a possibility those
photos may have been destroyed. I hope they haven't
been destroyed. But if they do become available, then
I'd like to place a copy of them in the La Verne
Library.

    I also read that Mayor Curtis Moore said
there will be a Gold Line train coming to La Verne,
San Dimas every five minutes. That's 12 trains per
hour. This number does not include the Metrolink
trains, which are -- as you know are 80 a day.

    In the supplemental EIR, you are studying the
traffic at White and First and Second Street. How can
you study the traffic at this intersection without
including the Fairplex traffic?

    I agree with Tim Sandoval, the chairman of
the Gold Line and the mayor of Pomona, the Los Angeles
County Board of Supervisors, representative Norma Flores
and the Fairplex that we need to finish the traffic
study that is currently being undertaken at the White
and Arrow intersection in the Fairplex.

And finally, Lisa, I just wanted to thank you, Lisa, in being so helpful in getting information out to us.

Thank you.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Julie Sevelsov.

MS. SEVELSOV: Sevelsov, but that's no problem.

MS. LEVY BUCH: After Julie is Anders Voss.

MS. SEVELSOV: Good evening. I have here two pictures showing the greenbelt along the strip of land between Glendora Avenue and Vermont Avenue.

And one of the reasons why I'm addressing the meeting today is I wanted to know if the actual station along with the area where you sit can be as close to Glendora Avenue as possible because that's the shortest walk to rest rooms and stores right there in that area there.

And the other one is, as you can see how beautiful this area is right here, this is close to Vermont Avenue, and it has many beautiful grasses and native plants and, of course, pine and oak trees. And it's really lush and beautiful. I don't know if you can see it very well. I wish you could put it up on the screen.

But I was hoping they could keep some of this

Response 30-21

The Project Modifications do not include changes to the station design and thus station design was not analyzed as part of this Final SEIR. Please contact the Construction Authority directly (https://www.metro.net/projects/station-design-projects/) regarding comments on station design.

Response 30-22

See response to comment 30-19, above.
Response 30-23

The Project Modifications do not propose any changes that would impact the greenbelt. For more information see Section 3.13 of the 2013 FEIR, and Section 3.10 of this Final SEIR.
Response 30-24

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5. See comment Response 30-12, above. Additionally, the White Avenue mitigation measure will improve safety and access, because traffic queues will be shorter and more gaps in traffic will be available for local travelers turning onto or crossing over White Avenue.
be improved upon by widening the street.

I remember it coming up at the previous
meetings that those -- some of those accidents were
caused by constriction of the street. But I don't see
how that could be because it's already been constricted
for several street blocks at that point.

And I know Steve and I were discussing this
just a few minutes ago, that most of the accidents are
just negligence and people not respecting La Verne's
community. That -- that southern part of La Verne, you
know, it is very different than the rest of White
Avenue. So if it gets widened, that is only going to
further encourage that type of driving.

When I was a student at Bonita High School, I
was nearly hit several times when I first started
walking up White Avenue. And by the second quarter of
my freshman year, I just decided it's not worth it. I'm
just going to take Bonita over.

I feel like I'm just rambling at this, and
I'm almost out of time. So thank you for hearing me
out.

---

MS. LEVY BUCH: Steve Johnson and then Li Huang.

MR. JOHNSON: Hello. My name is Steve Johnson. I
live at 2571 Third Street, La Verne. My family first
moved to that residence in 1962. So a long-time
Response 30-25
See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 30-26
See Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 30-27
See comment Response 30-23, above.

Response 30-28
See comment Response 6-4, as well as Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5.
We can't go south because there's no access to First Street. We can't go to Fulton. There is access to White -- or Bonita Avenue to the north. But Bonita is very much impacted with commuter traffic, as well.

You know, this whole idea makes it difficult to -- if you were to put lights at Second and Third, that would allow us then, as a neighborhood, to be able to cross the street to actually use the Gold Line station, instead of having to drive a car across that intersection to use the parking lot, take more space in the parking lot.

But I do foresee our using the station, especially when it connects then to Ontario Airport through to Montclair. When it gets to the airport, that's when the transportation system is actually interconnected and are useful.

And, again, widening -- widening White Avenue I think is going to adversely affect our quality of life.

Thank you.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Li Huang and then Jeff Bassler.

MS. HUANG: Okay. My name is Li Huang. I'm a resident in old town La Verne. It's only three house to the White Avenue.
I have two children born in La Verne, and then they go to elementary school and middle school, and after school -- and then they're always riding bikes and the skateboard across the street from White Avenue to Third Street every single day.

So that's why I'm so concerned of safety because I just noticed this two days ago, and my husband come back home to talk to me about this. It's a really big interference, especially about the safety issue.

So I -- after I pick up from school, they always ride. A lot of kids. You know, a lot of kids if they're born here, they're very good friends. We live in a very nice peaceful old town La Verne. And then we love it here. You know, we just live there 13 years already.

So I want to consider most is the safety issue. And because it's very difficult to cross the White Avenue to Third Avenue, it's just a very -- for all of them to ride skateboard there.

And -- and also, noisy, just really noisy. Because I -- I remember two years ago, maybe a couple years ago, some hearing.

We don't really care about something like really (inaudible). And then I saw the big church and (inaudible). And then, oh, what happened? And then

Response 30-29

See Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5. Regarding traffic impacts and east-west access along White Avenue, implementation of the mitigation measure will improve safety and access, because traffic queues will be shorter and more gaps in traffic will be available for local travelers turning onto or crossing over White Avenue.
something happened to the school, and then start ready
to teach all kids sex education. All the parents
freaked out. Now fighting for the sex education coming.
And then this is news again. Okay? So I
really think we live here. We love La Verne. So we
need to consider what -- not just safety in the house,
we need safety because our kids love it and all friends
here -- born here, they love old town La Verne.
And then we decide not moving out anywhere.
We start to remodel our house. We're just three houses
up White Avenue. So we know after the noise, the
traffic, a lot of our house value will go down. There's
really concern about that.
So I'm -- I appreciate we have a voice to be
heard tonight. And I hope that you really consider the
old town La Verne residents. It's a very nice peaceful
town. Okay? The traffic not too bad, though. It just
goes to -- if White Avenue widened, more traffic come.
This (inaudible). But now it will come --
all come to our area. So -- so I hope --
A lot of residents, they concerned. But
maybe they don't notice. And we just noticed two days
ago on the table. Hey, what happened? It's already
been heard, hearing two years ago. What happened again?
So I hope our voice will be heard. Okay?
Response 30-30

For concerns regarding the analysis of construction related impacts, including traffic management, please review Chapter 2 of the 2013 Final EIR. The limits of the Foothill Gold Line Phase 2B Project, including the terminus at the Montclair Transcenter were defined, analyzed and approved in the 2013 FEIR. A suite of public transportation options to the Ontario Airport are available and can be researched at the following website: https://www.flyontario.com/parking-transport/public-transport
future.

    Thank you.
    
    MS. LEVY BUCH: Mark Hanson.

    MR. HANSON: Give me a second.

    MS. LEVY BUCH: Okay. Is there anyone who -- that
is my last speaker card. So is there anyone else
that --

    MR. HANSON: I just found out about this myself.

But until we get our traffic --

    MS. LEVY BUCH: Come up. Come up. Start over,
just so we --

    MR. HANSON: Until we got our -- okay. Until we
got the traffic soothing put in place about -- was it
two years? Three years ago? White went --

You’re proposing widening what was a de facto
four-lane street anyway, and we had some really bad
accidents on there, as we can all attest to. The
soothing did slow it down. We’re still having accidents
there.

    My concern is now, too, when you get it back
to where it was -- coming here, I told my wife, this guy
is racing down Second Street, and then cuts left on
White to cut the light off, it’s going to -- you know,
that’s what he’s doing.

You put this is now, we get this widened,
we're going to have more people cutting it off. You can look at some -- I was going to try to point you to websites I found about ways in turning our residential streets into alternate corridors. It gets to where people aren't even safe, you know.

If we leave it the way that it is, it's not going to be -- it's still going to be bad for the amount of cars that are coming in there.

But I'm definitely against widening White Avenue. And I agree with -- Steve, was it you who said lights at Second and Third? I agree with that.

And maybe it would prevent people from cutting us off, blocking off my street at Bonita. It's for us. The residents that live there are going to be affected, not the people that are coming from out of town so that they can conveniently ride the train to work.

MS. LEVY BUCH: I have more. I have a hard time reading this. Hold on.

MS. MORRIS: Marisha Morris.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Marisha Morris. Oh, that's you.

And then the other one is Toma. The last name is Toma.

Okay. Either way. You don't have to be --

MS. TOMA: I live on 5th Street and I Street. And I'm a walker. I walk my dog every day twice a day. And

Response 30-31

See comment Response 30-23.

Response 30-32

See Response 6-4, above. Additionally, see Topical Response No. 1 and Topical Response No. 5.
I'm really concerned -- I'm concerned, not only with the traffic, but also with the noise.

We already have to deal with the Metrolink horn from 4:30 every half an hour -- from 4:30 in the morning every half an hour. It used to only "beep."
It's the whole La Verne, "ooooooooohhhhh."

So I don't understand why, for example, in Claremont there is not that noise, but here in La Verne we have to listen to that.

And we also seen -- it's just another noise that is going to be -- that we have to deal with. So isn't there another way to do at the outskirts of La Verna without contaminating the cute little area that is Bonita.

All of these areas are really, really cute. And cities are losing that. So I really would like to fight to really conserve that type of small town. The trees are beautiful. Walking is really -- I like having the children playing outside the house and everything.

So that was it.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Marisha.

MS. MORRIS: Hi. My name is Marisha Morris. I'm a resident of Claremont. I recently moved here a few years ago. I'm a resident of the City of Los Angeles.

But I have provided recommendations to
Response 30-35

The Project Modifications do not include any changes to the Project that would have a significant impact on land uses. The 2013 Final EIR evaluated the land use impacts of the Project. The Authority does not have land use authority. Each local land use planning agency in the Project area will make land use determinations in accordance with the applicable general plan and state law.

Regarding the comment regarding temporary construction impacts, each technical section of the 2013 Final EIR and this 2019 Final SEIR analyzed and addressed relevant impacts through mitigation of construction impacts.
is going to do it when basically there is going to be large impacts for a long period of time to all residents, and us here are going to be greatly affected. Basically because of all of the influx of people who are going to want -- want to visit, and basically it’s really going to change the dynamic of what everyone has come to know as the lovely city of -- all the Foothill cities.

So that’s all.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you.

MS. MORRIS: Thank you.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Aaron Jancan.

MR. JANCAN: Hi. Good evening. I’m Aaron Jancan. I’m at 2440 Bonita. I’m five houses west of White.

What prompted me to come today is another car hitting my car. So they take out my mirrors. I’ve had to replace three of my side mirrors. And what prompted me -- I’m walking out my house today, and I hear someone snap my window -- or the mirror. And it’s the breakaways. He takes off. I try to get in my car to get his license, but it’s -- the problem I have is I see more and more traffic coming, turning onto White.

And by widening the street, adding all this extra vehicles and people coming through, I can see people squeezing in between the stopped traffic on
1 Bonita and between my car. And it’s just getting old.
2 And I just don’t want to see this happen.
3 It’s -- I’ve called the police numerous
4 times. I’ve had to have three people -- I mean, they we
5 fortunate enough too, by licence plates, get these
6 things taken care of.
7 But I just see this happening more and more
8 and more with the -- the traffic that’s going to be
9 coming onto Bonita to White.
10 So that’s all I want to say.
11 Thank you.
12 MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you.
13 Is there anybody else that would like to make
14 a comment?
15 Why don’t you come up, but I just need you to
16 make sure you fill out a card after. So we have a
17 record of it.
18 MR. LEVA: Good evening. My name is Rudy Leva. I
19 live at 2533 Bonita Avenue, and I’m just a new resident
20 of La Verne. I just bought my house a month ago.
21 I did rent a house across from Rivas Park, and
22 it’s a lot quieter there. I notice that White is very
23 busy and actually at times very dangerous.
24 I feel that if you increase the -- the lanes
25 on that -- on White Street, that you’re going to open

Response 30-37
See Topical Response No. 1, and see comment Response 30-23.
Response 30-38

See comment Response 30-23, above.

1 yourself up to more speeding, more traffic.
2        Someone had mentioned La Verne is not the gem
3 like it used to be. But let me contradict that. I
4 bought this house in La Verne because I do think
5 La Verne is a great place to live.
6        My wife and I enjoy walking around the
7 neighborhood. We enjoy the beautiful homes and the
8 trees that are there. We enjoy walking to places to go
9 eat. And that's why we made the investment to buy into
10 La Verne.
11
12 I did not know until Sunday that we were --
13 there was even a thought of widening White Street. And
14 it's very disappointing to hear that. I think that if
15 you had lived on that street and you know exactly what
16 we're going through as residents of La Verne that you
17 would be not in favor of increasing the lanes on White
18 Street.
19
20        So I just ask you to look deep within
21 yourself, know that -- that -- I guess I can call myself
22 a La Verne-ite. Right on.
23
24        But I think that doing something like this
25 would really harm the community. And that's all I have
26 to say.
27    MS. HANSON: Hi. My name is Janet. And I live at
28    2550 Second Street. I think a lot of the residents here
Response 30-39

The Project Modifications do not include any changes that have an impact on racing on First Street. Enforcement of traffic laws is within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the applicable local policing authority.

Response 30-40

See Topical Response No. 1.

1. would recognize my husband who rides his bicycle with our dog every day.
2. I have a lot of concern for his safety because of the increased traffic if you widen White. I mean, it's -- it's so difficult even trying to get home to make a left-hand turn going east on Second Street.
4. My husband and I have lived on that street for about 45 years now.
5. And like you say, we are landlocked in there.
6. We're at the end of a cul-de-sac. We can't get out. We have people coming through cutting up "I."
7. And also, I don't think anybody has addressed the fact on First Street they use that as a racetrack at night. They're racing back there all of the time.
8. Yeah. I mean, it's -- you hear it all the time.
9. And also -- let's see. I just have so many different things. I just want to ask that you would consider keeping it just the single lane. I mean, you brought it down to one to try and alleviate people making it a two lane. And, you know, I don't want to go back to having four lanes.
10. So thank you for your consideration.
11. MS. LEVY BUCK: Is there anybody else that you

www.diannejonesassociates.com 310.472.9882
would like to speak?

So thank you all very, very much for your feedback. It's helpful. It's appreciated.

--oOo--
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Response 31-1
See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 31-2
See Topical Response No. 1. As also described in Section 3.1 (Air Quality) of this Final SEIR, no new or increased air quality impacts were predicted due to the Proposed Modifications compared to the 2013 FEIR. Therefore, the existing approved air quality mitigation measures as described in detail in Section 3.1.5.1 of the 2013 FEIR would still be applicable without changes or revisions, and are summarized in this Final SEIR, Section 3.1.5.

Response 31-3
The White Avenue mitigation measure will improve safety and access, because traffic queues will be shorter and more gaps in traffic will be available for local travelers turning onto or crossing over White Avenue. See Topical Response No. 5.

Response 31-4
See comment Response 31-3, above.

Response 31-5
See comment Response 31-1, above.

Response 31-6
The ability of business owners and residents to use White Avenue will not be hindered by the implementation of the Project Modifications, including the revised mitigation measure to restripe White Avenue, as described further in Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.
The best solution is to eliminate through traffic on White Ave. between 1st and Bonita.

Benefits:
1. Avoids noise pollution from the three rail services (Freight, Metrolink and Gold Line) blowing their horns at the intersection.
2. Addresses the safety issues of cars being stranded on the tracks.
3. Improves air quality, safety, and quality of life for the residents on Laverne in this area.
4. Improves property values and promotes La Verne as a destination where you live and grow rather than a place you pass through.

Challenges:
1. Requires the use of E St, Fulton, Gary or Wheeler for commuters to access the 210 via Fruit, Foothill or Towne.
2. May require some residents to access the neighborhood via alternative routes.

Option 1:
Block street access across the tracks. (Shown in Green) This would achieve all the benefits listed above.

Option 2:
Block street access on the north side of 1st St (Shown in Blue). This would achieve benefits 3 and 4 above.

Option 3:
Block street access on south side of Bonita (Shown in Peach). This would achieve benefits 3 and 4 above.

I propose a 6 to 12 month study in which temporary traffic barriers are erected one at a time at each of the location options above and traffic patterns and support is measured and assessed for each option. I have included a map on the following page with the three proposed barrier locations for the study.

If it is not feasible to eliminate through traffic on White, it should remain as it is currently configured and the following changes be made:

1. Reduce speed limit on White between Arrow and Bonita to 25MPH
2. Limit or eliminate truck traffic through the intersection of White and Bonita
3. Add a traffic light to the intersection at White and Second
4. Widen and improve Fulton St and add a signal at Fulton and Bonita

I appreciate your time and consideration towards this matter.

Sincerely,

Ian Stewart

Response 31-7
See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 6.

Response 31-8
See Topical Response No.1 and No. 5; the commenter’s recommendation is outside the purview and authority of the Project. However, the City of Pomona, Public Works Department (http://www.ci.pomona.ca.us/index.php/public-works-home / 909-620-2261) and the City of Laverne Public Works Department (https://www.ci.la-verne.ca.us/index.php/documents/public-works) should be contacted for any concerns regarding existing roadway conditions.

Response 31-9
See comment Response 31-8, above.
Letter 32

Response 32-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 32-2

See Topical Response No. 5 regarding and Topical Response No. 7.

---

Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer

Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
466 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202, Monrovia, CA 91016
p 626.305.7004  f 626.305.1711  e levybuch@goldlineline.org
www.goldlineline.org

From: Kathleen Donn <kathlyndon21@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2019 2:01 PM
To: Lisa Levy Buch <levybuch@goldlineline.org>
Subject: White Avenue proposed widening

Ms. Buch,

I am a resident of the area which will be affected by the proposed widening of White Avenue for the expansion of the Foothill Gold Line into La Verne, CA. I strongly opposed this action for the following reasons:

1. I moved to La Verne over 20 years ago for the same reason as many other residents - it was a quiet small town. While I understand it is La Verne will continue to grow, widening White Avenue will force La Verne to grow on a much larger scale. I live off of White Avenue. Even now I have to wait 5-10 minutes to turn onto my street to get home at night.

2. Along with an increase in traffic comes an increase in traffic accidents. Other changes will likely include increases in crime and littering. Finally, it is inexorable that residents’ property will be modified and/or taken away.

Kathy Donn
The comments provided by the City of San Dimas are included as part of this response to comments efforts. Comments raised on substantive issues in regards to the environmental analysis conducted as part of this SEIR have been provided with additional relevant information and, as applicable, cross reference to supporting documentation.

Response 33-2

See comment Response 33-1, above.

Response 33-3

As provided and described in the Draft SEIR, Introduction – Legal Requirements the Gold Line Foothill Extension from Azusa to Montclair Project environmental document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.). California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21166 states that once an environmental impact report (EIR) has been prepared for a project, no subsequent or supplemental EIR is to be prepared unless one of the following circumstances occurs:

a) Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revision to the environmental impact report.

b) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken, which will require major revisions to the environmental impact report.
made that at least some of the changes will be substantial necessitating a SEIR rather than a SEIR.

Potentially major changes taking place after certification of the 2013 FEIR which may warrant the SEIR include, but are not limited to, the following:

- New LA Metro policy requiring First/Last Mile improvements to be incorporated into project designs and completed at station openings
- New LA Metro requirement that all stations to charge parking fees
- Revised transportation model with differing assumptions than prior model
- Changes in CEQA to allow use of VMT to analyze impacts
- Legislative changes (both adopted and pending) which affect the growth inducing impacts around transit stations

Project Description
The current project description includes the four phasing options for various termini and a change in the location of the Pomona North Station parking. The City of San Dimas has urged that the project description should also be revised to include the contemplated change in the location of the station parking facilities in San Dimas from the currently environmentally cleared location (City of San Dimas Maintenance Facility - SDMF) to the sites on Arrow Highway. This change was previously contemplated in Addendum No. 4 but was subsequently removed from that Addendum. Analyzing the SDMF site only for traffic and parking in this EIR is an unnecessary waste of public resources when it is fully intended to change to the Arrow Highway sites in the very near future. While this may necessitate additional analysis of an impacted historic resource, it will avoid unnecessary confusion and wasteful traffic analysis over the site of the parking.

In addition, it is more appropriate to address the contemplated changes to parking for all of the 28 Stations as part of this environmental document. All parties are fully aware of the recommendations from Metro to reduce the amount of parking for all of the 28 stations based upon their newly revised parking protocols (including paid parking) and that the GIA initiated a further parking study in response to their recommendations. All parties expect that there will be changes to the parking cleared in the 2013 FEIR. Separating that consideration from this SEIR should be reconsidered because much of the traffic/transportation analysis will be flawed and useless when the revised parking proposal is unveiled. This will also avoid unnecessary confusion regarding which traffic analysis and which mitigation measures will apply when there are up to three environmental documents (2013 FEIR, this SEIR and a future parking only EIR) on the subject matters of parking and traffic. Separating these topics when changes are almost certain may be an unwarranted piece-mealing of environmental analysis.

The project description should also identify possible or likely time frames between various phases. Experience from prior Gold Line phasing indicates these time frames can be considerable. Limiting this to “when funding becomes available” as a time frame is unreasonably open-ended.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Revised and updated estimates to circulation, land use, ridership and traffic/parking are necessary to prepare an appropriate analysis of the environmental effects on air quality with the

c) New information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time of the environmental impact report was certified as completed, has become available.

This Draft SEIR was prepared and this Final SEIR has been prepared due to the need for revisions to the 2013 FEIR as a result of the Project Modifications. The Draft and Final SEIR’s compared the potential effects of the Project Modifications to the effects of the Project evaluated in the 2013 FEIR and approved by the Authority Board. To help inform reviewers of this Final SEIR and for comparison purposes a summary table (Table S-1) has been prepared and is provided as part of this Executive Summary. Table S-1 provides a listing of the impact determinations presented in the 2013 FEIR and this 2019 Final SEIR. This table demonstrates the limited nature of impacts associated with the Project Modifications and confirms that preparation of a Supplemental EIR was the appropriate and applicable document.

Response 33-4
See comment Response 33-3, above.

Response 33-5
See comment Response 33-3, above.

Response 33-6
See Topical Response No. 6.

Response 33-7
See Topical Response No. 2.
Response 33-8

The model was used to provide and maintain consistency with the original analysis conducted in the 2013 FEIR. The model is documented in the report Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report, by Parsons Brinckerhoff, June 2011.

The socioeconomic and demographic data are based on the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan data developed and maintained by SCAG. The model used the socioeconomic and demographic data updated in 2014 as an input to reflect the 2035 horizon year.

Response 33-9

VMT based analysis is provided in Section 2.1.4 of this Final SEIR, consistent with the provisions of Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines which now provide for the use of VMT to evaluate the transportation impacts of transit projects. Section 15064.3(c) states that “a lead agency may elect to be governed by the provisions of this section immediately. Beginning on July 1, 2020, the provisions of this section shall apply statewide.”

Response 33-10

See Response 33-3, provided above. The potential for growth inducing impacts associated with the Project Modifications was analyzed and documented in Section 3.12 of this Final SEIR. The results of the analysis conducted determined that no new or more severe significant impacts would occur.

Response 33-11

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 33-12

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 33-13

See Topical Response No. 4. Detailed discussions regarding the construction phasing and anticipated timelines are provided in Section 1.2.2.1 of this Final SEIR and they are illustrated on Figure 1-1.
Response 33-14

See Topical Response No. 2, No. 5, and No. 6 for information regarding parking, traffic and first/last mile discussions. Additionally, traffic analysis, including circulation and ridership is provided in Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR. Air Quality analysis is provided in Section 3.1. The analysis provided in the referenced chapter and section includes an assessment of new or more severe significant impacts associated with the Project Modifications, including evaluation and presentation of mitigation measures, as applicable.

Response 33-15

An analysis of greenhouse gases is provided in Section 3.2 of this Final SEIR. The analysis provided included an assessment of new or more severe significant impacts associated with the Project Modifications. No new or more severe significant impacts were identified.

Response 33-16

See Responses 33-14 and 33-15. The analysis of changes to the phased construction schedule was conducted as part of the air quality analysis and no new or more severe significant impacts were identified.

Response 33-17

See Topical Response No. 7.

Response 33-18

See Topical Response No. 2, No. 5, and No. 7.

Response 33-19

See Topical Response No. 7.
The comment is not raising an issue commensurate with the analysis conducted nor to the Project Modifications analyzed as part of this Final SEIR.

Response 33-21

See Topical Response No. 6.

Response 33-22

See Topical Response No. 6.

Response 33-23

See Topical Response No. 4, comment Response 33-8, provided above, and Section 1.2.2.2 for information on construction phasing and funding. Ridership forecasts were developed using standard professional practices including the models developed and maintained by SCAG and used for this Final SEIR. Interim phasing and analysis was conducted as part of this Final SEIR, see Chapter 2 – Transportation.

Response 33-24

See Topical Responses No. 2.

Response 33-25

See Topical Responses No. 2 and Response 33-23.

Response 33-26

See Topical Responses No. 2. Safety and Security analysis was conducted and is provided in Section 3.9 of this Final SEIR. No other changes to the existing and approved project, including the analysis...
Metro does not necessarily stifle that demand but distributes it to alternate locations in the vicinity that do not charge for parking. In suburban locations abundant free parking continues to exist. However, the bottom line is that no one reading the DSpEIR is able to know if the conclusions are appropriate because the input and criteria used in the parking model are not identified.

The City Engineer, Public Works Director, and Traffic Engineer have each reviewed the traffic analysis and identified a number of errors in lane configurations and traffic controls in the modelling and associated analysis. While it is our understanding that GLA staff is aware of these concerns it is unclear how and when they will be corrected and addressed. It is also unclear if these corrections/changes will result in any impacts requiring mitigation. Listed below are their comments as previously discussed with GLA staff. Please identify how and when these adjustments and any related analysis will be conducted for this DSpEIR.

1. Are the Measure M funds identified above coming from a Metro-only pot of money, or is this money meant to also provide funding for the Cities? (Page No./Dwg No. 36)
2. The modelling in Synchro is not correct for many intersections for Phase 1 and Phase 2. They do not match the Addendum 4 plans. I did not review the Glendora intersections. (Page No./Dwg No. 55)
3. 2018 MUTCD (Page No./Dwg No. 193)
4. 36: Bonita Avenue does not stop at Monte Vista. It is a 2-way stop on the north/south approaches. (Page No./Dwg No. 1350)
5. 25: EB Arrow at SR 57 NB ramps are 2-thru lanes and 1-thru/rt lane. NB ramp is 1-thru/rt lane and 1-thru/rt. (Page No./Dwg No. 1439)
6. 34: NB and SB left turns at Cataract and Bonita are protected. Add left turn pockets for NB and SB Cataract. Are clearance times too short? No RTOR for Cataract. (Page No./Dwg No. 1448)
7. 36: 2-way stop on north/south approaches. Bonita does not stop at Monte Vista. (Page No./Dwg No. 1450)
8. 38: San Dimas and Bonita: a. EB will have one thru and one thru/rt lane. The outside thru/rt lane ends shortly after the intersection. Your approach on modeling the outside lane at a right turn only lane is conservative. b. Left turns are prot-perm with Flashing Yellow Arrow in all directions. c. NB, SB, and WB have right turn pockets (Page No./Dwg No. 1452)
9. 43: NB and SB San Dimas Canyon left turns at Arrow will be protected. SB RTOR not permitted (Page No./Dwg No. 1457)
10. Comments from Phase 1 AM peak LOS also apply to Phase 1 PM peak LOS (Page No./Dwg No. 1481)
11. Comments from Phase 1 AM peak LOS also apply to Phase 2 AM peak LOS (Page No./Dwg No. 1561)
12. 2035 Phase 1 AM and 2035 Phase 2 PM Peak comments all apply (Page No./Dwg No. 1657)
13. The report does not discuss the project proposed grade separation of Bonita Avenue/Cataract Avenue in San Dimas. The appendices includes a technical memorandum that discusses micro simulation analysis recommendation to grade separate Bonita/Cataract intersection.

While the modeling process and assumptions, including the constrained parking conditions, are standard traffic engineering practice. The Authority also conducted a field investigation around the Pomona North Station to assess and identify additional and publicly available parking resources. The field investigation was conducted in an attempt to address the excess demand identified at this station and based on the phased implementation/interim station termini scenario. The result show that there are additional resources available that would accommodate the projected excess demand. See Chapter 2, Section 2.3 Transportation Analysis and Impact Results, for additional detail and Appendix A-1 for a technical memorandum prepared to document the field investigations conducted.

The socioeconomic and demographic data are based on the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan data developed and maintained by SCAG. The model used the socioeconomic and demographic data updated in 2014 as an input to reflect the 2035 horizon year.

Response 33-28

See Response 33-27. The model used was the same model used for the 2013 FEIS. However, the socioeconomic and demographic data conducted for safe crossings and ADA compliance, are proposed as part of the Project Modifications.

Response 33-27

See Topical Response No. 2. Additionally, the "WSP, 2018" reference is to the model itself, and not a formal report. Background on the modeling process and assumptions is provided in Section 2.1.1. The model was used to provide and maintain consistency with the original analysis conducted in the 2013 FEIR, including a constrained parking analysis scenario consistent with the number of station spaces already identified in the approved 2013 FEIR. The model is documented in the report Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report, by Parsons Brinckerhoff, June 2011.
14. The specific improvements for intersection 38 (Bonita Ave/San Dimas Ave) should be revised to read: add a northbound through lane, southbound right turn lane and convert eastbound right-turn only lane to through/right turn lane. (Page 48 Table 2.1)

15. The northbound approach at San Dimas Avenue/Arrow Highway should have two through lanes per Table 2 Project Modifications on page 48 (Page No./Dwg No. 1453).

16. The project plans for the traffic signal at San Dimas Canyon Rd/Arrow Highway show north/south as protected left-turns with arrows. The LOS analysis shows them to be operating as permissive lefts. The LOS analysis needs to be revised with proper signal phasing for all scenarios. (Similar comment as above) (Page No./Dwg No. 1535)

17. Tables 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, and 2-6 need to explain the model used in order to justify the ridership numbers, automobile access, and parking demand. How can San Dimas have less ridership in Phase 2 than the Approved Project? Explain the 2940 increase in ridership for the terminus in Pomona for Phase 2 and why the La Verne terminus in Phase 1 does not get a similar increase. Where are the additional riders Parking in Phase 2? Pomona has less of a parking impact in Phase 2 versus the Approved Project. Explain why parking increases do not appear proportional to ridership increases. (Page 2-11)

18. Why does San Dimas ridership decrease in Phase 2 versus the Approved Project (+140), yet the automobile trips increase and the parking demand decreases? (Page 2-11)

19. These tables should add a footnote describing the project modifications that improve the LOS (Tables 2-12 and 2-13)

Project phasing increases complexity to the analysis of traffic, parking and transportation impacts especially when one cannot predict reliable time frames due to the uncertainties of future funding. Mitigation measures need to consider these unknown time frames in determining both short term (during phasing) and long term (completed project) improvements for traffic, parking and transportation issues. It has been well established that these impacts are different at terminus stations and now the projects contemplates multiple "temporary" terminus facilities.

Land Use

The project changes to phasing creating potential multiple terminus stations prior to full project completion also affects surrounding land uses especially as it relates to both traffic and parking impacts. There is clear evidence that surrounding land uses are severely impacted when station parking and access are inadequate or poorly designed. These impacts can severely affect nearby parking facilities, businesses and residences. These impacts are exacerbated by charging a fee for station parking where no surrounding facilities charge for parking. Charging a fee for parking is now a Metro requirement. Careful consideration of these impacts should be considered in this EIR.

Furthermore, the State legislature is mandating major land use changes around transit stations in both adopted and anticipated legislation. These changes in growth are induced by and directly related to the station location. These changes intend to superecede existing zoning resulting in a updated in 2014 for the 2035 horizon year was included as an input to the model.

Response 33-29

The model is specific to the stations studied, including land use and local network inputs. The model was constrained to the number of parking spaces already identified and approved in the 2013 FEIR. See comment Response 33-27 for additional detail. The socioeconomic and demographic data are based on the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan data developed and maintained by SCAG. The model used socioeconomic and demographic data updated in 2014 to reflect the 2035 horizon year. The suggestion that the results from the LMU study have uniform applicability to all suburban stations is overly simplistic and does not take into account the specific station based analysis conducted for the Project Modifications as part of this Final SEIR.

Response 33-30

A detailed matrix of responses has been prepared and is included are part of these responses to comments. The detailed matrix is provided as Appendix A-3 at the end of this Response to Comments matrix.

Response 33-31

See Response 33-30.

Response 33-32

See Response 33-30.

Response 33-33

See Topical Comment Response No. 2, No. 4, and No. 5. Additionally, see Response 33-14 and 33-23.
See Topical Comment Response No. 2, No. 4 and No. 5.

Response 33-35

See Responses 33-10 and 33-29.

Sincerely,

Curt Morris, Mayor

Cc:  City Council
     Ken Duran, City Manager
     Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager for Community Development
     Krishna Patel, Public Works Director
     Jeff Malawy, City Attorney
Letter 34

Response 34-1

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 34-2

See Topical Response No. 2 and No. 5.

Response 34-3

See comment Response 34-2.

Response 34-4

See comment Response 34-2.

Response 34-5

See comment Response 34-2.

From: Lisa Levy Buth
To: Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension—Azusa to Montclair Supplemental Environmental Impact Report  June 2019

Letter #34

Response 34-1

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 34-2

See Topical Response No. 2 and No. 5.

Response 34-3

See comment Response 34-2.

Response 34-4

See comment Response 34-2.

Response 34-5

See comment Response 34-2.

From: Melissa Chinno <priscilla@city.commercial.com>
To: Lisa Levy Buth <llevybuth@foothillgoldline.org>
Cc: Robert Carder <rcarder9@gmail.com>
Subject: Pomona Goldline - Proposed Alternative Station Parking

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in reference to the proposed alternative station parking on Supply St. in Pomona, California. The proposed location is located in the middle of what is known as “Redline Business Center,” which is an association I manage thru my employer, CityCom. During my years working with this association, we have faced many issues with homeless and vandalism. We have reached out to the city for help but have had no luck. The private streets are either in need or repair or full replacement. We recently had to raise the dues to help the association owners save up for the many repairs that will be needed in the next few years.

The adverse effect adding more cars and people would have on this center. This center starts getting busy as of 4am with big trucks. If we were to have pedestrians and cars clouding the narrow streets, we would have a huge liability on our hands. People would be late to work, truck would not be able to move properly, and the streets would be stopped with traffic all the time. People using this station would end up parking on our busy streets and crossing were trucks are navigating. Our owners will face higher vandalism and would not have place for their employees and clients to park.
This center cannot hold the foot traffic nor the vehicle traffic that a parking location would bring. I truly do hope our owners wishes and quiet enjoyment of their businesses are respected during this decision process.

If you require any further information or feedback, please do not hesitate to reach out to me. Thank you.

Priscilla Carino
Property Manager
City Commercial Real Estate Services
P.O Box 548
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91732-0548
Phone 909-948-1862 | Fax 909-948-1349
Cal BPE#01 951071
Response 35-1

See Topical Response No. 1. No property acquisition is proposed in the revised mitigation measure.

Response 35-2

See comment Response 35-1. The limits of the White Avenue mitigation measure are illustrated on Figure 1-4 of this Final SEIR.
Response 35-3

See Topical Response 1 and comment Response 35-2.

Response 35-4

See Topical Response 1 and comment Response 35-2.

Response 35-5

See Topical Response 1 and comment Response 35-2.

Response 35-6

See Topical Response 1 and comment Response 35-2.

Response 35-7

As described in Section 3.8 of the Final SEIR, no new or increased noise and vibration impacts were predicted due to the Proposed Modifications. Therefore, the existing approved noise mitigation measures as described in detail in Section 3.11.9.2 of the 2013 FEIR would still be applicable without changes or revisions, and are summarized in the Final SEIR, Section 3.8.7.

Response 35-8

The Project Modifications proposed in the Draft SEIR do not result in new or increased air quality, aesthetic, noise, or vibratory impacts compared to the 2013 FEIR. Therefore, the existing mitigations described in the 2013 FEIR would still be applicable without changes or revisions.

Response 35-9

See Topical Response No. 5 and Response 35-8; the revised mitigation measure for White Avenue is shifting the features to a
restriping of the roadway and not a widening. As described in Section 3.8 of the Final SEIR and mentioned above, no new or increased noise and vibration impacts were predicted due to the Proposed Modifications. Therefore, the existing approved noise mitigation measures as described in detail in Section 3.11.9.2 of the 2013 FEIR would still be applicable without changes or revisions, and are summarized in the Final SEIR, Section 3.8.7.

Response 35-10

See Topical Response No. 1.
Response 36-1

See Topical Response No. 1, No. 5, and No. 6. The Project Modifications do not include any change to the station location or design of the La Verne Station. Station locations were originally analyzed and approved as part of the 2013 FEIR.

Response 36-2

See Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 36-3

See Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5.

Dear Ms. Buch,

Regarding this whole issue, you’ve heard where our community stands. We all worry about safety, property value, noise pollution, and so on. Who wouldn’t? While city council is thrilled at the prospect of having a Gold Line stop in La Verne, everyone else I’ve talked to is generally apprehensive at the idea, as having commuter traffic increase in La Verne is only going to further damage our neighborhood. Personally, I’d prefer if La Verne didn’t receive a stop at all.

In regards to my house in particular, you can understand that this is an incredibly sorrowful burden for my mom and me. I’ve been awoken by traffic in the middle of the night three times in the past week, and every time I’ve thought of how much more often that would be if this street were to become any wider. I also think of the many accidents that have damaged my neighbors’ personal property and how much more frequent and dangerous these accidents would be if our houses, cars, and plants were brought any closer to the already reckless traffic that storms through this area. The fact that a chunk of our front yard is at stake too makes this even more troubling. I really think adding traffic calming is the most feasible solution.
If this street is widened, I don't see how La Verne can remain the way it's tried to stay amongst all the changes that have been occurring in the world around us.

My home as I know it, is being thrown away, and I know I can't make you understand, but at least we tried.

Anders Voss
2478 Bonita Ave
Response 37-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 37-2

See Topical Response No. 1 and comment Response 37-1, above.

Response 37-3

See Topical Response No. 1 and comment Response 37-1, above.

Response 37-4

See Topical Response No. 7.

Response 37-5

See Topical Response No. 1 comment Response 37-1, above.

Response 37-6

See Topical Response No. 1.
Ms. Lisa Levy Buch  
Chief Communication Officer  
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority  
406 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 202  
Monrovia, CA 91016-3633  
Phone: (626) 471-9050  
Email: l levybuch@foothillgoldline.org

Dear Ms. Buch:

I am a resident of the area which will be affected by the proposed widening of White Avenue for the expansion of the Foothill Gold Line into LaVerne, CA. I strongly oppose that action because of the following reasons:

1. The widening of White Avenue would cause major safety concerns by bringing more cars and traffic to our city making White Avenue a Freeway thoroughfare right in the middle of our quaint town.
2. Widening the street would move cars closer to our homes causing more noise. Loss of green belts and beautiful 100 year old trees, plus increase the pollution which will be unhealthy for the residents living in the area and our historic trees.
3. Safety of the neighborhood would be at a greater risk. Loss of property and access of property is of great concern to us. The only parking we have on our property is our driveway which is only accessible from White Avenue and exits on Bonita Avenue. We were informed we would lose that access. I ask you, where are we to park, what impact does that have on the value of our home.
4. We purchased our home because of the small quaint town La Verne’s Old Town is. Our house was purchased to be our forever home which we know would be a good investment.
5. We urge you to please leave our town in tact and find another route, solution for non-residents to access the Gold Line.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Printed Name and Address:
CAROL KILE  
2331 BONITA AVE.  
LA VERNE, CA 91750
The following is a resubmission of Letter 24, whose comments have been addressed under Response 24-1.

Letter 38

I believe this is a repeat, but I am not certain.

Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer

Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority

409 East Huntington Drive, Suite 220, Monrovia, CA 91016
p: 626.305.7804 / f: 626.317.9843
e: info@foothillgoldline.org
www.foothillgoldline.org

From: Tim Hepburn <tjhe@ghosted.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2019 6:04 AM
To: Lisa Levy Buch <llevy@foothillgoldline.org>
Cc: Tim Hepburn <tjhe@ghosted.com>
Subject: Petition Form for White Ave widening - Sue

Lisa, the residents sent this to me so I am forwarding it to you. Thanks, Tim

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message

From: Li Huang <lih18007@gmail.com>
Date: May 5, 2019 at 12:06:32 AM PDT
To: tjhe@ghosted.com
Subject: Petition Form for White Ave widening - Sue

Hi Tim, 7 pages from Sue

Li
### Petition to

**Subject:** Petition to Oppose the Widening of White Avenue

**Purpose:** This petition is from concerned citizens who urge the readers to act now to stop the widening of White Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Printed Phone</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brown</td>
<td>123-456-7890</td>
<td>123 Main St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Johnson</td>
<td>234-567-8901</td>
<td>123 Other St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Green</td>
<td>345-678-9012</td>
<td>123 Different St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Format:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Printed Phone</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Smith</td>
<td>456-789-0123</td>
<td>123 Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Williams</td>
<td>567-890-1234</td>
<td>123 Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Martin</td>
<td>678-901-2345</td>
<td>123 Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- The petition is signed by various individuals.
- The petition includes specific addresses and phone numbers for each signer.
- The purpose of the petition is to oppose the widening of White Avenue.

**Additional Comments:**
- The petition has been signed by a variety of individuals, each with their own contact information.
- The petition aims to mobilize a larger group of residents to take action.

**Action Taken:**
- Action is suggested to be taken by the concerned citizens and their representatives.
- The petition encourages the participation of the community in opposing the project.

---

**Note:**
- The petition is a call to action for the community to unite against the proposed changes.
- The petition is organized to facilitate easy reading and understanding.
- The contact information provided allows for further communication and collaboration.
### Petition to

**Petition Summary and Background**
La Verne Residents Opposing the Widening of White Avenue

**Action petitioned for**
No, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to stop the widening of White Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td>2254 S 2nd St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td>3231 E Ave.</td>
<td>R. S.</td>
<td>5/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Soto</td>
<td></td>
<td>3811 N Avenue</td>
<td>9/18.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 N 6th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>5027 N. Ave.</td>
<td>6/8/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td>3283 N. Ave.</td>
<td>5/13/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Garcia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2211 S 5th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2301 S 6th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td>2297 N 3rd St.</td>
<td>4/31/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td>3651 N 2nd St.</td>
<td>10/3/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>3651 N 2nd St.</td>
<td>4/10/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 N 6th St.</td>
<td>5/21/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td></td>
<td>2211 S 5th St.</td>
<td>3/17/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>2301 S 6th St.</td>
<td>7/19/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Petition to**

**Petition Summary and Background**
La Verne Residents Opposing the Widening of White Avenue

**Action petitioned for**
No, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to stop the widening of White Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>2254 S 2nd St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td>3231 E Ave.</td>
<td>R. S.</td>
<td>5/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Soto</td>
<td></td>
<td>3811 N Avenue</td>
<td>9/18.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 N 6th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>5027 N. Ave.</td>
<td>6/8/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td>3283 N. Ave.</td>
<td>5/13/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Garcia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2211 S 5th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2301 S 6th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td>2297 N 3rd St.</td>
<td>4/31/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td>3651 N 2nd St.</td>
<td>10/3/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>3651 N 2nd St.</td>
<td>4/10/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 N 6th St.</td>
<td>5/21/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td></td>
<td>2211 S 5th St.</td>
<td>3/17/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>2301 S 6th St.</td>
<td>7/19/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Petition to

**Petition summary and background:** La Verne Residents Opposing the Widening of White Avenue

**Action petitioned for:** We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to stop the widening of White Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Sage</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2345 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Kido</td>
<td>5/5/19</td>
<td>2300 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian T. Pinto</td>
<td>1/1/20</td>
<td>2504 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Garcia</td>
<td>11/11/19</td>
<td>2404 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Daniel</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2404 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Miller</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2304 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jones</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2204 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul J. Smith</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2104 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Wilson</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2004 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Books</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2004 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Green</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2004 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brown</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2004 Baker Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Petition to

**Petition summary and background:** La Verne Residents Opposing the Widening of White Avenue

**Action petitioned for:** We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to stop the widening of White Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>2007 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Smith</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>3000 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>1200 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Parker</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>900 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Brown</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>700 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Green</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>500 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Miller</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>300 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brown</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>100 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>500 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Smith</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>300 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>100 Third St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Petition to

**La Verne Residents Opposing the Widening of White Avenue**

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to stop the widening of White Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALVADOR ALVARADO</td>
<td>5850 Benedict Ave</td>
<td>4/7/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Trujillo</td>
<td>2808 Benedict Ave</td>
<td>5/2/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Kirk</td>
<td>2805 Beaulieu Ave</td>
<td>6/11/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne Kianna</td>
<td>6793 Paseo Ave</td>
<td>5/17/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terae Keen</td>
<td>2711 Beaulieu Ave</td>
<td>5/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Martin</td>
<td>2627 Beaulieu Ave</td>
<td>5/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Goodhill</td>
<td>2711 Benedict Ave</td>
<td>5/17/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Goodhle</td>
<td>2011 E Beaulieu Ave</td>
<td>5/20/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response 39-1
See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 39-2
See comment Response 39-1, Topical Response No. 5 and Chapter 2 of the Final SEIR regarding information and analysis of traffic impacts.

Response 39-3
See Topical Response No. 7.

Response 4
See Topical Response No. 2.
May 3, 2019

Re: Goldline Parking Structure Pomona

To whom it may concern:

1. We, at Airflex Industries, are very opposed to the parking structure being presented at 260 W. Santa Fe Street, in the city of Pomona. Being directly across the street from your proposed parking structure, we would like to make you aware of the various complications that will be compounded by this addition. Bringing in over 1000 parking spaces will have a hugely negative impact on the already narrow, deteriorating streets. Our streets are not designed for the resulting heavy traffic to and from this parking structure. Having this many additional cars will impede and restrict delivery truck access for existing businesses.

2. We just received an increase in our association dues because of the streets already needing improvements and having that much more additional traffic will increase the demand for street repair and resurfacing tenfold.

3. In addition, Robinson Business Park has been a haven for homeless, resulting in crime and graffiti. Our facility alone has had three break-ins in the last 6 months, our iron gates were destroyed by thieves breaking and entering our premise. A trailer which was fully locked down by three different padlocks, chained and bolted to the ground was stolen. Two different alarmed vehicles were broken into and equipment stolen. During working hours, we frequently find homeless people sleeping in the shrubbery on our property, broken bottles of alcohol, needles & drug paraphernalia as well as an excess of trash.

4. The impact of having potentially thousands of people and cars through this small private community will affect all our businesses. Robinson Business Park in quite a negative way and we are hopeful that you will please reconsider this issue.

Respectfully,

Brett Hoffman
President/Ceo
Airflex Industries

T: (909)392-8474 | F: (909)392-8414
E: brett@airflexindustries.com
Letter 40

Response 40-1

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 40-2

See Topical Response No. 2.

---

From: Li Zhong <lzhong@pharco.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 04, 2019 6:05 PM
To: Lisa Levy Bach <LisaBach@foothillgoldline.org>
Cc: r.cardeir@gmail.com
Subject: Protect for Goldline Pomona Parking Structure

To whom it may concern:

1. Building a parking structure next to Rodine business center in Pomona has raised deep concerns for our business owners in this business center. Our environment, safety, traffic, parking and etc. will all be negatively affected. As a result, our business will be getting slow, and our property values will go down. If these things happen, the city should be responsible for all the losses due to this project. Therefore, as a business owner, I strongly protest this project. Any city's project should not negatively affect the existing businesses and civilians.

Sincerely,

Li Zhong
Genuine Pharmaceuticals Inc.
158 Gentry St.
Pomona, CA 91767
909-469-8230
Dear Lisa,

Safety dictates that White Avenue should remain a two lane road as it presently is. We have already experienced the horror of a four lane highway here and it doesn’t fit the neighborhood. This road was never designed or intended to be a four lane highway. Four lanes will ruin our neighborhood, one that has been home to my family for almost 100 years. I’ll quote Dan Keesey from an article in the Daily Bulletin, “It is primarily being driven because of safety concerns from the California Public Utilities Commission – which oversees railroad crossing – that cars primarily in the southbound direction will begin to stack on the tracks when we have a red light at Arrow Highway.” This statement blatantly discounts the value of the lives of people that live in my neighborhood, putting the beloved traffic flow ahead of human lives.

- Two lanes will indeed limit traffic and save lives.
- Two traffic signals will limit traffic and save lives.
- The traffic will already be slowed by trains every 5 minutes.
- TRAFFIC WILL NATURALLY FIND A DIFFERENT AND BETTER ROUTE.
- Traffic to the terminal from the south has 4 lanes of White Ave. with Arrow Highway.
- Traffic from the north will find Wheeler Ave. and Garey Ave., both 4 lanes, connecting with Arrow Highway.
- Traffic from the east will find the terminus in Pomona on the 4 lane highways of Garey Ave. and Towne Ave. connecting with Arrow Highway.
- La Verne local traffic to the terminal will actually be enhanced by adding traffic signals on White Ave.
- Case in Point: Traffic signals on Indian Hill Boulevard in Claremont’s Old Town have actually trained traffic patterns to alternate routes. The traffic through Old Town Claremont has slowed and enhanced the quality of life in this area, all in the presence of a Metrolink terminal.
- North-South traffic through Claremont has found connections using Monte Vista, Towne Ave. and Arrow Highway.
- Why would anyone choose to experiment with our lives and quality of life? If White Ave. is changed it can’t ever be changed back. The easy and sensible experiment is to add two traffic signals and leave the striping with 2 lanes. This 2 lane striping solution has been successful and traffic signals will further enhance a potentially dangerous situation.
- QUALITY OF LIFE SHOULD HOLD A HIGHER VALUE THAN POTENTIAL TRAFFIC FLOW. Traffic flow has adequate existing routes.

Thank you for considering all the options here. Please don’t be in a hurry to irreversibly change and damage our neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Roger Hanawalt
rogerhanawalt@me.com
2580 3rd Street, La Verne, CA 91750

Letter 41

Response 41-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and detailed traffic analysis in Chapter 2 of the Final SEIR, which supports the new improvements including the revised mitigation measure (LTR-9) regarding the restriping of White Avenue.

Response 41-2

See comment Response 41-1, above

Response 41-3

See comment Response 41-1, above.

Response 41-4

See comment Response 41-1, above.

Response 41-5

See comment Response 41-1, above.

Response 41-6

See comment Response 41-1, above.

Response 41-7

See comment Response 41-1, above.

Response 41-8

See comment Response 41-1, above.
Response 41-9
See comment Response 41-1, above.

Response 41-10
See comment Response 41-1, above.

Response 41-11
See comment Response 41-1, above.

Response 41-12
See comment Response 41-1, above.

Response 41-13
See comment Response 41-1, above.
Letter 42

Response 42-1

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 42-2

See Topical Response No. 2; comment Response 42-1, above.

Response 42-3

See Topical Response No. 2; comment Response 42-1, above.

Response 42-4

See Topical Response No. 2; comment Response 42-1, above. Additionally, the Authority has revised the White Avenue mitigation to respond to public comments and is not proposing to widen White Avenue. Regarding the comment of additional vehicle trips, the traffic analysis indicates that the Project Modifications will not result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled. The Project is projected to reduce vehicle miles traveled by providing an alternative to the private auto.

Response 42-5

See comment Response 42-1, above.

Response 42-6

See comment Response 42-1, above.
4. The current parking lot of 260 W. Santa Fe Street is consistently used to its maximum capacity, causing excess vehicles to already park on Santa Fe Street.
5. Narrow streets comprise our business park: 35 feet for Gentry Street and 37 feet for all other streets. As referenced in #3, delivery vehicles frequent this area and I fear this will increase risk of vehicle collisions.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

Wesley Knudson

on behalf of

Charlie Tachdjian

Owner, American Classic Cars

173 State St.

Pomona, CA 91767

(909) 596-5700

http://www.americanclassiccars.com
Response 43-1

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 43-2

See Topical Response No. 5.
narrow. This will make it very difficult for through traffic.

Another serious problem is that the railroad crossing parallel to Santa Fe, near Supply Street where the cars often change full speed onto Santa Fe because of the lack of a place to stop, after crossing the tracks that is not in traffic. This is a very serious and dangerous problem.

Best wishes,
Scott

www.acrtech.net
Review us on Google
Letter 44

Response 44-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5. As presented in these Topical Responses access and safety will be improved because traffic queues will be shorter and more gaps in traffic will be available for local travelers turning onto or crossing over White Avenue. Existing roadway access from 3rd Street onto White Avenue will again be improved and the northern connection to Bonita Avenue via I Street is not being modified nor impacted by the Project Modifications.

Response 44-2

See comment Response 44-1, above.

Response 44-3

See comment Response 44-1, above.

Response 44-4

See comment Response 44-1, above.

Response 44-5

See comment Response 44-1, above.

Response 44-6

See comment Response 44-1, above.

Response 44-7

See comment Response 44-1, above.
Response 44-8

The suggestion raised in this comment is not commensurate with the analysis conducted nor the elements of the project approved in the 2013 FEIR. This Final SEIR analyzed Project Modifications to the original Project, as described and approved in the 2013 FEIR. However, the City of Pomona, Public Works Department (http://www.ci.pomona.ca.us/index.php/public-works-home / 909-620-2261) and the City of Laverne Public Works Department (https://www.ci.la-verne.ca.us/index.php/documents/public-works) should be contacted for any concerns regarding existing roadway conditions.

Response 44-9

See comment Response 44-1, above.
Letter 45

Response 45-1

See Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 45-2

See comment Response 45-1, above.

Response 45-3

See comment Response 45-1, above.

Response 45-4

See comment Response 45-1, above.

May 3, 2019

Lisa Levy Buch, Chief Communications Officer
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 East Huntington Drive, Ste. 202
Monrovia, CA 91016-3633

Dear Ms. Buch,

I am writing in response to the proposed widening of White Avenue and acquisition of a portion of my property on the corner of White and Benton Avenue in La Verne. As you are aware from my speeches at the meetings on April 16, 2019 and April 25, 2019, I am vehemently opposed to the draft proposal. Not only would widening White Avenue forever damage the characteristic charm and value of this portion of the downtown La Verne neighborhood, I fear that it would alter the types of individuals who would want to live in such a loud neighborhood. One of my concerns is that we would change from a neighborhood of permanent residents, to one of temporary renters. It is not desirable to live next to a busy four-lane“highway.” I am convinced that it is in the best interest of La Verne to retain residents who will invest in the community.

I would urge you to consider the safety concerns that my neighbors and I have voiced regarding this proposal. Since moving in to this property nine years ago, I have seen a serious increase in both the volume of traffic and the speeds at which commuters race through the neighborhood. My neighbors and I would implore you to consider making another street the main thoroughfare, and even to consider making White a one-way section through this part of town. I truly believe that drivers will find a way to go around if they don’t have the option of passing through our neighborhood.

This historic property is a significant investment for me, and the proposal to acquire 37.6 square feet of my historic home would greatly devalue this investment. Therefore, I have retained the services of an attorney to help protect my financial interests. As this home is considered my retirement, this proposal greatly threatens my financial security, and I am prepared to take whatever means necessary in order to ensure my future stability.

Thank you in advance for your thoughtful consideration of my concerns.

Catherine Geerken (Document signed electronically)
May 3, 2019

From: Bruce Allyn, Jr.
President
Bruce Allyn Plumbing, Inc.
190 Gentry St.
Pomona, CA 91767

To Whom It May Concern:

I am very opposed to the parking structure being installed at 260 W. Santa Fe Street, in the city of Pomona. I believe this location will have an adverse effect on my business and the area around the Rodline Business Park. Our streets are not designed for the additional traffic that will be using them for access to the parking structure, and any off street parking will restrict delivery truck access. The dimensions of our streets will create a safety hazard. Our current streets will need ongoing repairs or resurfacing constantly because of the additional traffic. Please reconsider this location.

Respectfully,

Bruce Allyn, Jr.
President
Bruce Allyn Plumbing, Inc.
Letter 47

Response 47-1
See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 47-2
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-3
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-4
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-5
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-6
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-7
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-8
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Hello Lisa,

Please find attached the comments from the Rodine Business Park located in Pomona for inclusion with the Draft SEIR review issued recently. Please let me know that you have received this message.

Respectfully,

Robert A. Carder
April 30, 2019

FOOTHILL GOLD LINE JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
406 E Huntington Drive
Monrovia, CA 91016

Attention: Lisa Levy Buch, Chief Communications Officer

Subject: Pomona Station Relocation

Dear Board Members,

This letter represents the Rodine Business Association that is the private association that represents the thirty-one buildings in the area being considered. Most of the smaller units are owner occupied businesses and there has been many concerns raised due to the Draft SEIR recently issued. I am the President of the association and was asked to submit our association members’ objection to the relocation of the parking structure. The current location has many benefits and the proposed relocation has many challenges that will be expensive to mitigate; if the issues can even be mitigated.

ADVANTAGES OF CURRENTLY APPROVED STATION PARKING FACILITY LOCATION

1. Properly constructed ingress and egress locations can be utilized.
   a. Providing access to Garey Ave. on the east side will allow entering from a major street and include a Kiss and Ride drop off area.
   b. Providing signalization on the exit would allow for vehicles to exit northbound on Garey Ave and Southbound for those using Garey to access the 10 Freeway, the 60 Freeway and the 71 Freeway which keeps excess traffic off of smaller feeder streets.
   c. Providing access to Bonita Ave on the north side at a signalization directly across from Jacaranda Way would allow those citizens from the north residential neighborhood to more conveniently exit their home complex. Vehicles would also be able to proceed eastbound to the 210 Freeway on Towne Ave. or proceed westbound to White Ave. or Wheeler Ave. or Damien St. to access the 210 Freeway westbound.
2. This location is currently surrounded by industrial and commercial buildings and does not impact residents currently. Any new development should/will be made aware of the structure and individuals can decide for themselves the impact of it.

Response 47-9
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-10
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-11
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-12
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-13
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-14
See Topical Response No. 7.

Response 47-15
See comment Response 47-1, above.

Response 47-16
See Topical Response No. 5 and Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR for information and analysis related to traffic.
3. Access to the Gold Line platform would be direct or only require crossing one track. The access from the proposed location will require crossing two Metrolink tracks, a freight line track and one of the Gold Line tracks; FOUR tracks. This is even a grave concern in the SEIR (see 3.9-12).

### DISADVANTAGES OF PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE STATION PARKING FACILITY LOCATION

1. Parking structure will be constructed next to the existing single-family home neighborhood directly to the south. The mitigation of the lights helps, but exposing them to street traffic early in the morning and late into the night will create sound, pollution and other issues.

2. Parking structure ingress and egress will require navigating several very narrow streets that conduct a variety of businesses. The streets that riders will use are very narrow; 33 feet for Gentry Street and 37 feet for all other streets (see LaBelle and Marvin Street Report).

3. There is no direct route from the proposed location to any major street. If Santa Fe is turned into a one-way entry street, all traffic will have to take at least three small internal streets to proceed to Garey Ave. or Arrow Hwy. and Arrow Hwy is not currently signalized nor mentioned as a mitigation measure.

4. The impact of thousands of additional vehicle trips will have a heavy impact on the streets and require more repairs and resurfacing or rebuilding that will impact our common area fees.

5. Streets are nearing end of useful life and the additional traffic of 1,000s of vehicle trips will result in early failure of these streets.

6. Metrolink/Gold Line typically charge for parking vehicles in the structure, the non-payers and overflow parking will severely impact our street parking and delivery truck accessibility.

7. The current parking lot is always full of vehicles and has caused excess vehicles to park on Santa Fe Street and Fulton Drive already. The structure will provide approximately 1,050 per Table 5-13: Build Alternative – Parking Space Provisions in the SEIR. This will encourage additional riders that will use the surrounding streets. These narrow streets allow parking on both sides and delivery vehicles impact lanes on a regular basis (see Exhibit 01).

8. These streets are private and are posted to allow for towing for removal of vehicles that will just create additional issues for our Association and for Metrolink and Gold Line.

9. As this parking structure was not considered under the Rodine approved development plan, the City of Pomona may require additional studies be done due to the impact on the permitted planned project.

10. The association dues are based on the small building and manufacturing performed in the existing buildings. The installation of a parking structure will require Gold Line to
negotiate the new common area fees as the increase in traffic will impact our reserves for the largest cost item substantially (see Reserve Study).

11. There are not any mediation measures regarding the impact on the Rodine Business Park building owners or regarding the narrow streets mentioned in the report.

OTHER ISSUES

1. Safety and security will need to be addressed, as this will be a terminus for some duration. Gold Line and Metrolink has already experienced many issues with transients, homeless and others that will require mitigation at this terminus. This may require Metro Police and Pomona Police to provide additional services.

2. This structure will increase ridership of both Gold Line and Metrolink systems. The next Metrolink terminal to the west is Covina, so any riders that live between these stations will typically drive the opposite flow of traffic in the mornings and evenings that will make Pomona the obvious choice for many riders. This will also impact the White Avenue traffic flow that will be magnified by these additional vehicles as those proceeding west will exit on Supply Ave. south, then on State St. east and then exit the Park on Amberson to make a right on Arrow Hwy. These vehicles will then proceed to White Ave., and those proceeding to the 210 Freeway will turn north on White Ave. which will further exacerbate the issues on White Ave. detailed in the SEIR. This issue is not addressed in the SEIR and the numbers presented do not seem to be accurate (per La Verne City meeting).

We strongly recommend that the parking structure be constructed as currently approved and the proposed location not be certified or approved. The impact to too many residents, businesses and commercial enterprises is just too high for the new location to be considered.

Respectfully,

Robert H. Carden
President
Rodine Business Park Association
EXHIBIT 01 — TRUCK OBSTRUCTING TRAFFIC
Response 48-1

See Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5.

---Original Message---
From: Lisa Levy Buch <L LevyBuch@foothillgoldline.org>
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2019 1:15 PM
To: Reynolds, Jason <Jason.Reynolds@Jacobs.com>; Haroun, Hamy <Hamy.Haroun@Jacobs.com>
Cc: Chris Burner <CBurner@foothillgoldline.org>; Bill Reagan <BReagan@foothillgoldline.org>; Mitch Purcell <MPurcell@foothillgoldline.org>; rthornton@nossaman.com; Laura Langford <L Langford@foothillgoldline.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] SEIR Comment: Do Not Widen White Avenue!

See below

---Original Message---
From: Russ Greiling <cussagreiling@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2019 5:51 PM
To: Lisa Levy Buch <L LevyBuch@foothillgoldline.org>
Subject: Do Not Widen White Avenue!

Greetings,

My name is Russell Greiling and as a long time resident, home owner and voter near the section of White Avenue in La Verne, I reject your outdated solution to the Gold Line created traffic increase in our town. My neighborhood and I protest shifting the small town feel of Old Town La Verne. Up to date examination of the possible Gold Line clearly shows that White Avenue should not be an unnecessary and environmentally destructive thoroughfare. Following Wheeler, Garvey and Towne Avenues and Arrow Highway to get to the Gold Line, provides sufficient access. Don’t destroy a whole neighborhood with this expensive, outdated plan. After the Montclair Station opens the White Avenue widening will no longer be needed. It is an unnecessary expense.

– Russell Greiling
Resident Near the Unnecessary White Avenue Expansion

Sent from my iPhone
Letter 49

Response 49-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and detailed traffic analysis in Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR.

Response 2

See comment Response 49-1, above.
Letter 50

Response 50-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 50-2

See comment Response 50-1, above.

Dorothy Brandt Davis
2650 2nd Street
La Verne, CA 91750

5/4/2019

Lisa Levy Buch, COO
Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, CA 91016-3633

Dear Ms. Levy Buch,

1. At 89 being a life long resident east of White Avenue south of Bonita Avenue, I am concerned with the development occurring on White Avenue. More traffic means, an inability for an elderly woman like me to cross White to go into the downtown. Traffic is already too much. Please re-route the cars to other streets.

2. I grew up in this section of town, and have continued to stay here because of the small town nature present here. The proposed changes to our neighborhoods will affect our outlook, and positive well being.

I have often crossed White Avenue at 2nd as well as 3rd Street. This ability MUST be considered in any master plan.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Brandt Davis
(909) 593-5146
Response 51-1

Future expansion of transit service to Ontario, either through the Foothill Gold Line or other services would be a product of the SCAG’s RTP 2012-2035. More information on the RTP can be found here: http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Pages/default.aspx. Additionally, a suite of public transportation options to the Ontario Airport are available and can be researched at the following website: https://www.flyontario.com/parking-transport/public-transport

Response 51-2

See comment Response 51-1, above.
Response 52-1

The FEIR used a 2010 base year for evaluation existing conditions. The SEIR used the same existing conditions for consistency with the FEIR. In the FEIR, the existing conditions traffic volume data were used as the basis for future year forecasting, so changing those volumes would result in a different set of impacts in the FEIR. The SEIR focused on the changes in the Project Modifications, so a different set of traffic volume inputs would result in changes where it would be impossible to delineate between impact changes caused by the Project Modifications and those resulting from different volumes. A more detailed explanation of this topic is provided in Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR.

Response 52-2

Intersections 24 and 25 do not have significant impacts per the criteria described in the FEIR and SEIR. While these intersections are projected to operate at LOS E/F, the increase in delay is minimal, and does not meet the threshold for an impact. In other words, mitigation measures are only identified for those intersections where operations are projected to show a substantive negative change in operations. The figure and table that show intersections at LOS E or worse are not showing intersections with impacts.
Ms. Levy Buch  
May 6, 2019  
Page 2

If you have any questions, please feel free to call Reece Allen, the project coordinator at (213) 897-9140 and refer to GTS # LA-2018-02384.

Sincerely,

MAYA EDMONSON  
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse
Letter 53

Response 53-1

See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 53-2

See Topical Response No. 5, in addition to Chapter 2 of the Final SEIR for traffic related information and analysis.
May 6, 2019

Ms. Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communication Officer
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
408 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, CA 91016-3533


Dear Ms. Buch:

The Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) has received the above-noted DSEIR on the proposed Phase 2B of the Metro Gold Line Foothill extension from the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority (Authority). Thank you for the opportunity to comment on key issues relative to SCRRA and operations of the railroad that operates adjacent and within your project limits.

SCRRA operates Metrolink commuter trains over our San Bernardino Line (San Gabriel Subdivision) and is responsible for the maintenance of way on portions of the Pasadena Subdivision near Pomona. Both of these rail lines were once part of the Southern Pacific Railroad and Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe (now BNSF) rail systems now owned by Metro within Los Angeles County.

The Authority proposes to construct and operate the Project in four construction phases, rather than the two phases approved as part of Addendum No.2. The first phase of construction would include 8.2 miles of the alignment through Los Angeles County, from Azusa-Citrus Station to La Verne Station. The second phase would include 0.8 mile of alignment from La Verne Station to Pomona Station. The third phase would include 2.2 miles of the alignment from Pomona Station to Claremont Station. The fourth phase would include 1.0 mile of the alignment from Claremont Station to Montclair Station in San Bernardino County. This proposed four-phased construction would occur across a range of timelines and result in La Verne Station (2019 to 2024), Pomona Station (2019 to 2025, subject to availability of funding from Metro), and Claremont Station (2021 to 2028, subject to availability from Metro) operating as temporary end-of-line (terminus) stations.

As part of the Project Modifications, the Authority also proposes a design refinement that would involve relocating the north side Pomona Station parking facility to an existing parcel on the south side of the station. The Project Modifications would also include a

Response 54-1

Comment is not commensurate with the analysis conducted as part of this Final SEIR. There are no modifications to train operations proposed as part of the analysis conducted.

Response 54-2

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 54-3

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 54-4

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 54-5

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 54-6

See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 54-7

As provided in Topical Response No. 2, Metro will be responsible for operations once the Gold Line is open for service.
new traffic mitigation measure that will widen White Avenue from the existing at-grade railroad crossing north to the intersection with 6th Avenue.

Our initial general comments on these changes in the Draft SEIR are as follows:

1. **Train Operations:** Metrolink operates 40 trains/day Monday through Friday; 20 trains/day on Saturdays; and 14 trains/day on Sundays within the areas of La Verne and Pomona. The number of Metrolink trains, along with the Gold Line rail traffic, will create lots of gate activations and crossing related issues. We appreciate the care and proper considerations to mitigate these crossing issues and make the systems operate safely within the joint corridors. Additional safety analysis may be required to ensure the safety of both systems.

2. **Pedestrian Safety:** SCRRRA is concerned about the pedestrian safety at the North Pomona Station at-grade crossing off Santa Fe Street. The new site plan with the proposed parking garage located to the south of the Metrolink tracks will result in a significant increase in pedestrian volume at the Metrolink North Pomona Station at-grade pedestrian crossing to reach the Metro Gold Line platform. Some pedestrians may even try to circumvent the pedestrian gates if they are in a rush to catch their train. The Authority has proposed widening of the Metrolink pedestrian crossing from 4 ft. to 8 ft. wide. We are not convinced that this will alleviate the concerns noted. Consideration should be given to a pedestrian grade separation, such as a bridge off the parking structure (possibly off the 2nd level), that could reduce the volume of pedestrians crossing the Metrolink tracks.

3. **Parking Impacts:** Your project plans to remove approximately 114 existing Metrolink parking spaces in our Pomona North parking lot to facilitate construction of the Metro Gold Line platform. An influx of Metro Gold Line passengers is also anticipated to displace much of the remaining parking for the Metrolink passengers. Should Metro charge for parking at the new Pomona parking structure, we anticipate that Metro passengers looking to avoid parking charges will use Metrolink parking spaces instead. SCRRRA requests that a plan be developed to manage the parking to mitigate the impacts to Metrolink ridership. Two options for consideration may be:
   a. This parking structure not charge for parking to keep consistent with SCRRRA practices and standards or
Gold Line Phase 2B – Draft Supplement Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR)

Page 3

b. That some means be found to segregate parking to ensure Metrolink riders can continue to enjoy free parking.

These are initial general comments on the Draft SEIR and SCRRRA will continue to work with the Authority on mitigation of additional issues in the design phase of the project moving forward.

If you have any questions, feel free to contract Ron Mathieu at (213) 420-0466 or via e-mail at mathieu@scrra.net

Sincerely,

Roderick Diaz
Director, Planning and Development

Cc: Anne Louise Rice, SCRRRA
    Justin Fornelli, SCRRRA
    Jeanet Owens, Metro
Letter 55

Response 55-1

See Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5.

Response 55-2

See comment Response 55-1, above.
We're very against the proposed widening of White Avenue in La Verne. We're residents of North La Verne, but we love our historic core and don't want it compromised. If you add more lanes to White, it will invite more traffic. Plus we will lose this beautiful green space to cars and traffic. This is La Verne's most charming neighborhood and widening White will undermine the small-town vibe we love.

Other communities deal with increased traffic through their historic neighborhoods without adding lanes. Claremont's experienced a huge increase in village traffic without widening Indian Hill. We travel on single lane streets when transitioning from the 710 to the 110 in Pasadena. Yes, it's crowded, but we'd rather deal with a bottleneck than destroy beautiful neighborhoods & green spaces. Sometimes it's nice to slow down a bit and admire the beauty of Southern California's distinctive gardens & bungalows.

If you will build it, they will come. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. Everything is fine the way it is. We like White Avenue the way it is. Please don't change it.

Sincerely,
Kimberly Green & Mark Alvey
2638 Peacock Place
La Verne, CA 91750
The following is a resubmission of a partial scanned image of a petition consistent with Letter 24. These comments have been addressed under Response 24-1. See Topical Responses No. 1 and No. 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition summary and background</th>
<th>La Verne Residents Opposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action petitioned for</td>
<td>We, the undersigned, are con</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Torres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly遥</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Esquibel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Wang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Roberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisela Lottke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Locks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 6, 2019

Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, CA 91016-3633

Dear Ms. Buch:

City of Claremont Comments on Draft Supplemental EIR
Metro Gold Line Extension Phase 2B

The City of Claremont appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the referenced Draft Supplemental EIR (DSEIR). The City of Claremont continues to support completion of the full Gold Line Foothill Extension to Montclair.

The City of Claremont understands that at this time, the design build contract anticipated to be awarded in July 2019 does not include construction to the City of Claremont. However, when funding is obtained, it remains the City of Claremont’s goal to see the completion of the Gold Line project to the City of Montclair. However, it has been brought to our attention that comments previously provided by the City of San Dimas and Glendora were not considered in the DSEIR.

As a result, the City of Claremont is submitting this letter to the Gold Line Construction Authority (GLA) to show support for our neighboring Phase 2B cities. Their general concerns regarding traffic and parking issues will soon be that of Claremont’s once funding is obtained to extend the construction of the Gold Line to the City of Montclair. These are valid concerns. It is understood that there will be another round of a DSEIR submitted for review once the Gold Line extends to Montclair, however, the immediate concerns from our neighboring cities should be addressed.

In addition, the City of Claremont would like to reiterate that the inclusion of First/Last Mile improvements as part of the Gold Line extension project continues to be a priority for us. We realize that Claremont is not part of this construction phase, however, we are still concerned because it is our understanding that the DSEIR contains very little...
Lisa Levy Buch
May 6, 2019
Page 2 of 2

Information on any First/Last Mile improvements to be incorporated into the project as required by LA Metro policy. We believe that additional mitigation measures to fund these improvements within the existing project are necessary.

The City of Claremont looks forward to working with the GLA, and seeing these major issues incorporated and addressed as part of the revised project in order to maximize the benefits for Metro, the GLA, the cities, surrounding residents, businesses and property owners. Please feel free to contact the City with any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Christopher M. Paulson
Interim Assistant City Manager

Inclusion: Traffic Comments Spreadsheet

c: City Council
   Tara Schultz, City Manager
   Brad Johnson, Community Development Director
   Maria Tippeling, Interim City Engineer
   Vincent Ramos, Associate Engineer
   Chris Veirs, Principal Planner
Letter 58

Response 58-1
See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 58-2
In addition to comment Response 58-1, above, refer to comment Response 23-6 regarding notification of the Draft SEIR.

Response 58-3
See comment Response 58-2, above.

Response 58-4
See comment Response 58-1, above.

Response 58-5
See comment Response 58-2, above.

Response 58-6
See comment Response 58-2, above.

Response 58-7
See comment Response 58-2, above.

Response 58-8
See comment Response 33-3.

May 6, 2019

VIA E-MAIL

Lisa Levy Buch
Chief Communications Officer
Metro Gold Line Foothill Construction Authority
406 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, CA 91016-3633
E-Mail: llevybuch@foothillgoldline.org

Re: Objection to Foothill Gold Line Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Levy Buch:

This firm represents Skywater – Pomona, LLC ("Skywater"), owner of the property located at 250 West Santa Fe Street in Pomona (the "Subject Property") which Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority (the "Authority") intends to acquire. The purpose of this letter is to set forth Skywater's comments/objections to the draft supplemental environmental impact report ("Draft SEIR") regarding the Foothill Gold Line Project (the "Project").

1. The Authority Failed to Provide Notice Concerning the Draft SEIR.

As described by the Authority's Project Background & History Highlights, one of the two key proposed Project modifications is the changed location of the future parking facility. Yet remarkably, the Authority failed to notify Skywater – the owner of the location of the proposed future parking facility – of any plans to modify the Project or of the Draft SEIR. It is inconceivable that the Authority would not notify the party most directly impacted by the changes to the Project. This is particularly true given that Anna Kurban of R. E. Michel Company, LLC1 specifically asked you to provide notice of any developments affecting the Subject Property. Cal. Code Regs. title 14, § 15087 states that notice of the Draft SEIR shall be mailed to the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who have previously requested notice.

Yet Skywater was never so notified and only recently learned of the Authority's plan to modify the Project in a manner that would require the acquisition of the Subject Property. Accordingly, Skywater has had insufficient time to properly analyze the revisions to the Project and the reasons for these proposed revisions. The Authority will undoubtedly argue that it has technically complied with the notice provisions. Even if true, it is hard to fathom why the

1 R. E. Michel Company, LLC is an affiliated entity of Skywater. The reference to "Skywater" herein shall also include R. E. Michel Company, LLC.
Response 58-9

The Project in its entirety was analyzed under the 2013 FEIR and approved at that time. This Draft SEIR is not attempting to piecemeal components of the Project but is analyzing modifications to the Project as a whole, as described further in comment Response 33-3.

Response 58-10

See comment Response 33-3. The Final Supplemental EIR evaluated whether the Project Modifications required major revisions to the 2013 FEIR in accordance with CEQA section 21166 and the CEQA Guidelines. The Final SEIR includes an update of information from the 2013 FEIR to identify any new or more significance adverse impacts from those identified in the 2013 FEIR. This Final SEIR includes documentation of the changes to evaluation of impacts in the 2013 FEIR. Table S-1 provides a comparison of impacts between this Final SEIR and the 2013 FEIR. The Final SEIR has not “piecemealed” the evaluation of the Project. Rather, the Final SEIR evaluation follows the analytical approach to the evaluation of project changes approved by the California courts in multiple decisions, including most recently by the California Supreme Court in Frendo's of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist. (2016) 1 Cal.5th 937.
3. **The Proposed Parking Plan In The Draft SEIR Will Cause Operational Conflicts With Existing Businesses, So The Proposed Location Is No Better Than The Originally Proposed Location.**

According to Section 1.2.2.3 of the Draft SEIR, the Authority abandoned the previously approved northern parking structure due to "operational conflicts" with an existing warehousing and distribution facility. The Authority reaches this conclusion yet fails to provide any analysis or explanation as to how it reached this conclusion. But there will be operational conflicts with business operators to the south of Santa Fe Street. Skywater is aware that such business operators are submitting objection letters similar to this one. With a project of this scale, there will be "operational conflicts" with many businesses, yet the Draft SEIR fails to conduct any analysis of these operational impacts to the businesses located south of Santa Fe Street. In short, from an operational conflict perspective, the proposed location for the parking facility at the Subject Property is no better – and likely worse – than the originally proposed location.

4. **The Previously Approved Parking Facility Location Is A Better Alternative Than The Currently Proposed Parking Facility Location.**

In addition to the foregoing, the previously approved parking facility location is a better and more logical alternative than the currently proposed location at the Subject Property. The previously approved location, north of Santa Fe Street, is closer to the Gold Line Station Platform. The currently proposed location is close to the Metro Link Station Platform, not to the Gold Line Station Platform. The mere proximity of the previously approved location alone is sufficient reason to deem that superior to the currently proposed location. In addition to that, however, the currently proposed location at the Subject Property will be on the south side of Santa Fe Street while the Gold Line Station Platform will be on the north side of Santa Fe Street. This creates safety hazards with patrons (including those who will unauthorizedly park in the outdoor parking lots of businesses on the south side of Santa Fe Street) forced to cross Santa Fe Street to reach the Gold Line Station Platform.

Further, access to the previously approved parking facility location is far superior than access to the currently proposed parking facility location. The previously approved location fronted N. Garey Avenue, a major arterial. Access to the currently proposed location will be through small streets in an industrial park.

5. **The Draft SEIR Violates The California Environmental Quality Act.**

The Authority cannot lawfully proceed with the Draft SEIR until it has conducted proper CEQA review for the entire Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Project. Under CEQA (Public Resources Code sections 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations, section 15000 et seq., "Guidelines"), a "project" is defined as "the whole of an action." (Guidelines, § 15378.) For any project, environmental review must be completed prior to project approval. (Friends of Marmoth v. Board of Supervisors (1972) 8 Cal.3d 247, 263; County of Inyo v. Yorba (1973) 32 Cal.App.3d 795, 810; No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles.
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8 cont. (1974) 13 Cal.3d 68, 79.) Consequently, the California Supreme Court has stated: “it is clear that the requirements of CEQA cannot be avoided by chopping up proposed projects into bite-sized pieces which, when taken individually, may have no significant adverse effect on the environment.” (Assem. for a Cleaner Environment v. Yosemite Community College Dist. (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 529, 637-638; citing Plan for Arcadia, Inc. v. City Council of Arcadia, (1974) 42 Cal.App.3d 712, 726.)

There should be no debate that Authority’s taking of the Subject Property for the Authority’s Project constitutes a “project” within the meaning of CEQA. Yet, it appears that the Authority is attempting to circumvent the mandates of CEQA by improperly “piecemealing” components of the massive Project into small segments such that the true cumulative nature of the Project’s innumerable impacts will never fully be disclosed to the public at large or otherwise considered by the appropriate decision-makers. Thus, the Authority cannot have completed proper CEQA analysis since it has not yet considered the entire and cumulative impacts stemming from the entirety of the proposed and ongoing Project.

To the extent the Authority is relying on the previously certified EAR to support the Project, such reliance is improper as the EIR relies on outdated and incomplete information and is therefore flawed. The environmental, sociological, and economic conditions currently confronting the proposed Project have changed significantly since the EIR was certified.

6. Conclusion.

For the foregoing reasons, Skywater respectfully requests that the Authority find an alternative solution for the Project that does not entail the taking of the Subject Property.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

[Name]
for SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

SMRH402302541
Letter 59

Response 59-1

The City of Glendora’s scoping comments have been incorporated and response are provided as part of this response to comments matrix.

Response 59-2

VMT based analysis is provided in Section 2.1.4 of this Final SEIR, consistent with the provisions of Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines which now provide for the use of VMT to evaluate the transportation impacts of transit projects. Section 15064.3(c) states that “a lead agency may elect to be governed by the provisions of this section immediately. Beginning on July 1, 2020, the provisions of this section shall apply statewide.” Because the Final SEIR is evaluating to what extent the Project Modifications change the evaluation of impacts in the 2013 FEIR, the Final SEIR also utilizes the traffic evaluation methodology of the 2013 FEIR.

Response 59-3

See comment Response 59-2, above. Additionally, the evaluation of mitigation measures was conducted, including the addition of a second left-turn lane for eastbound Route 66. However, improvement was negligible and the impact remained after mitigation. Therefore, there are no identified mitigation measures that add capacity to reduce delay without substantial right-of-way acquisitions that would in turn have secondary impacts related to the partial or full loss of adjacent private properties. Therefore, the Project Modifications, to avoid the identified secondary impacts, would introduce a new unmitigable significant traffic impact at this intersection during the PM peak period. Section 2.3.4.1 of this Final SEIR provides more detail discussion. Also, for reference Section 2.6.2 of the 2013 FEIR provides the TSM based analysis conducted.
Response 59-4

The model was used to provide and maintain consistency with the original analysis conducted in the 2013 FEIR. The model is documented in the report Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report, by Parsons Brinckerhoff, June 2011.

The socioeconomic and demographic data are based on the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan data developed and maintained by SCAG. The model used the socioeconomic and demographic data updated in 2014 as an input to reflect the 2035 horizon year. Background on the modeling process and assumptions is provided in Section 2.1.1 of this Final SEIR.

Response 59-5

See comment Response 59-4 and Topical Response No. 4.

Response 59-6.

The Final SEIR evaluated whether the Parking Modifications may impact parking at the stations (See Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR). The Project Modifications do not include any revisions to service at the Glendora station from the Project as approved in 2013. The Authority and Metro will continue to coordinate with the City of Glendora regarding bus transfer service at the Glendora station.

Response 59-7

See Topical Response No. 6

Response 59-8

The Project Modifications do not include any changes that would impact the City Public Works Yard. The Authority has and will continue to actively coordinate with the City of Glendora as the advanced design and implementation processes continue.
Response 59-9

Safety and Security analysis, including reference to and incorporation of required safety regulations, was conducted as part of the approved 2013 FEIR (Section 3.12) and this Final SEIR (Section 3.9).

Response 59-10

Project Modifications do not include any revisions to service at the Glendora station from the Project as approved in 2013. The Authority and Metro will continue to coordinate with the City of Glendora regarding bus transfer service at the Glendora station.
Response 59-11

Comment noted. The Authority acknowledges and appreciates the continuing partnership and coordination with the City of Glendora. The City’s continuing support for completion of this project to its ultimate termini point is also acknowledged as part of a shared objective.

Response 59-12

As provided and described in the Draft SEIR, Introduction – Legal Requirements the Gold Line Foothill Extension from Azusa to Montclair Project environmental document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.). California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21166 states that once an environmental impact report (EIR) has been prepared for a project, no subsequent or supplemental EIR is to be prepared unless one of the following circumstances occurs:

a) Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revision to the environmental impact report.

b) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken, which will require major revisions to the environmental impact report.

c) New information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time of the environmental impact report was certified as completed, has become available.
This Draft SEIR was prepared and this Final SEIR has been prepared due to the need for revisions to the 2013 FEIR as a result of the Project Modifications. The Draft and Final SEIR’s compared the potential effects of the Project Modifications to the effects of the Project evaluated in the 2013 FEIR and approved by the Authority Board. To help inform reviewers of this Final SEIR and for comparison purposes a summary table (Table S-1) has been prepared and is provided as part of this Executive Summary. Table S-1 provides a listing of the impact determinations presented in the 2013 FEIR and this 2019 Final SEIR. This table demonstrates the limited nature of impacts associated with the Project Modifications and provides substantial evidence that preparation of a Supplemental EIR was the appropriate and applicable document.

Response 59-13

The Project Modifications do not include any changes to the Project that would have impacts on the design of the referenced bridges.

Response 59-14

Transportation/Traffic analysis was conducted and document in Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR. Air quality analysis was conducted and is provided in Section 3.1 of this Final SEIR. Greenhouse gas analysis was also conducted and the documentation of this analysis is provided in Section 3.2 of this Final SEIR.

Response 59-15

The Project Modifications do not include any changes to the Project that will have any impacts on the operation of the Project in the City of Glendora or the impacts of the Glendora Station as approved in 2013 or regarding availability of electric vehicle recharging stations.
Land Use and Planning

9. **Equity.** As noted above, a significant funding source for this project is the TIRCP, which has a strong emphasis on disadvantaged communities. Given the potential phasing and truncation, the Authority should reevaluate the impact on disadvantaged communities. Additionally, CEQA guidelines call for understanding the social impacts of projects, particularly as it relates to changes in the physical environment (§§ 15064, subd. (e), 15131, subd. (a)) and (§§ 15064, subd. (e), 15131, subd. (b)). This analysis will further support the benefits of the project and clarify the impacts.

Noise

10. **Noise & Vibration Impacts.** More information is needed for the City to adequately comment on potentially significant impacts to noise, vibration and aesthetics of sound wall (wall material, height, etc.), given expedited construction schedule. Specifically, significant portions of the railroad right-of-way abut and are adjacent to residential uses. The SEIR shall identify any and all noise and vibration impacts and, where significant, mitigations shall be identified.

11. **Bridge Construction Noise Impacts.** With regard to noise impacts related to bridge construction at Grander/Foothill, Route 68 and Lone Hill/Arbo Centre, the SEIR shall include updated sound and acoustical studies. The SEIR shall identify any and all noise and vibration impacts and, where significant, mitigations shall be identified.

Public Services

12. **Access to City Public Works Yard.** The City continues to have concerns over access to the City of Glendora Public Works Maintenance Yard at 440 S. Lorraine Avenue, Glendora. Currently, the city yard is accessed via the railroad right-of-way. The City requests that the Authority work with us to determine a solution to this issue, including but not limited to acquiring private property to reestablish access to city yard. Re-routing access via any residential collector street not rated for truck weight or hazardous materials handling is not acceptable.

13. **Impacts to Infrastructure within Right-of-Way.** The SEIR shall identify any and all impacts to city-owned infrastructure within railroad right-of-way and, where significant, mitigations shall be identified.

14. **Business Interruption Fund.** Given the expedited schedule, the City requests the Authority document any closures or other impacts which may interfere with local businesses. The City requests any impacts above to be included in the
Response 59-21

Consistent with the Project Modifications proposed, Land Use and Planning based analysis was conducted. Please see Section 3.7 of this Final SEIR. The Project Modifications do not include any changes to the Project that will have an adverse impact on disadvantaged communities. The phasing of opening of the Project will provide an additional transit option to individuals who cannot afford a private automobile.

Response 59-22

Consistent with the Project Modifications proposed, Noise and Vibration based analysis was conducted. Please see Section 3.8 of this Final SEIR.

Response 59-23

The Project Modifications do not include any changes to the Project construction and operation in the City from the Project approved in the 2013. The 2013 Final evaluated the noise impacts of construction of the Project in the City. Response 59-24

The Project Modifications do not include any changes to the Project construction and operation that will impact the City Yard. The Authority has and will continue to actively coordinate with the City of Glendora as the advanced design and implementation processes continue.

Response 59-25

The Authority has and will continue to actively coordinate with the City of Glendora as the advanced design and implementation processes continue.
Response 59-26

Detailed discussions regarding the changes to construction and phasing are provided in Section 1.2.2.1 of this Final SEIR. Short-term construction impacts were analyzed and are documented in Section 2.6.3.1 of the 2013 FEIR.

Response 59-27

Ridership forecasts were developed using standard professional practices including the models developed and maintained by SCAG and used for this Final SEIR. See Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR for analysis commensurate with these forecasts and professional practices.

Response 59-28

A detailed transportation/traffic analysis was conducted according to the Project Modifications. See Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR for documentation and impact determinations.

Response 59-29

The Project Modifications do not include any changes to the Glendora Station and thus will not have any impact on bus transfer interface. LA Metro will continue to coordinate with the City regarding bus transfer interface issues at the Glendora Station.

Response 59-30

The Final SEIR evaluated changes to traffic in the vicinity of Project stations as a result of the Project Modifications (see Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR). The Final SEIR does not identify any new or more significant traffic impacts at the Glendora Station. [CONFIRM]

Response 59-31

See Topical Response No. 6
Response 59-32

The Project Modifications analyzed as part of this Final SEIR do not include any changes to the parking structure identified and approved in the 2013 FEIR.

Response 59-33

See comment Response 59-31, above.
The Authority acknowledges that the City of La Verne has incorporated the comments provided during the scoping period into this formal comment letter submitted as part of the Draft SEIR public circulation process. Responses are provided below.

Response 60-2

See Topical Response No. 4

Response 60-3

As provided and described in the Draft SEIR, Introduction – Legal Requirements the Gold Line Foothill Extension from Azusa to Montclair Project environmental document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.). California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21166 states that once an environmental impact report (EIR) has been prepared for a project, no subsequent or supplemental EIR is to be prepared unless one of the following circumstances occurs:

a) Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revision to the environmental impact report.

b) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken, which will require major revisions to the environmental impact report.

c) New information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time of the environmental impact report was certified as completed, has become available.
This Draft SEIR was prepared and this Final SEIR has been prepared due to the need for revisions to the 2013 FEIR as a result of the Project Modifications. The Draft and Final SEIR’s compared the potential effects of the Project Modifications to the effects of the Project evaluated in the 2013 FEIR and approved by the Authority Board. To help inform reviewers of this Final SEIR and for comparison purposes a summary table (Table S-1) has been prepared and is provided as part of this Executive Summary. Table S-1 provides a listing of the impact determinations presented in the 2013 FEIR and this 2019 Final SEIR. This table documents the substantial evidence of the limited nature of impacts associated with the Project Modifications and confirms that preparation of a Supplemental EIR was the appropriate and applicable document.

Response 60-4

See comment Response 60-3, above

Response 60-5

See Topical Response No. 6.

Response 60-6

The model was used to provide and maintain consistency with the original analysis conducted in the 2013 FEIR. The model is documented in the report *Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report*, by Parsons Brinckerhoff, June 2011.

The socioeconomic and demographic data are based on the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan data developed and maintained by SCAG. The model used the socioeconomic and demographic data updated in 2014 as an input to reflect the 2035 horizon year. Background on the modeling process and assumptions is provided in Section 2.1.1 of this Final SEIR.

Additionally, the analysis conducted as part of this Final SEIR, background on the modeling process and assumptions is provided in Section 2.1.1. The model was used to provide and maintain...
consistency with the original analysis conducted in the 2013 FEIR, including a constrained parking analysis scenario consistent with the number of station spaces already identified in the approved 2013 FEIR.

Response 60-7
See Topical Response No. 2 for information regarding Metro’s parking ordinance and the parameters for fee based parking.

Response 60-8
See comment Response 60-6, above

Response 60-9
VMT based analysis is provided in Section 2.1.4 of this Final SEIR, consistent with the provisions of Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines which now provide for the use of VMT to evaluate the transportation impacts of transit projects. Section 15064.3(c) states that “a lead agency may elect to be governed by the provisions of this section immediately. Beginning on July 1, 2020, the provisions of this section shall apply statewide.”

Response 60-10
See Response 60-3, provided above. The potential for growth inducing impacts associated with the Project Modifications was analyzed and documented in Section 3.12 of this Final SEIR. The results of the analysis conducted determined that no new or more severe significant impacts would occur.

Response 60-11
See Topical Response No. 7.
Response 60-12

See Topical Response No. 2. The Authority has revised the Project Modification to remove an interim terminus at La Verne.

Response 60-13

See Topical Response No. 2. No changes to parking as evaluated in the 2013 FEIR are proposed. See also comment Response 60-6, above.

Response 60-14

See Topical Response 2; comment Response 60-13, above.

Response 60-15

See comment Response 60-13, above.

Response 60-16

See Topical Response No. 4 and Section 1.2.2.2 for information regarding the construction phasing and the anticipated timelines.

Response 60-17

Air quality analysis was conducted and is provided in Section 3.1 of this Final SEIR. Greenhouse gas analysis was also conducted and the documentation of this analysis is provided in Section 3.2 of this Final SEIR.

Response 60-18

See comment Responses 60-6, 60-7, and Topical Response No. 6 for information regarding ridership, parking, and First/Last Mile topics.
Response 60-19

See comment Response 60-17, above

Response 60-20

See Topical Response No. 7.

Response 60-21

Updated traffic and circulation analysis has been conducted and documented in Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR. See also comment Response 60-20 for information regarding safety and security. See Topical Response No. 7.

Response 60-22

See Topical Response No. 6.

Response 60-23

See comment Response 60-22.

Response 60-24

See comment Response 60-6, above. The Authority has revised the Project Modifications so that La Verne is not the interim terminus station.

Response 60-25

See Topical Response No. 2. Additionally, the "WSP, 2018" reference is to the model itself, and not a formal report. Background on the modeling process and assumptions is provided in Section 2.1.1. See also comment Response 60-6 and Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR for more detailed discussions.
Response 60-26
See comment Response 60-6 and Topical Response No. 6.

Response 60-27
See also comment Response 60-6 and Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR for more detailed discussions. The model is specific to the stations studied, including land use and local network inputs. The socioeconomic and demographic data are based on the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan data developed and maintained by SCAG. The model used socioeconomic and demographic data updated in 2014 to reflect the 2035 horizon year. The suggestion that the results from the LMU study have uniform applicability to all suburban stations is overly simplistic and does not take into account the specific station based analysis conducted for the Project Modifications as part of this Final SEIR.

Response 60-28
See also comment Response 60-6 and Chapter 2 of this Final SEIR for more detailed discussions.

Response 60-29
Comment Matrix Spreadsheets include responses to comments on lane configurations and traffic controls. Those separate matrices are provided in Appendix A-3.

Response 60-30
Analysis was conducted to determine potential traffic, parking, phasing-based impacts and that analysis was presented in this Final SEIR. See Chapter 2 for the detailed documentation and impact determinations. Also, see Topical Responses No. 2, No. 4 and No. 5 for additional information on parking, phasing and traffic.

Response 60-31
The Project Modifications do not include any changes to the Project related to D Street in the City of La Verne from the Project approved in the 2013. Any concerns with the median and safety along this street should be posed to the City of La Verne.

Response 60-32
See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 60-33
Consistent with the Project Modifications proposed, Land Use and Planning based analysis was conducted. Please see Section 3.7 of this Final SEIR. Based on this analysis no new or more severe significant impacts would occur.

Response 60-34
See Topical Response No. 2.

Response 60-35
The potential for growth inducing impacts associated with the Project Modifications was analyzed and documented in Section 3.12 of this Final SEIR. The results of the analysis conducted determined that no new or more severe significant impacts would occur. The Final SEIR was prepared in light of existing laws and policies regarding the relationship between land uses and transportation improvements. The 2013 FEIR evaluated the land use impacts of the Project. The Project Modifications do not include any elements that will have a new or more significant impact on land use than the Project evaluated in the 2013 FEIR.
See Appendix A-3 of the 2019 Final Supplemental EIR for a complete response to comments.
Response 62-1

Photographic imagery of rail crossings have been received and noted.
Letter 63

Response 63-1

See Topical Response No. 1 for an update on the widening of White Avenue, and Topical Response No. 5 regarding traffic impacts.

Response 63-2

See comment Response 63-1, above.

Response 63-3

See comment Response 63-1, above.

Response 63-4

See comment Response 63-1, above.

Response 63-5

See Topical Response No. 1.

Response 63-6

See comment Response 63-1, above.
Response 64-1

The following is a resubmission of a portion of Letter 56, whose comments have been addressed under Response 56-2.
Response 65-1

See Topical Response No. 1 and detailed traffic analysis in Chapter 2 of the Final SEIR, which supports the new improvements including the revised mitigation measure (LTR-9) regarding the restriping of White Avenue.

Response 65-2

See comment Response 65-1, above.
see responses to comments 4-9. Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. Delay calculations were updated in Synchro, and the impact assessments were revised. Tables 2-10, 2-11, 2-16, and 2-17 show the updated values (indicated by highlighting), and details are provided in the attached Synchro output files.

2 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas / La Verne / Pomona
55
The modeling in Synchro is not correct for many intersections for Phase 1 and Phase 2. They do not match the Glendora intersections.
2 DC
see comments 9 of the previous comments on the Glendora intersections.

3 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas
194
SB RTOR
2 DC
SB - See Clarification.

4 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas
1350
SB: Bonita Avenue does not stop at Monte Vista. It is a 2-way stop.
2 DC
SB - See Clarification.

5 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas
1439
25E EB arrow at SB 57 NB ramps is 2-lane and 1-lane/t-lane. NB ramp is 1-lane and 1-lane/t-lane.
2 DC
see comments to response to comments 4 and 9. Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. All right lane clearances were increased to 3 seconds (SB/WD) and 4 seconds (NB/WB). With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS B for NB and Phase 1 in the AM peak hour and LOS C in the PM peak hour. The delays in the future build scenarios are projected to be lower than No Build, therefore no potential impact was identified.

6 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas
1448
All NB and SB left turns at Cataract and Bonita are protected. Add left turn pockets for SB and SB Cataract. Are clearance times too short? No RTOR for Cataract.
2 DC
see comments to response to comments 4 and 9. Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS B (both AM and PM) for Phase 1. The delays in the future build scenarios are projected to be lower than No Build, therefore no potential impact was identified.

7 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas
1950
SB 2-way stop. Bonita does not stop at Monte Vista.
2 DC
see response to comment 4.

8 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas
1452
SB: SB San Dimas and Bonita.
1. EB will have one thru and one turn/lane. The outside thru/lane end short after this intersection. Your approach on modeling the outside lane at a right turn only lane is conservative.
2. Left turns are prot-prot in all directions.
3. NB, SB, and WB have a right turn pockets.
2 DC
Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS C (both AM and PM) for No Build and Phase 1. The associated delay increases are greater than 6 seconds in all scenarios, which would be considered a potential impact per the County of LA criteria, but the intersection performs at LOS C (deemed acceptable in common traffic engineering practice), so no additional mitigation measures will be required.

9 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas / La Verne
1457
NB and SB San Dimas Canyon left turns at Arrow will be protected. SB RTOR not permitted.
2 DC
Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS C (both AM and PM) for No Build and Phase 1. The associated delay increases are greater than 6 seconds in all scenarios, which would be considered a potential impact per the County of LA criteria, but the intersection performs at LOS C (deemed acceptable in common traffic engineering practice), so no additional mitigation measures will be required.

10 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas / La Verne / Pomona
1481
Comments from Phase 1 AM peak LOS also apply to Phase 1 PM peak LOS.
2 DC
See comments to response to comments 4 and 9. This comment is no longer applicable because the original Phase 1 comments at La Verne have been eliminated.

11 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas / La Verne / Pomona
1561
Comments from Phase 1 AM peak LOS also apply to Phase 2 AM peak LOS.
2 DC
The responses to the comments above apply equally to the Phase 1 and the original Phase 2 AM and PM peaks.

12 Kurt Pedersen
San Dimas / La Verne / Pomona
1657
2035 Phase 1 AM and 2035 Phase 2 AM Peak comments all apply.
2 DC
see responses to comments 10 and 11.

13A Dominick Milano
San Dimas / La Verne
3-11
Tables 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, and 2-6 need to explain the model used in order to justify the ridership numbers, automobile access, and parking demand.
3 DC
see comments to Table 2-[3] (attached), the ridership is higher in Phase 1 than in the Approved Project.

13B How can San Dimas have less ridership in Phase 2 than the Approved Project?
With the changes in the modified Table 2-[3] (attached), the ridership is higher in Phase 1 than in the Approved Project.

13C Explain the 2940 increase in ridership for the terminus in Pomona for Phase 2 and why the La Verne terminus in Phase 1 does not get a similar increase.
The comparison between the original Phase 1 and 2 is no longer relevant because only one phase is included. However, to address the original comment, Pomona's larger increase [now 2200 for Phase 1 (new terminus at La Verne) vs. Approved] compared to La Verne is likely due to the better access and parking at the Pomona station (note the large increase in automobile trips). In addition, the Commuter Rail (Metrolink) station at Pomona provides the riders an additional opportunity of transferring from the Metrolink line to Gold Line (and vice versa) and also an important role in increasing the ridership at Pomona in Phase 1. Further, in general, an additional station (e.g., Pomona in Phase 1) is expected to attract new riders and provide more options or changes in the travel patterns of some riders.
Response Code: 1-Incorporation Planned; 2-Discussion/Clarification Required; 3-Not Applicable; 4-Not Due for this Submittal; 5-Authority Direction Required

Status Code: R - Resolved, U - Unresolved, C - Completed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>City / Agency</th>
<th>Page No. / DWG No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response Code</th>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Revised Response to Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Will the larger radius fit within the right of way at the NE corner of White and Bonita?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>We have provided a 25ft curb return and eliminated the right turn lane striping so that a WIBO can make this turn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>The NB right turn only lane on White at First Street can be eliminated, which may allow White Avenue to be shifted to the east, eliminating the need to acquire property at the SW corner of White and First.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>DB will determine in final design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>No room for EB right turn lane at Arrow and White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>The Synchro analysis was updated to eliminate this right-turn lane. See the response to comment #16 for details on the update.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>San Dimas/ La Verne/Pomona</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>The modeling in Synchro is not correct for many intersections for Phase 1 and Phase 2. They do not match the Addendum 4 plans. I did not review the Glendora intersections.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>See responses to comments 7-19 and 23-24. Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. Delay calculations were updated in Synchro, and the impact assessments were resisted. Tables 2-10, 2-11, 2-16, and 2-17 show the updated values (yellow highlighting), and details are provided in the attached Synchro output files.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Verify you do not need to acquire property at the northeast corner of Bonita and White.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>With restricting only there is no right of way required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Fix spelling - La Verne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Spelling will be corrected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>San Dimas/ La Verne</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>43: NB and SB San Dimas Canyon left turns at Arrow will be protected. SB RTOR not permitted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 (Pomona terminus) Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS C for No Build and Phase 1 (for both AM and PM). The associated delay increases are greater than 6 seconds in all scenarios, which would be considered a potential impact per the County of LA criteria, but the intersection performs at LOS C (deemed acceptable in common traffic engineering practice), so no additional mitigation measures will be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>45: Arrow and Wheeler SB is one Thru/Rt lane and one Lt turn lane. NB and SB left turns are protected, not perm+prot SB no RTOR allowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS C for No Build and Phase (for both AM and PM). The associated delay increases are greater than 6 seconds in all scenarios, which would be considered a potential impact per the County of LA criteria, but the intersection performs at LOS C (deemed acceptable in common traffic engineering practice), so no additional mitigation measures will be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>48: A Street has separate left turn lanes at Arrow Hwy. Left turns are protected in all directions. No SB RTOR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS F for No Build and LOS B (for both AM and PM) for Phase 1. All future build conditions are projected to operate better than No Build and therefore no potential impact is identified. The improvement in delay is due to the signalization of the intersection as part of the project improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>50: D Street at First Street changed to right in/right out with addition of median island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Build geometry was updated to reflect the CULC application, where the median island was included. Left turn volumes were reassigned. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS A for Phase 1 (for both AM and PM), and therefore not identified as a potential impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>51: D Street and Arrow NB has thru/rt and left lanes SB has thru/rt and left lanes NB and SB left turns are protected No SB RTOR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS B for No Build and LOS C for Phase 1 (for both AM and PM). The associated delay increases are greater than 6 seconds in all scenarios, which would be considered a potential impact per the County of LA criteria, but the intersection performs at LOS C (deemed acceptable in common traffic engineering practice), so no additional mitigation measures will be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Revised Response to Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS C for No Build and Phase 1 (for both AM and PM). In all future build scenarios, delay is projected to decrease and therefore not identified as a potential impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The left-turn movement was originally coded separately from the TWLTL in Synchro, but per the comment, a short turn bay has been added in Synchro to replicate the dir prot left-turn operations of the TWLTL, that are expected in the field. This change applies to the No Build and Build scenarios (with and without mitigation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>For Phase 1 a, these two intersections (16 and 57) are discussed as unimproved and the White Avenue widening is a mitigation. Therefore, the No Build and Build (without mitigation) scenarios were evaluated with only a single through lane. The change only has a marginal effect on traffic operations/delay (less than a second), so there are no changes in the impact determination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS C for No Build and LOS C/2 (AM/PM) for Phase 1. The associated delay increases over No Build are less than the allowable thresholds in all scenarios, therefore no potential impact was identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Build geometry was updated to correct a coding error. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS C for No Build and Phase 1 (both AM and PM). The associated delay increases over No Build are less than the threshold in all scenarios, therefore no potential impact was identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>For Phase 1, this intersection was discussed as unimproved and the White Avenue widening is a mitigation. Therefore, the No Build and Build scenarios were evaluated with only a single through lane. The mitigation scenario was evaluated as noted in the comment with two through lanes, so no further changes are needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>For all scenarios, the Synchro coding was updated to remove the NB and SB right turn pockets. However, the EB and WR right turn pockets were retained in the model since there are de facto right turns in the field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Build geometry was updated to reflect the current version of the plans. With the revisions made to the Phase 1 Synchro models, this intersection is projected to operate at LOS C/2 (AM/PM) for No Build, and LOS B (both AM and PM) for Phase 1. The delays in the future build scenarios are projected to be lower than No Build, therefore no potential impact was identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response Code:** 1-Incorporation Planned; 2-Discussion/Clarification Required; 3- Not Applicable; 4-Not Due for this Submittal; 5-Authority Direction Required

**Status Code:** R - Resolved, U - Unresolved, C - Completed
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Response Code: 1-Incorporation Planned; 2-Discussion/Clarification Required; 3- Not Applicable; 4-Not Due for this Submittal; 5-Authority Direction Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>City / Agency</th>
<th>Page No. / DWG. No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response Code</th>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Revised Response to Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>15: White has separate left turn lanes at Second</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>All incorporate</td>
<td>See response to comments 13 and 14. No changes to the mitigation measures were identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kurt Pedersen</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>16: White has separate left turn lanes at First</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>All incorporate</td>
<td>See response to comment 15. No changes to the mitigation measures were identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dominic Milano</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Last paragraph. La Verne also uses LOS of &quot;D&quot; as acceptable for operations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>All incorporate</td>
<td>The La Verne General Plan indicates volumes at LOS D but doesn’t specify the LOS D as the standard. However, it will be added to the list of cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A</td>
<td>Dominic Milano</td>
<td>La Verne/San</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>Tables 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, and 2-6 need to explain the model used in order to justify the ridership numbers, automobile access, and parking demand.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>See Section 2.1.1 of the Draft SEIR. All provide. model split.</td>
<td>This comment has been split into five parts to make the response readable. In general, Section 2.1.1 of the Draft SEIR provides background on the modeling approach. Note that the data reported in Tables 2-3 through 2-6 for the Proposed Project match the data reported in the 2013 FEIR. However, for the 2019 SEIR, the analysis was re-run using an updated version (from 2014) of the model. The forecasts are generally similar, but do change in some cases. A marked-up version showing the updated numbers (in red) using 2014 model version of the Proposed Project is attached as a PDF. While this version will not be used in the SEIR, to maintain consistency with the FEIR, it should be helpful in addressing some of the comments. The comparison between Phase 1 (Pomona terminus) and the Approved Project also reflects the other changes addressed in the SEIR (i.e., the change in parking at Pomona and the bus service from Montclair).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How can San Dimas have less ridership in Phase 2 than the Approved Project?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>With changes in the modified Table 2-5 (attached), the ridership is higher in Phase 1 than in the Approved Project.</td>
<td>For each of the scenarios, the model was run constraining the parking to a specified number of parking spaces at the urban rail stations. Once the parking demand meets the supply, the model iterates to get rid of additional park-and-ride trips by shifting them to other park-and-ride stations with availability, other modes of access to transit (e.g., kiss-and-ride and bus), or shifting to the auto modes. As can be observed from Table 2-6, the Pomona Station is full (9,063 demand) in Phase 1. So, the additional riders are choosing other modes of access, and not spilling over to local streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explain the 2040 increase in ridership for the terminus in Pomona for Phase 2 and why the La Verne terminus in Phase 1 does not get a similar increase.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Explain the 2040 increase in ridership for the terminus in Pomona for Phase 2 and why the La Verne terminus in Phase 1 does not get a similar increase.</td>
<td>The comparison between the original Phases 1 and 2 is no longer relevant because only one phase is included. However, to address the original comment, Pomona’s bigger increase (now 2,280 for Phase 1 [new terminus at Pomona vs. Approved]) compared to La Verne is likely due to the better access and parking at the Pomona station (note the large increase in automobile trips). In addition, the Commuter Rail (Metrolink) station at Pomona provides the riders an additional opportunity of transferring from the Metrolink Line to Gold Line (and vice-versa) and plays an important role in increasing the ridership at Pomona in Phase 1. Further, in general, an additional station (i.e., Pomona in Phase 1) is expected to attract new riders and provide more options or changes in the travel patterns of some riders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where are the additional riders parking in Phase 2?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Refer to Topical Response No.2</td>
<td>For each of the scenarios, the model was run constraining the parking to a specified number of parking spaces at the urban rail stations. Once the parking demand meets the supply, the model iterates to get rid of additional park-and-ride trips by shifting them to other park-and-ride stations with availability, other modes of access to transit (e.g., kiss-and-ride and bus), or shifting to the auto modes. As can be observed from Table 2-6, the Pomona Station is full (9,063 demand) in Phase 1. So, the additional riders are choosing other modes of access, and not spilling over to local streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pomona has less of a parking impact in Phase 2 versus the Approved Project. Explain why parking increase does not appear proportional to ridership increases.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Refer to Topical Response No.2</td>
<td>The Pomona parking lot is full in Phase 1, but not in the Approved Project (per the modified version of Table 2-6). Therefore, the effects related to parking are greater in Phase 1. As noted in the response to comment 150, the relationship between ridership and parking is complex in the model. The parking was constrained at the Pomona station, so there will not always be a proportional relationship between the parking and ridership increase. This is specifically true when the parking lot is full.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dominic Milano</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>For La Verne in Phase 1 the ridership increases by 630, automobile trips increase by only 131, and parking increases by 22. For La Verne in Phase 2 the ridership increases by 350, automobile trips increase by only 13, and parking decreases below the Approved Project with no explanation of where the overflow from Pomona will park. (Only because there will be &quot;no increase in parking demand over the EIR&quot;)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>See Section 2.1.1 of the Draft SEIR. All provide. model split.</td>
<td>See response to comment 226. Also, note that the modified versions of Tables 2-3 to 2-6 indicate that the parking at La Verne in Phase 1 is essentially the same as the Approved Project. Regarding Pomona, ridership includes non-parking trips by automobile (kiss-and-ride) and shuttle. Since the Pomona station is full in Phase 1, the overflow from Pomona will use other park-and-ride lots or change their mode of access (e.g., kiss-and-ride and shuttle) to Gold Line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Dominic Milano</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>There is no discussion on the impacts of paid parking.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Refer to Topical Response No.2</td>
<td>Refer to Topical Response No.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Code: 1-Incorporation Planned; 2-Discussion/Clarification Required; 3- Not Applicable; 4-Not Due for this Submittal; 5-Authority Direction Required
Status Code: R - Resolved, U - Unresolved, C - Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>City / Agency</th>
<th>Page No. / DWG No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response Code</th>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Revised Response to Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dominic Milano</td>
<td>La Verne/ San Dimas</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>The traffic operation analysis results need to footnote that certain intersections will have project mitigation improvements that will result in improved LOS's</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Question deleted by Kurt/Dominic.</td>
<td>See Topical Response No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dominic Milano</td>
<td>La Verne/ San Dimas</td>
<td>2-12 and 2-13</td>
<td>These tables should add a footnote describing the project modifications that improve the LOS.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intersections with decrease in delay due to proposed project improvements will be identified by using a footnote and related discussion. Note that the change in delay between the Build and No-Build (2035) is best seen in Tables 2-10 and 2-11 (not 2-12 and 2-13). In general, there are three factors that affect delay between these scenarios: reduction in overall traffic due to mode shift to transit, increase in local traffic due to station trips, and changes in intersection geometry or control associated with the project. The first and third factors will always improve delay, and even the second factor can improve delay (e.g., if there is increased traffic to a low-delay movement, like a right-turn). In some cases, there are intersection improvements but the delay increases anyway (because of the traffic volumes).
## SEGMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>City / Agency</th>
<th>Page No. / DWG No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response Code</th>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Pomona/UXR</td>
<td>SEIR/Gen.</td>
<td>Provide additional detail regarding forecast shuttle service for Pomona Station from Montclair and Claremont. A decrease in auto traffic due to 1,400 riders of a future shuttle seems like a potentially ambitious estimate when the Project change designates Pomona Station as a terminus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Pomona/UXR</td>
<td>SEIR/Gen.</td>
<td>Please provide mitigation of the 6% overage in parking demand at Pomona station (1,063 spaces).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During Phase 1 (terminus at Pomona Station), the Project Modifications would result in approximately 73 more daily automobile trips at Glendora Station, 50 more daily automobile trips at San Dimas Station, 13 more daily automobile trips at La Verne Station, and a reduction in daily automobile trips of 277 at Pomona Station. The reduction in trips at Pomona Station is associated with the introduction of bus shuttle service from the Montclair and Claremont stations. This shuttle service is a change from prior assumptions and would encourage riders to shift from park-and-ride and kiss-and-ride at Pomona Station. The daily ridership on the shuttle is 1,700 trips per day, and 1,400 trips use Pomona Station. The analysis indicated that the shuttle bus service yields a 16 percent reduction in kiss-and-ride trips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A field investigation was conducted to address the excess demand identified at this station and based on the phased implementation/interim station termini scenario. The result showed that there are additional available parking spaces available that would accommodate the projected excess demand. See Chapter 2, Section 2.3 Transportation Analysis and Impact Results, for additional detail and Appendix A-1 for a technical memorandum prepared to document the field investigations conducted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Station/Location</td>
<td>SEIR/Gen.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Pomona/UXR</td>
<td>SEIR/Gen.</td>
<td>Independent review of parking demand by consultant to Pomona indicated about 1,400 parking spaces for 2035 (with Pomona Station as intermediate/on-line, not terminus, station). City consultant is currently evaluating parking demand with Pomona Station as a terminus, with further comments potentially forthcoming.</td>
<td>The approved and industry standard Metro model was used to conduct the analysis. Parking demand was evaluated using an assumption of constrained demand (approximately limited by available capacity of 1,000 spaces). Modeling parking demand with different assumptions will yield different results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Pomona/UXR</td>
<td>SEIR/Gen.</td>
<td>Signalization with full access at intersection 1007 (Garey / Grevilia) would require removing existing median improvements, and may require additional changes in regards to nearby driveways, which should be evaluated.</td>
<td>Signalization of intersection 1007 has been eliminated from the Project Improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Pomona/UXR</td>
<td>SEIR/Gen.</td>
<td>SEIR should evaluate what happens if detailed engineering feasibility does not workout for NB Towne/Arrow LT lane w/storage lane extension</td>
<td>The mitigation at this intersection will no longer with the change to the location of the Pomona parking garage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ron Chan</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>53/2-11</td>
<td>Pomoan Station Ridership: +2,940 for Phase 2 SEIR. Automobile Trips: -277 for Phase 2 SEIR. Bus shuttle service: 1400 trips; what about the trips for remaining 1,540 riders? How are they getting to the Pomona Station? SEIR should fully recognize the traffic and parking impacts of Pomona being a temporary terminus and at least address those temporary terminus impacts with temporary terminus mitigations. Pomona Station ridership (delta +98%): 3,010 FEIR, 5,950 Phase 2 SEIR Automobile Trips (delta -18%): 1,571 FEIR, 1,294 Phase 2 SEIR Parking Demand (delta 0%): 1,064 FEIR, 1,063 Phase 2 SEIR</td>
<td>Walk trips, carpool, and bus trips make up the remaining trips to the station. The model assigns trips to each mode based on origin, travel time, and available parking. All of the modal projections were made using the approved Metro travel demand model. The impact analysis for Phase 1 was conducted as temporary; i.e., the impacts and mitigation measures were considered as if the Pomona terminus would be permanent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td>REVIEWER</td>
<td>MINOR</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Ron Chan Pomona 52/2-12</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no explanation/justification on how Ridership doubles and Parking Demand remains the same. How are the riders arriving at the Pomona Station? Bus shuttle is 1400 riders, but the remaining 1,540 riders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ron Chan Pomona 478/1559/163</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64: NB La Verne and the trailer park (SB) at Arrow are split phase. Consider realigning the NB lane configuration due to slight offset geometry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ron Chan Pomona 479/1560/163</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65: EB and WB McKinley at White is split phase. Not shown on synchro sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Ron Chan Pomona 1639/1738</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67: Can Fulton &amp; Arrow be signalize instead of La Verne &amp; Arrow? More residential driveways on La Verne, less driveways on Fulton. Fulton seems more like a connector road with not much residential frontage compared to La Verne, where there is 5 or 6 houses. Restrict NBLT from La Verne onto Arrow, they will be force to use the signal to make the left turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ron Chan Pomona 1648/1737</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1001: Metrolink at Fulton - Why are there no volumes for WBL and SBL?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ron Chan Pomona 1654/1743</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1007: Grevillia at Garey: Is NB prot left necessary? Would perm/prot or flashing yellow work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Ron Chan Pomona 1656/1745</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1109: There is a significant offset on the driveway and Amberson at Arrow Hwy. Need to split phase NB and SB or lead lag protected phases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See response to comment #6. For each of the scenarios, the model was run constraining the parking to a specified number of parking spaces at the urban rail stations. Once the parking demand meets the supply, the model iterates to get rid of additional park-and-ride stations with availability, other modes of access to transit (e.g., kiss-n-ride and bus), or shifting to the auto modes. This is an existing intersection. The 2013 FEIR required signalization "when warranted" not realignment. The phasing will be corrected during final design. Note that the McKinley/White intersection is over a mile from the alignment. Since there are no identified impacts to the Fulton/Arrow intersection, there is no basis for a mitigation measure to signalize the intersection. Turn restrictions were implemented at this intersection. Signalization of intersection 1007 has been eliminated from the Project Improvements. Signalization of intersection 1007 has been eliminated from the Project Improvements.
### SUBMITTAL PACKAGE: Draft SEIR Review

**Response Code:** 1-Incorporation Planned; 2-Discussion/Clarification Required; 3- Not Applicable; 4-Not Due for this Submittal; 5-Authority Direction Required

**Status Code:** R- Resolved, U - Unresolved, C - Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEGMENT</th>
<th>REVIEWER</th>
<th>REVIEWER's Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Matt Pilarz Pomona SEIR/Gen. Outreach and contact with property owners/businesses/residents of private streets and surrounding areas needed for parking, traffic, permissions, etc. impacts identification and mitigation for inclusion in SEIR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Since the parking garage will be located on the north side of the tracks (as opposed to the southern location analyzed in the draft SEIR), this is no longer an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Matt Pilarz Pomona SEIR/Gen. Metro First-Last Mile (FLM) study improvements should be considered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FLM supporting strategies would further encourage transit use, and reduce the number of automobile trips, so these would not result in additional impacts. FLM is a Metro initiative and funded outside the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Matt Pilarz Pomona SEIR/Gen. SEIR should consider potential needed changes to bus routes and schedules</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bus routes and schedules will be modified by local agencies as demand and resources shift, with or without the Project. The specific changes cannot be predicted, so impact analysis cannot be conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Matt Pilarz Pomona SEIR/Gen. SEIR should consider needed public safety services further due to project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Please provide more detail regarding this comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Matt Pilarz Pomona SEIR/Chapter 3 SEIR should not state that &quot;Pomona North Compass Blueprint Station Area Plan was adopted in 2014.&quot; (It is not an adopted plan.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Text revised to edit the reference to &quot;adopted&quot; out of the discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachments to Letter No. 4

EXHIBIT "1"
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-0535

August 4, 2015

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

I write today to express concern over incidents surrounding the HARD Summer Music Festival that took place the weekend of August 1-2 at the Pomona Fairplex. The events surrounding the festival were unacceptable and tragic, resulting in the deaths of two teenagers, and the Board of Supervisors must do something to prevent this from happening again.

As you know, the Pomona Fairplex is a premiere entertainment center and is home to the annual Los Angeles County fair. While the Fairplex is a large and important venue for entertainment, it is also near a residential area filled with homes, schools, and recreational areas. These are communities that value spending time with family, raising their kids, and engaging their neighbors.

The HARD music festival undermined the peace and tranquility of this community. As a resident, I witnessed firsthand the excessive noise and bumper to bumper traffic resulting from patrons driving to and from the venue. Families were also unable to use the large community park adjacent to the Fairplex due the lack of parking and traffic resulting from the event. Furthermore, the surrounding community was subject to indecent exposure and abuse of private property, including public urination and litter, and numerous fights. Most troubling of the festival was the associated drug use that led to the deaths of two teenage girls. The behavior surrounding the festival was unacceptable and put this community at unnecessary risk of harm.

In June, I wrote to the City of Pomona expressing strong support for granting a public hearing for the appeal filed by the residents of Pomona regarding the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) by the L.A. County Fair Association. I ask that the Board of Supervisors support a public hearing and take their actions a step further by initiating an Environmental Impact Review (EIR) and traffic study to assess the impacts of the Fairplex's activities on the local communities. I also urge the Board to support Supervisor Solis's motion to ban electronic music festivals on county land until an investigation into the teens' deaths concludes.
We must work together to ensure the safety and security of our communities so we do not experience another tragedy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Norma J. Torres]
Member of Congress
Nov. 13, 2018

Honorable Mayor Sandoval & Members of the Pomona City Council
City of Pomona
P. O. Box 660
Pomona, CA 91769

Dear Honorable Mayor Sandoval & Members of the Pomona City Council:

Since I arrived at Fairplex nearly two years ago, we have actively engaged with the City of Pomona and the community to better understand the impacts of Fairplex events on adjacent neighborhoods. We included our stakeholders in a year-long strategic planning process, listening carefully to the community’s dreams and aspirations for our nearly 100-year-old institution.

An amendment to the F-Zone land use designation will be before you on November 19, 2018. There has been much discussion about this topic over the past year. I have engaged with each of you, our stakeholders and the Planning Commission to find a collaborative solution regarding impacts from Fairplex events. Notably, the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council not approve the proposed F-Zone amendment. We support the Planning Commission’s recommendation and propose a collaborative approach for regulating future uses at Fairplex.

Our neighbors, particularly those who are part of Protect Our Neighbors (PON), expressed a strong concern regarding trash, noise and traffic resulting from Fairplex events. In direct response to the issues raised, we created a system to respond to incidents in real-time through a centralized 24 hour call-in number. We also dispatch Fairplex crews to regularly clean the neighboring public right of ways. To minimize disruption in the late night hours, we stepped up our efforts to enforce noise restrictions.

The community has voiced that these short-term measures are not enough. We agree. Long-term initiatives should be pursued, not just to reduce impacts resulting from Fairplex activities, but as important, to develop a plan that will reimagine the campus as a stronger economic engine resulting in more revenue for our local governments, more opportunities for local entrepreneurs and more quality jobs.

Based on the input from our stakeholders, and in collaboration with Mayor Sandoval and Councilmember Torres, Fairplex presents the following proposal that will result in a greater investment in mitigations to reduce the impact of noise, traffic and pollution in the surrounding neighborhoods, and a long-term plan to guide Fairplex activities into the future.
The proposal requires Fairplex to conduct an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), traffic study and develop a Specific Plan for the Fairplex property that would replace the existing F-Zone. Additionally, our proposal will generate over $1.5 million in new City revenue from Fairplex events to fund additional mitigations in the surrounding neighborhoods. Most importantly, the proposal resets the relationship between the City of Pomona and Fairplex, so that we can come together to create a stronger and more economically vibrant community.

Our proposal, which would be memorialized in an agreement signed by Fairplex and the City following City Council and Fairplex Board of Directors approval, would include the following key terms:

- **EIR, Traffic Study & Specific Plan**: Fairplex will fund and conduct, in collaboration with the City and County, an Environmental Impact Report and traffic study to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of Fairplex activities. As part of the study, Fairplex will accept the recommendation to relocate the existing facilities yard to the campus west of White Avenue. Both independent studies will be part of a proposed Specific Plan that will guide future development and programming on the Fairplex campus.

- **Mitigation funding**: Fairplex will increase the parking percentage the City receives from 2 percent to 5 percent over three years, and add a $1.50 City fee for every full-price gate admission Fair ticket. New revenues identified through the agreement will be used by the City to fund projects that will mitigate the impact of Fairplex activities. We support the creation of a community-based advisory committee that will advise the City to prioritize projects.

- **New event funding**: Fairplex will place a per ticket fee of up to $5 for new music events. Fairplex will be allowed up to six music events, ranging from 10,000 to 40,000 attendees per day, subject to City approval for the term of the agreement. Events may span up to two nights each, run up to 75 dBA over a 15-minute period and conclude no later than 11 p.m.* Events may include a single music event in the first year of the agreement with no more than 10,000 guests, an additional second event of up to 20,000 guests in the second year, and an additional third event of up 40,000 guests in the third year.

- **Additional Revenue to the City's General Fund**: Fairplex and its activities already generate more than $8 million in tax revenue for Pomona, in addition to direct payments made to the police department during the LA County Fair to pay for public safety and other critical services throughout the City. This agreement will generate additional revenue for all residents of Pomona from increases in property, sales and hotel taxes.

- **Advance notice**: Fairplex will inform the City and neighbors two months in advance of any music event or festival with an anticipated attendance of 10,000 or more per day and actively engage in addressing local residents' concerns on traffic, noise, lighting and trash.

- **Ban on Raves, Cannabis events**: Fairplex will be prohibited from hosting raves or cannabis-related events.
Honorable Mayor Sandoval & Members of the Pomona City Council
November 12, 2018
Page 3

The additional $1.5 million in revenue will go directly to a mitigation fund, controlled by the City, to pay for projects that will reduce impacts to our closest neighbors, who experience a disproportionate impact due to their proximity to the campus.

Based on the above, we recommend a three-year agreement which will be reviewed annually and evaluated based on inflation and will limit any further contemplation of amending the F-Zone until the Specific Plan is considered and either approved or disapproved by the City. This agreement will be subject to the formal approval of the Pomona City Council and Fairplex Board of Directors. Until the agreement is fully executed, this proposal is not binding on either the City or Fairplex.

We believe this proposal, and the collaborative efforts already begun, will go a long way to move our relationship forward. The proposed agreement is instrumental in developing a combined vision for the future of Fairplex as an economic engine for all of Pomona; a place that celebrates the best of our community; and a stronger community partner. We thank Mayor Sandoval and Councilmember Torres for their leadership in finding a path forward.

Please contact me if you have any questions. I look forwarding to working with you.

Sincerely,

Miguel A. Santina
President and CEO

*Based on sound engineers TechMD Inc, who works with the city of Pasadena and the Rose Bowl.*
**Category:** Good Neighbor  
**Timeline:** Short Term

**Initiative:** Engage in effective ongoing communications with local neighbors.

**Description:** Manage and refine the Neighborhood Response System (NRS) to ensure responses to local residents are swift and consider their concerns in planning of future events. Incorporate a neighbor contact feature in the Fairplex App.

**Category:** Good Neighbor & Strengthening Community  
**Timeline:** Mid Term

**Initiative:** Create a greenbelt for the community.

**Description:** The community sessions surfaced a strong desire for Fairplex to create a greenbelt around the campus. The discussion suggested this project would have many benefits including supporting healthy lifestyles and creating a space for people to spend time with their pets. Others encouraged Fairplex to use a greenbelt project to create more access points to the campus for community to encourage people to enter and enjoy the facility. Fairplex will initiate a community planning process in 2018 to address needs within the County of Los Angeles and the City of Pomona.

**Category:** Good Neighbor & Strengthening Community  
**Timeline:** Short Term

**Initiative:** Work on Traffic Mitigation.

**Description:** To alleviate traffic issues around the campus, Fairplex will contract with off-site parking during the LA County Fair. Support and advocate for better egress/ingress into and off of Interstate 10 from White Avenue. Partner with the city to improve neighboring streets around the campus and to maintain cleanliness. Solicit community input regularly through meetings. Conduct traffic study as part of any new development.
Overview

Phase 1 of the Pomona Valley ITS Project was the conceptual design that determined solutions to transportation congestion problems in the Pomona Valley. This phase focused on solutions to daily congestion on freeways and arterials, traveler information, incident-related back-ups, and event management for the Fairplex and surrounding areas.

Phase 2 is the detailed design and system procurement phase of the Pomona Valley ITS Project. This phase centers on the design, integration, and testing of Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) deployments per the Pomona Valley ITS Conceptual Design that was completed during Phase 1.

The PVITS project has three primary project components. ITS technologies will be developed related to:

1. Pomona Valley Forum-Wide ATMS
2. Route 60 Corridor Conceptual ATMS
3. Fairplex Traffic Management Plan

For more information regarding this project, contact Hank Hsing at hhsing@dpw.lacounty.gov

For more information regarding this project's web site, contact Melissa Hewitt at melissa.hewitt@kimley-horn.com
LOCAL NEWS

LA County Fair 2018: More parking, new Uber/Lyft drop-off created to alleviate traffic woes

Dwight Richards, vice president of operations, shows the construction site of a new rideshare pickup and drop off lot at the Fairplex in Pomona on Thursday, August 9, 2018. Fairplex has made some changes to improve the traffic flow for the Los Angeles County Fair. (Photo by Watchara Phomicinda, The Press-Enterprise/SCNG)

By LISET MÁRQUEZ | lmarquez@scng.com | Inland Valley Daily Bulletin
PUBLISHED: August 11, 2018 at 7:49 am | UPDATED: August 11, 2018 at 5:35 pm

It was parking scenario Dwight Richards doesn’t want to see repeated at this year’s Los Angeles County Fair: On the final Saturday of last year’s run, both parking lots were filled to capacity by 6:30 p.m., creating traffic in the lots that spilled onto the streets.

“That doesn’t typically happen,” Richards, vice president of operations at Fairplex, said. He and his team are responsible for keeping things moving smoothly at the L.A. County Fair and year-round Fairplex events.

This year’s transportation-oriented theme, celebrating the Mother Road by urging visitors to “Get Your Kicks...at the LA County Fair,” has nothing to do with the changes, he added. The struggle, in fact, is real.

Sign up for The Localist, our daily email newsletter with handpicked stories relevant to where you live. Subscribe here.

“We are seeing longer stays and a consolidation of visitors in the last week – it has been challenging,” Richards said.

Which is why this year’s traffic management plan includes the addition of 1,700 parking spaces, a new designated lot for Uber and Lyft users, and changes to improve the flow of traffic in and out of the two lots.

In all, Richards said their efforts ahead of this year’s fair will increase parking by 5 percent and alleviate snarls that have impacted some of the neighborhoods in the past.
Dwight Richards, vice president of operations, shows the command center at the Fairplex in Pomona on Thursday, August 9, 2018. Fairplex has made some changes to improve the traffic flow for the Los Angeles County Fair. (Photo by Watchara Phomicinda, The Press-Enterprise/SCNG)

Enforcement will also be stepped up this year, with patrol units checking IDs to ensure Fair patrons don’t attempt to park on nearby Val Vista Street in Pomona.

Renee Hernandez, spokeswoman for Fairplex, said the association will be working again with the DMV to enforce handicap parking. Last year, the DMV issued hundreds of citations for handicap parking violations, she said in an email.

“Also this year, we are doubling the amount of handicap spaces available to our guests from 500 to 1000, double the amount required by law,” she wrote.
Going on a parking diet

Thursday afternoon, Richards gave a brief tour of the command center located at the center of the fairgrounds. From cameras there, Richards can remotely watch the parking lots and survey the traffic flow. While Fair-goers take in rides and corn dogs for four weeks, this is where Richards will spend most of his time.

To get a sense of the size of the operation, nearly half of Fairplex’s 487 acres are parking lots with about 28,000 spaces. By comparison, Disneyland might handle about 15,000 vehicles a day, Richards said.

Coming up with new stalls was the result of what Richards described as a going on a parking diet.

Fairplex officials started with the Blue Lot on the east side of White Avenue. For many years, 5 acres on the northeast end had been rented to an auction company that was using it to store vehicles.

They decided this year, the Fair would need the 5 acres to address its growing parking needs, picking up 400 spaces in the process, Richards said as he looked at the fenced off portion of the lot. The company is still in the process of moving out the vehicles.

By removing the tenant, Fairplex will create a new entrance off Arrow Highway and add six ticket lanes. Fairplex will open those lanes and redirect traffic to the Arrow Highway entrance during peak hours, Richards said.

Currently, vehicles enter the Blue Lot through the entrance off White Avenue. With the new gates at the Blue Lot, parking staff will be able to handle 600 more cars an hour, meaning as many 4,000 cars an hour can come through the two gates, he said.

Fairplex was able to add another 1,100 parking spots in the same lot by relocating its designated area for trailer parking to a 5-acre site in La Verne. While this portion of the lot is dirt, crews in the coming weeks will clear out the site and lay down ground-up asphalt and stripe the spaces, he said.

“The last time we really used this area of the lot was in the ’90s,” he said.

Fairplex was able to partner with La Verne to use a city-owned lot just off of Fairplex Drive to store the displaced trailers. The carnival portion of the fair alone has 300 truckloads, some of which remain on the fairgrounds, he said.

Another 200 spaces, for employees, was added in the former barn area, he said.
With parking demand continuing to grow, Richards said the next step could be to lease out a parking structure from the University of La Verne and shuttle people in. Depending on the growth, he acknowledged it’s a measure Fairplex could take as early as next year.

**Rerouting rideshare lot**

For Richards, creating a new area for ride-hailing services such as Lyft or Uber or a taxi that was closer to an entrance was critical. Last year, Fairplex created a drop-off site at Gate 15 on Arrow Highway, complete with carpeting and a cellphone charging station.

Patrons, however, had to take a shuttle to get into the fair. The spot was rarely used. Fairplex officials found drivers were going to Gate 1 off McKinley Avenue to drop off their clients, Richards said.

“The saying is ‘they want to be dropped at the 50-yard line,’ so we’re giving them that,” he said.

A special entrance at the Blue Lot will lead into a designated pick-up and drop-off area for Uber and Lyft users. It will leave them just couple of feet from the ticket gates. Richards showed off the area where crews were going to repave the lot. It was previously used for preferred parking users, he said.

Meanwhile, a patrol unit will be posted at Gate 1 to deter any of the drivers from using that entrance to drop off guests.

“McKinley is a small street and it’s not built to handle volume. When people start stacking up on McKinley, they block it,” he said.

The L.A. County Fair runs from Aug. 31 through Sept. 23 and is closed Mondays and Tuesdays, except Labor Day.
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PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The County of Los Angeles, in cooperation with the cities within the Pomona Valley, has determined that development of an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) in the Pomona Valley would help to reduce congestion, enhance mobility, provide traveler information during non-recurring and event traffic congestion, and manage event traffic. The Pomona Valley Intelligent Transportation Systems (PVITS) project was conceived as a recommendation from the Pomona Valley Feasibility Study completed by the MTA in 1995. The ultimate objectives of the Project are to:

- Improve mobility by optimizing traffic management on arterials and freeways;
- Enhance Route 60 capacity by better coordinating freeway traffic with parallel arterials;
- Improve agency efficiency by coordinating management of operations and maintenance efforts among and between agencies; and
- Increase agency staff productivity by providing low-maintenance, high-quality communications and computational tools to assist in daily management and coordination activities.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The Conceptual Design of the Pomona Valley ITS project includes the preparation of a Stakeholder Operational Objectives Report that summarizes each project stakeholder's needs, objectives, and issues to consider in the planning, design, and implementation of advanced technologies for traffic control, traffic management, and traveler information systems. This Individual City Report document provides a summary of existing, planned (already approved), and desired transportation projects and policies within the City of La Verne. This summary is based upon information in the 1995 Pomona Valley Forum Signal Synchronization Study, with updates to the information based upon city input from recent surveys and coordination meetings. Separate reports of data summaries and stakeholder objectives have been created for each City within the Pomona Valley project area.

This report provides the following information for the City of La Verne:

- Section 1.0: Definition and overview of the study area
- Section 2.0: Existing, planned, and desired traffic control and communications infrastructure
- Section 3.0: Current issues and desired aspects of operations and maintenance
- Section 4.0: Current issues and desired aspects of interagency coordination

Figures illustrating the locations of existing and planned traffic control equipment and congestion issues are included in Appendix A. A list of all existing and proposed signalized intersections on study arterials within the City is included in Appendix B.

The Stakeholders Operational Objectives Report (Deliverable 4.1.2) is a separate document that will be developed as part of this project. It will provide more specific detail on the ideal operational characteristics of the PVITS equipment and user interfaces.
The City of La Verne is concerned about the future extension of SR-210 opening and its impact on traffic levels.

The City of La Verne is concerned about the aesthetics of arterial-based Dynamic Message Sign (DMS) equipment. Another issue will be City Planning Commission approval to get sign design/implementation.

The biggest traffic issue for the City is the 15-20 days per year during the Los Angeles County Fair, but the extent of impacts is not enough to warrant the expense of implementing a management system.

The City of La Verne does not have any relationship issues with the Fairplex. According to the City, traffic from the Fairplex seems to be minimal and the City doesn't see a need to be involved with any Fairplex-related ATIS or ATMS systems.

La Verne Police Department (LVPD) desires management of Arrow Highway corridor signals at times of Fairplex Events, either through management by LVPD or jointly with Fairplex.

5.0 NEXT STEPS

The information summarized within this document will be utilized to formulate the Stakeholders and Operational Objectives Report (Deliverable 4.1.2). This document will provide a project-wide evaluation of stakeholder needs and wishes, and provide a basis for the Requirements Analysis under Task 5 of this project. The Stakeholders and Operational Objectives Report will provide the following analyses of PVITS project implementation, from information summarized in the Individual City Reports:

- Anticipated benefits to stakeholders
- Potential cost implications to stakeholders
- Potential impacts on local agency staffing and operation
- Potential impacts on local agency management and maintenance costs

Deliverables from the Addendum Report, Route 60 Feasibility Study, and the Fairplex Traffic Management Plan efforts will also be incorporated into the Requirements Analysis task, and into tasks beyond this, such as the Concept of Operations and Alternatives Analysis.
DISCLAIMER

Disclaimer: The information and data contained in this document are for planning purposes only and should not be relied upon for final design of any project. Any information in this Transportation Concept Report (TCR) is subject to modification as conditions change and new information is obtained. Although planning information is dynamic and continually changing, the District 7 Division of Planning and Local Assistance makes every effort to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of the information contained in the TCR. The information in the TCR does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation, nor is it intended to address design policies and procedures.
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COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

I-10 is an Urban Principal Arterial in an urbanized corridor providing access to the cities of Alhambra, Baldwin Park, Beverly Hills, City of Industry, Claremont, Covina, Culver City, Diamond Bar, El Monte, La Verne, Los Angeles, Monterey Park, Pomona, Rosemead, San Dimas, San Gabriel, Santa Monica, South El Monte, Vernon, Walnut and West Covina.

LAND USE

The I-10 corridor is heavily congested, highly developed, and varies from residential, industrial to commercial. The many significant trip generators along this corridor include:

- Downtown Los Angeles
- Santa Monica Airport
- Santa Monica coastal beaches
- University of California, Los Angeles
- Convention Center/Staples Center
- University of Southern California
- L. A. County University of Southern California Medical Center
- California State University, Los Angeles
- El Monte Airport
- Santa Anita Race Track
- California Polytechnic University, Pomona
- Frank G. Bonelli Regional Recreation Areas
- Pomona Fairplex
- Brackett Airport
- LaVerne University
- The Claremont Colleges
- Numerous major shopping centers

Significant growth in housing, population, and employment are generally projected throughout the I-10 corridor area. This growth is expected to occur through in fill and recycling of existing land uses.

The following graphs show socioeconomic growths in the cities along I-10 Corridor per the SCAG 2012-2035 RTP/SCS GROWTH FORECAST
BOARD MEETING DATE: October 6, 2017  

AGENDA NO. 30

REPORT: Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee

SYNOPSIS: Below is a summary of key issues addressed at the MSRC’s meeting on September 21, 2017. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 19, 2017, at 2:00 p.m., in Conference Room CC8.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Receive and file.

Fred Minassian
SCAQMD Liaison to MSRC

Meeting Minutes Approved
The MSRC unanimously approved the minutes of the June 15 and August 17, 2017 meetings. Those approved minutes are attached for your information (Attachments 1 & 2).

FYs 2016-18 Major Event Center Transportation Program (PA2017-05)
As part of its FYs 2016-18 Work Program, the MSRC allocated $5,000,000 for event center transportation programs and released Program Announcement #PA2017-05. The Program Announcement solicits applications from qualifying major event centers and/or transportation providers to provide transportation service for venues not currently served by sufficient transportation service. To date, the MSRC has awarded a total of $1,437,494. The MSRC considered recommendations concerning two additional applications submitted by Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink).

Metrolink requested the MSRC to consider an award of $351,186 to provide special train service to the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 professional football seasons. Service would be provided on the Orange County, San Bernardino, Antelope Valley and 91/Perris Valley Lines. In 2017, the service will utilize Tier 4 locomotives if available, but will utilize Tier 2 locomotives if the Tier 4 locomotives are not available. In 2018 and beyond, the service would be required to utilize Tier 4 locomotives. Metrolink and its participating member agencies would
ACTION: This item will be considered by the SCAQMD Board at its meeting on September 1, 2017 meeting.

Agenda Item #11 – Consider Funding for Application Received under the Natural Gas Infrastructure Program

Cynthia Ravenstein, MSRC Contracts Administrator, reported on this item. As a part of the FYs 2016-18 Work Program, the MSRC allocated $4 million for implementation of fund new and expanded CNG and LNG refueling stations, as well as modifications of vehicle maintenance facilities and technician training. A Program Announcement was developed and released on June 2, 2017 and open until June 29, 2018. To date, the MSRC has received one application from Penske Truck Leasing Company for modifications to their maintenance facility and technician training. The MSRC-TAC reviewed the request and are recommending approval of an award in an amount not to exceed $82,500.

ON MOTION BY MSRC MEMBER BEN BENOIT AND SECONDED BY MSRC VICE-CHAIR LARRY MCCALLON THE MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE AN AWARD TO PENSKE TRUCK LEASING COMPANY IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $82,500.
AYES: BENOIT, KITOWSKI, MCCALLON, PETTIS, YAMARONE.
NOES: NONE.

ACTION: This item will be considered by the SCAQMD Board at its meeting on September 1, 2017 meeting.

Agenda Item #12 – Consider Funding for Application Received under the Major Event Center Transportation Program

Ray Gorski, MSRC Technical Advisor, presented this item. This is an application that has been received under the Major Event Center Transportation Program. This is to implement additional transit service for the Los Angeles County Fair which is held at the Pomona Fairplex. This project was started last year and the MSRC did provide some incentive monies. There were quite a few lessons learned. They are seeking $100,000 to implement this expanded transit service for both the 2017 and 2018 Los Angeles County Fairs. The way this program works, they have existing transit lines but what they will do for line 197 which connects the Azusa Downtown Gold Line Station to the Fairplex is extend it to weekend service and also align the hours of operation with those of the County Fair. This went to both the TCM subcommittee as well as your MSRC-TAC and there was a fairly substantial amount of discussion and deliberation. We had representatives from Foothill Transit attend the MSRC-TAC meeting to provide clarification and to answer questions from the membership. The issue was the last time that the MSRC funded this and the utilization of the service was relatively low and we wanted to understand why the utilization service was low and what Foothill Transit and their partner, the Fairplex we’re going to do to improve that for the 2017 and 2018 Fair seasons. What we learn from the representatives from Foothill Transit is that it is in their opinion that last year they simply got off to a much later start than they are this year. They did not provide the level of outreach and marketing last year because they had a time crunch last year. They have given assurances that they are doing ample outreach and marketing to make sure that the potential users are familiar with this service and the
conductivity that provides other forms of public transit. There is a discount on your Fair admission if you utilize this service and it has a lot of very positive attributes. We felt that the outreach was a lacking component last year and led to having a relatively low ridership because of that the MSRC-TAC is recommending the following that you award funding in the amount of $100,000, $50,000 per year but the 2018 award be contingent on providing an interim report which demonstrates the utilization of the service and the marketing that they've done to show that they are in fact having an increase in the ridership. There was quite a bit of discussion and information brought to the subcommittee and the committee relative to other Fair transit services and what their ridership was at the initiation of the service and how it did overtime.

MSRC Member Jack Kitowski asked just for clarification, if this board doesn't see it again that means? Mr. Gorski replied it's in the opinion of your TAC that substantial progress has been made. Mr. Kitowski stated I think we would be interested in hearing about the results regardless but I am supportive of the structure. Mr. Gorski replied we will make sure that when they provide the data we will put it in a presentation format for your consideration.

ON MOTION BY MSRC VICE-CHAIR LARRY MCCALLON AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BEN BENOIT THE MSRC UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE AN AWARD OF $100,000 TO FOOTHILL TRANSIT FOR THE 2017 AND 2018 LOS ANGELES COUNTY FAIRS. $50,000 FOR THE 2017 FAIR AND $50,000 FOR THE 2018 FAIR WILL BE CONTINGENT UPON FOOTHILL TRANSIT PROVIDING RIDERSHIP DATA AT PROJECT MIDPOINT TO THE MSRC-TAC TCM SUBCOMMITTEE FOR EVALUATION.
AYES: BENOIT, KITÓWSKI, MCCALLON, PETTIS, YAMARONE.
NOES: NONE.

ACTION: This item will be considered by the SCAQMD Board at its meeting on September 1, 2017 meeting.

Agenda Item #13 – Consider MSRC-TAC Evaluation Panel’s Recommendation for Technical Advisor Services for the MSRC

MSRC-TAC Chair Gretchen Hardison reported on this item. As you know the MSRC retains an independent contractor Ray Gorski to provide technical assistance and support of the 2766 discretionary fund program. That task generally includes preparing work program RFPs, evaluating discretionary fund projects, monitoring contractor performance, viewing final reports and keeping MSRC and MSRC-TAC apprised of the latest technologies and scientific developments in motor vehicle emission reductions. Since the current technical advisory contract ends on September 30th of 2017 the MSRC-TAC Administrative Subcommittee developed an RFP to rebid for technical advisor services for a new two-year term with an option for a second two year term extension. The RFP was released with your approval on June 2nd and applications were due on July 13th. We followed the SCAQMD procurement policy and procedure in terms of advertising the availability of this RFP. Two proposals were received and response to that RFP. The TAC impaneled an evaluation panel reviewed and scored the proposals and the results are in your packet. I am very pleased to bring an unanimous recommendation from the MSRC-TAC to you to award the contract for technical advisor services for Mr. Raymond Gorski.
SCAQMD TO FUND AIR FILTRATION PROJECT IN SOUTH BAY SCHOOLS

Following a successful pilot program earlier this year, SCAQMD awarded $1.125 million on Oct. 3 for high-efficiency air filtration devices at schools in communities surrounding the Valero oil refinery in Wilmington.

The project is funded by a penalty settlement with the Valero oil refinery following its failure to meet a May 9, 2007 deadline to phase out its use of the highly toxic chemical hydrogen fluoride (HF).

This new project will help expand the air filtration program to schools in communities surrounding the Valero refinery and help reduce children’s exposure to particulate matter and diesel emissions.

“School children have a right to breathe clean air,” said William Burke, SCAQMD’s Chairman. “Southland refineries must comply with some of the toughest air pollution laws in the nation. This will give an extra level of protection to school children in the Wilmington area.”

SCAQMD will provide $1.125 million to IQAIR North America to install high-efficiency air filtration devices at schools located in communities impacted by industrial and refinery emissions. SCAQMD will work with school representatives to identify schools that are most impacted.

Air filtration devices range in cost from less than $100 for a high-efficiency filter for use in existing heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) units to about $8,500 for a stand-alone air filtration device used in schools without existing HVAC systems. The number of schools participating in the project will vary depending on the type and number of device required at each school.

In December 2006, SCAQMD funded a pilot study at three elementary schools located near refineries, and other industrial facilities and freeways in the Carson-Long Beach area. The project tested the effectiveness of various air filtration devices at removing pollutants from indoor air. Preliminary results from two schools -- Hudson Elementary in Wilmington and Del Amo Elementary in Carson -- showed that the low-cost, high-efficiency HVAC filters are effective at removing particles from indoor air.

For more information, contact Phil Fine at (909) 396-2239.

The Future is Green Conference a Success

More than 2,700 people attended “The Future is Green Conference and Expo” which showcased new and emerging technologies that are reducing emissions and conserving energy. The three-day event, held at the Long Beach Convention Center, September 14-16, 2008, was hosted by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and a group of regional air districts, including the South Coast AQMD.

Panel sessions covered topics ranging from renewable energy and green consumer products to clean fuels and green building standards. The expo included more than 100 exhibitors, and nearly 40 advanced-technology vehicles were on display. Keynote luncheon speakers included T. Boone Pickens, who discussed his plan to use wind and solar power to generate electricity, and natural gas to power vehicles. CAPCOA also encouraged high school teachers to bring field trips to the conference. More than 1,300 students from 29 schools toured the expo and attended special sessions on how they could reduce air pollution and fight global warming.

Conference proceedings, including many of the presentations, will soon be made available on the conference website www.capcoagreen.com.

For more information, contact Larry Kolczak at (909) 396-3215.
ZERO-EMISSION ELECTRIC TRAM UNVEILED AT DESCANSO GARDENS

An environmentally friendly electric tram for transporting guests made its official debut in October at Descanso Gardens in La Cañada Flintridge. The new tram replaced an aging, propane-fueled internal combustion engine that was noisy and decades-old. The improved vehicle features zero emissions and it meets American with Disabilities Act requirements.

Funded by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the tram is expected to improve air quality in and around the park. It plugs into a conventional electric outlet for overnight charging.

“This tram will provide thousands of visitors to a clean, zero-emission form of transportation,” said Michael Antonovich, Los Angeles County Supervisor, Fifth District, and SCAQMD Governing Board Member. “Replacing the short-distance tourist trams at the park with electric vehicles is also a responsible first step in making this beautiful educational facility more environmentally friendly.”

Officials from Descanso Gardens say this is just the first step in the 160-acre park’s long-term vision of becoming a self-sustaining natural environment with regard to water, energy, waste disposal and recycling. Groundskeepers already use electric utility carts. In the future, the tram, which transports about 14,000 visitors through the county-owned park every year, will be refueled with solar photovoltaic electricity.

For more information, contact Lisa Mirisola at (909) 396-2638.

Be Green – Get Your Advisor Online

The SCAQMD Advisor is now available on the website – www.aqmd.gov. You can access it online, or sign up on the listserve. Select the Community tab on the website, scroll down to “list serve” and follow the steps. You’ll get the latest Advisor, and conserve paper at the same time. If you are currently receiving the Advisor in the mail and prefer to subscribe to the online version, please let us know. Send a message to Advisornewsletter@aqmd.gov.

Another New City Joins SCAQMD

On October 1, 2008, Menifee, the newest city in Riverside County held its official incorporation ceremony. Menifee is the 25th city in SCAQMD’s jurisdiction of Riverside County and is located at the southwestern part of the county near the new city of Wildomar.

Menifee’s city incorporation ceremony and first city council meeting were held at Bell Mountain Middle School, in Menifee. Over 500 people were in attendance at the ceremony where Riverside County Supervisor Jeff Stone, along with Supervisor Marion Ashley, swore in Menifee’s first City Council: Mayor Wallace Edgerton, Mayor Pro Tem Darcy Kuenzi, Councilmembers John Denver, Scott Mann and Fred Twyman. George Wentz is the new City Manager.

For more information, contact William Sanchez at (909) 396-3203.

CARB Board Voices Appreciation for SCAQMD Climate Protection Efforts

South Coast AQMD welcomed the opportunity recently to serve as host for the September 25, 2008 meeting of the California Air Resources Board (CARB), held in Diamond Bar.

CARB’s agenda included a presentation by SCAQMD’s Executive Officer Barry Wallerstein on SCAQMD’s efforts related to climate change, including an overview of:

- the SCAQMD Governing Board’s recently adopted Climate Change Policy;
- development of the SoCal Climate Solutions Exchange consistent with the AB 32 Global Warming Solutions Act, to encourage voluntary greenhouse gas reductions as well as co-benefits for local investment & public health;
- modification of the District’s annual emissions reporting software to include voluntary greenhouse gas reporting; and
- development of an interim greenhouse gas significance threshold for project analyses under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in the current absence of a state threshold.

Dr. Wallerstein noted, “When we look at Southern California and we look at the scope of the climate change issues that face us, we believe that we can be part of the solution -- and that, in fact, we need efforts at all levels, not just the state, the federal government, or us at local air districts, but also at the local government level as well.”

He also noted that the whole AB 32 program must be anchored by the active participation and leadership of local government entities including local air districts, boards of supervisors, councils of government (COGs), transportation planning agencies, and city councils.

In response, CARB board members saluted SCAQMD’s efforts to date and encouraged CARB’s staff to redouble their efforts to work with local air districts as major partners in implementing the AB 32 Scoping Plan.

For more information, contact Jill Whynot at (909) 396-3104.
The Communities of Faith Partnership is a special part of the Clean Air Congress, SCAQMD’s free service to inform and encourage public participation in policy issues surrounding air quality and its impacts on health and the environment.

The goal is to build bridges and empower everyone to make a difference in their community by:
- Informing congregants about air quality and environmental issues
- Hosting presentations on air quality issues
- Attending air quality meetings
- Coordinating faith-based environmental and health fairs

Membership in the Communities of Faith Partnership is free and is open to all religions and faith-based groups.

For more information, contact Lisa Ball, 909-396-2642.

Going Green at the Los Angeles County Fair

For eighteen days in September, SCAQMD was a major sponsor and participant in the 2008 Los Angeles County Fair held at the Fairplex in Pomona. The Fair, which celebrated its 86th year, attracted more than one million people.

Visitors to the SCAQMD exhibit, located in the Fair’s Going Green - Making a World of Difference attraction, were able to learn how to access local air quality information on a daily basis, and how they can help improve air quality by utilizing current and new products, and lower polluting equipment.

Some of the most popular displays at the exhibit provided information on the following SCAQMD programs:

The Clean Air Congress: A free service hosted by the SCAQMD for everyone who cares about clean air. By joining the Clean Air Congress, members are informed and involved in the fight against air pollution.

The Healthy Hearths Initiative: Residents in SCAQMD’s four-county jurisdiction are eligible to receive a $125 discount at participating dealers on the purchase and installation of a gas-log set to replace wood-burning fireplaces. The program is part of SCAQMD’s Healthy Hearths initiative which aims to reduce harmful pollution from residential wood burning.

The Clean Air Choice Car Program: A program sponsored by the SCAQMD to provide information to help make personal transportation decisions that benefit the environment and improve air quality. The public can check out lists of low-emission vehicles for model year 2008 that help to identify the current clean air cars now in dealer showrooms.

Lawn Mower & Leaf Blower Exchanges: Southland residents will once again have the opportunity in 2009 to participate in the SCAQMD’s popular Lawn Mower Exchange program, and professional gardeners/landscapers will also have the opportunity next year to participate in the Leaf Blower Exchange program. Residents can sign up on the SCAQMD’s web site list-serve to be notified of the details for next year’s events.

EnviroFlash: Local air quality notifications are available via e-mail on a daily basis by signing up for EnviroFlash - a free system offered through the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in partnership with SCAQMD. To sign up, visit www.enviroflash.info

For additional information on any of these programs, please visit the SCAQMD’s web site at www.aqmd.gov or contact Pom Pom Ganguli at (909) 396-3185.
EXHIBIT "9"
Rep. Napolitano Celebrates Grand Opening of Pomona Fairplex Trade and Conference Center

March 14, 2012 | Press Release

(Pomona, CA) Today, Rep. Grace F. Napolitano welcomed the grand opening of the new Trade and Conference Center at the Pomona Fairplex.

"This new Trade and Conference Center will be a critical resource for our local economy," Napolitano said. "Its state-of-the-art facilities will give the Pomona Fairplex an even higher profile, and help attract new visitors and conferees. This is a smart investment that will mean more jobs and more revenue coming to our area."

Napolitano worked with Rep. David Dreier to secure more than $1 million to help fund the Trade and Conference Center.

The center is projected to create 280 full-time jobs, and will provide further economic benefits by attracting conferences and generating tax revenue for the city and county. The new facilities will host domestic and international commerce programs, expositions and trade symposia, and events that provide education in traditional trades.

The 85,000 square foot, state-of-the-art conference and exhibition center also features broadband connectivity, campus-wide wireless integration, and a satellite communications system geared towards attracting and benefiting small businesses. It will have both small- and medium-sized meeting rooms outfitted with high-tech equipment, designed to help small businesses during events.

Napolitano gave Dreier special recognition for his involvement in the project. Dreier has announced that he will retire at the end of this year.

"Rep. Dreier has served this region well for many years," Napolitano said. "He has been a friend to me and to our communities, working hard to help us complete this project and many others. I will truly miss him in Congress."

# # #
What is Amazon PolyPlex? What is the coalition that has been discussed?

A: In 2016, a diverse coalition was created to leverage the economic potential of this region. Members include government and transportation agencies, education and health care institutions, non-profit organizations, utilities and businesses. The coalition developed plans to make the region the new economic, commerce, innovation, social, and educational center of Southern California. The efforts of this coalition prepared the groundwork and the support behind the Amazon PolyPlex proposal.

Amazon PolyPlex is a regional land-use collaboration between Cal Poly Pomona and Fairplex, led by a strategic partnership with State of California Governor, Edmund G. Brown; Los Angeles County Supervisor, Hilda L. Solis; City of Pomona Mayor, Tim Sandoval; California State Polytechnic University President, Soraya M. Coley; and Fairplex President and CEO, Miguel A. Santana. Amazon PolyPlex is at the junction of five major freeways and ideally located at the intersection of four counties representing global commerce and one of the nation’s largest economies. The Amazon PolyPlex proposal signifies a new day in Pomona, one which will brand the region as the new hub of Southern California.

Q: If Amazon HQ2 comes to PolyPlex, will the partners have to go through a permitting process?

A: If PolyPlex is awarded the project, there are several areas of approvals and permitting that will take place with elected offices and boards, all of which are represented in the Amazon PolyPlex proposal. These include the County of Los Angeles, City of Pomona, California State University System and Fairplex, all of whom have worked together to identify and outline this process as part of the PolyPlex proposal.
Q Does the Amazon PolyPlex proposal involve government subsidies?

A: The PolyPlex proposal submission does not include any local tax breaks. Instead, the partners are looking to reinvest a portion of property and other taxes generated from the development back into the local community to address impacts of housing, traffic and other infrastructure.

Q How does the Amazon PolyPlex proposal impact taxpayer dollars?

A: Overall the PolyPlex project is intended to increase government revenues through jobs, property and sales tax, utilities, hotel tax and increased commerce in the region. The PolyPlex proposal submission does not include any local tax breaks. Instead, the partners are looking to reinvest a portion of property and other taxes generated from the development back into the local community to address impacts of housing, traffic and other infrastructure.

Q How can the region support 50,000 new jobs so quickly?

A: The Amazon RFP identifies multiple phases of the HQ2 project that will take place over the course of 15-17 years. While initial operations could begin as early as 2019, the operation would most likely not reach its full capacity until 2030 or beyond, during which time housing, transportation and other infrastructure would be in place to support the region’s workforce growth.

Q With 50,000 new jobs, can the community support Amazon PolyPlex’s needs for housing and transportation?

A: One of the major competitive advantages of the PolyPlex proposal is that it includes so much available land within the two campuses. This available acreage in excess of the requirements for HQ2 has been identified for potential housing and other resources to support a robust live, learn, work and play environment for Amazon HQ2 employees and the greater community.
Q If Amazon HQ2 comes to PolyPlex, will there still be an LA County Fair?

A: Yes, the Fair will continue, and we imagine partnering with Amazon and CalPoly to make it even better. The LA County Fair has been part of Fairplex’s mission for nearly 100 years. The Fair has been the heart of a year-round business that supports the regional economy through arts, culture, entertainment and commerce. The PolyPlex proposal identifies the Fair and Fairplex activities as a tremendous opportunity to connect the organization’s mission and core business to Amazon, a company deeply committed to consumers and commerce.

Q What are the next steps in the proposal process?

A: Proposals are due to Amazon by October 19, 2017. The company will make its final site selection and announcement sometime in 2018.

Q What happens if PolyPlex is not awarded the project?

A: The Amazon PolyPlex proposal signifies a new day in Pomona, one in which city, business, education and community leaders aim to change the perception of the region and make it the new hub of Southern California. This is just the beginning. If not Amazon PolyPlex, the coalition is committed to its vision to make this regional intersection of education, innovation and commerce a global economic influence and a sustainable community to live, learn, work and play in.
Attachments to Letter No. 5

EXHIBIT “11”
3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section provides an overview of existing land uses, land use designations, applicable plans and policies, and evaluates the potential for land use impacts associated with the alternatives.

3.10.1 Regulatory Setting

Applicable regional and local plans and regulations are included in the following discussion. A variety of sources, including applicable General Plans and zoning maps, were used to evaluate potential land use impacts.

3.10.1.1 Regional

Southern California Association of Governments Regional Comprehensive Plan. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is designated by the federal government as the Southern California region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization and Regional Transportation Planning Agency. SCAG has sought to address regional planning concerns through various plans and programs, including the 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

The RCP addresses regional issues including housing, traffic/transportation, water, and air quality, and serves as an advisory document to local agencies in the Southern California region to use for preparing local plans and handling local issues of regional significance. RCP land use, transportation and air quality goals are as follows:

- **Land Use and Housing:** Successfully integrate land and transportation planning and achieve land use and housing sustainability by implementing the Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy.\(^1\)
  - Focusing growth in existing and emerging centers and along major transportation corridors.
  - Creating significant areas of mixed-use development and walkable, “people-scaled” communities.
  - Providing new housing opportunities, with building types and locations that respond to the region’s changing demographics.
  - Targeting growth in housing, employment and commercial development within walking distance of existing and planned transit stations.
  - Injecting new life into under-used areas by creating vibrant new business districts, redeveloping old buildings and building new businesses and housing on vacant lots.
  - Preserving existing, stable, single-family neighborhoods.
  - Protecting important open space, environmentally sensitive areas, and agricultural lands from development.\(^2\)

- **Transportation**
  - A more efficient transportation system that reduces and better manages vehicle activity.
  - A cleaner transportation system that minimizes air quality impacts and is energy efficient.

---

\(^1\) The Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy is a guideline for how and where the Growth Vision for Southern California’s future can be implemented and calls for changes to current land use and transportation trends on only 2 % of the land area of the region.

3.10.2.3 City of La Verne

The proposed alignment would traverse the southern portion of the City of La Verne, north of and roughly parallel to Arrow Highway. Residential, industrial, and commercial uses are located in the surrounding area. Land uses immediately surrounding the station site include mini-storage, vacant, commercial and industrial uses in the south and industrial and institutional uses (University of La Verne) to the north (see Figure 3.10-15 through Figure 3.10-19). The University of La Verne, Auto Club Raceway, and Brackett Field are located in this surrounding area. Other uses in the surrounding area include mobile home RV storage and mobile home park uses.

3.10.2.4 City of Pomona

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 Figure 3.10-19 through Figure 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 Palomares Park, RV parking uses and 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. Aside from a residential area on the north side of the Metro right of way, west of Carnegie Avenue, the alignment would be entirely within industrial or commercial areas. Land uses in the surrounding area are mostly residential, with some industrial and commercial uses also present (see Figure 3.10-19 through Figure 3.10-22).

3.10.2.5 City of Claremont

The proposed alignment would traverse the southern portion of the City of Claremont. Figure 3.10-22 through Figure 3.10-24 show the existing land uses along the proposed alignment and station area. The surrounding area contains industrial, institutional, mostly residential and commercial uses (see Figure 3.10-19 through Figure 3.10-24). Residential land uses characterize the area between Carnegie Avenue and Cornell Avenue, north of the alignment. East of Cornell Avenue on the north side of the alignment, land uses include various commercial developments such as banks, retail stores, and medical offices. The Claremont University Consortium, an institutional use, is located directly north of the proposed station area. South of the alignment, the area is characterized by residential uses to the west of Cambridge Avenue and east of Elder Drive. Between Cambridge Avenues and Indian Hill Boulevard, uses consist of industrial development as well as the Keck Graduate Institute. Aside from residential areas along the north side of the Metro right of way, between Carnegie Avenue and Indian Hill Boulevard and between Claremont Boulevard and the Los Angeles County line, the alignment would be mostly entirely bordered by industrial, commercial, or university properties. The surrounding area includes various commercial uses, including banks, retail, and medical office uses. The Claremont Colleges and the Keck Graduate Institute are also located in the surrounding area. Office uses to the north and multiple family residential uses to the south, directly east of Indian Hill Boulevard, are in Claremont Village. Multi-family residential uses such as the Claremont Villas Senior Apartments are located in the surrounding
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Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension
bus connections to nearby destinations such as the Santa Anita Racetrack, the Westfield Mall, the Methodist hospital, Old Town Monrovia, and offices along Huntington Boulevard. Claremont and Montclair have already completed major planning efforts and are moving forward with development that adheres to the vision outlined in these plans. The presence of the Metrolink stations has been one of the major drivers of this growth.

The City of Azusa also offers significant short-term opportunity. The three major developments occurring near their station locations - Rosedale, Block 36, and Watt & Gorton's Project - are bound to spur additional transit focused projects in the station areas.

The successful development at all four of these stations will likely generate interest in other nearby stations on the Foothill Extension. Stations such as Duarte, Glendora, La Verne and Pomona will likely follow with a mid-term phase of transit-oriented development. These stations will need to establish strong station area plans to link to nearby features such as the City of Hope, nearby grocery stores and neighborhood retail as well as the Fairplex and La Verne University. These station areas may support TOD, but the success of their development is dependent on making supportive policy changes and establishing a good pedestrian scale street grid and use mix.

Inwindale and San Dimas have limited short or mid-term potential for TOD, for vastly different reasons. Inwindale sustains a vital mix of industrial and warehousing jobs, and the station area's existing land use pattern leaves little possibility for TOD, While San Dimas offers good potential connections to Old San Dimas, the City's hesitation to support TOD policies - including allowing increased densities or significant new development - leaves very few short or mid-term opportunities for a successful TOD. Nonetheless long-term economic or political shifts could open up potential for new types of uses at these stations.
City of La Verne Recommendations

The City of La Verne requested a transportation plan, focusing on vehicular circulation on Arrow Highway, and a peer review for their station area plan prepared by the Arroyo Group. The transportation plan focused on existing and anticipated roadway demand and will incorporate recommendations for all modes of traffic focusing on enhancing specific implementation policies and multi-modal recommendations – the auto circulation, transit modes, bike, and pedestrian circulation. The IBI Group has also provided a full review of The Arroyo Group’s report. The Project Team recommends that the City of La Verne:

1. Implement guide signs along Arrow Highway and White Avenue to direct vehicles to the Gold Line station, passenger drop-off zones, parking facilities, and the SR-210 and I-10 freeways.

2. Inform the local community of traffic calming options during the planning and construction phases of the Gold Line Foothill Extension.

3. Establish a process for initiating and evaluating neighborhood traffic calming measures.

4. Consider developing a Transit Center near the Gold Line La Verne station to provide a nexus between multiple transit modes.

Based on the Market Analysis, the Project Team recommends that the City of La Verne:

1. Create linkages between the station, downtown La Verne, the University, and the Fairplex. TOD opportunities near the La Verne station will be longer term. However, the station offers many immediate amenities for transit riders including the downtown commercial area, the University of La Verne, and events at the Fairplex. The current planning policy efforts should include policies targeting development around the station and improving linkages between these three areas.
CURRENT CITY EFFORTS

Planned TOD Developments in:
- Claremont
- La Verne
- Azusa
- San Dimas
- Monrovia

Tremendous 'buy-in' from regional players such as:
- Fairplex
- City of Hope
- University of La Verne
- Azusa Pacific University
- Claremont Colleges
Other regional attractions reinforce the importance of the corridor

The Fairplex

Universities

The Claremont Colleges
University of La Verne
Citrus College
Azusa Pacific University

Ontario Airport
to determine existing daily traffic operations. Four of the segments are east-west roadways, and the remaining 31 are north-south roadways.

The existing conditions analysis was performed for all 35 roadway segments. The analysis showed that all roadway segments currently operate at LOS DC or better, except White Avenue between Arrow Highway and Third Street, which would operate at LOS F. Table 2-8 shows capacities, volumes, volume-to-capacity ratios, and corresponding LOS for each segment analyzed.

### 2.5.2.3 Study Intersections and Existing Levels of Service

Turning movement counts were collected at 90 intersections in the Study Area to assess existing peak-hour traffic conditions. The chosen intersections are located both along the proposed LRT alignment and adjacent streets. The AM and PM peak hours were identified as the critical time periods for an assessment of existing conditions. Detailed vehicle turning movement data are illustrated in Figure 2-8 to Figure 2-13.

The intersection analysis showed that 6-5 of the 90 locations operate at LOS E or F. Table 2-9 lists these six-five intersection locations. The remaining 84-85 intersections operate at LOS D or better during both AM and PM peak hours. Table 2-10 presents the results of the existing AM and PM traffic operations and corresponding LOS at each of the study intersections.

### 2.5.3 Parking

On-street parking is available near the proposed stations at Glendora and La Verne. The existing Metrolink stations at Pomona and Claremont also provide on-street parking near the stations. Limited or Nno on-street parking is provided near the proposed Glendora or San Dimas stations or near the Montclair Transcenter; however, sufficient off-street parking is available for current and future operations.

### 2.5.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

According to the 2012 County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan, three of the six proposed station locations would be within the vicinity of existing bike lanes. Glendora Avenue has a Class III bike route near the location of the proposed Glendora Station, Arrow Highway has a Class III bike route near the proposed San Dimas Station, while San Dimas Avenue has a Class III bike route north of Arrow Highway and a Class II bike lane south of Arrow Highway. College Avenue has a Class II bike lane near the proposed Claremont Station.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Comment Submitted or Received</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/25/2011</td>
<td>State of California Public Utilities Commission, Rosa Munoz</td>
<td>While we understand the cost of grade separating a highway-rail at-grade crossing makes for a perceived detriment to your project, the CPUC normally does not take cost into its consideration of the practicability of grade separating a crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2011</td>
<td>City of Glendora, Dianne Walter</td>
<td>City's Public Works Street Yard access off of Loraine Avenue is located on the railroad right of way. Discussion with Authority staff indicate that the Loraine access will not be impacts. The City respectfully requests confirmation from the Authority that the Loraine access to the Street Yard will be maintained as part of the Phase 2B project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2011</td>
<td>City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris</td>
<td>Requests the authority conduct a detailed grade crossing analysis that evaluates the feasibility of a grade separation in order to mitigate traffic concerns. The intersection of Bonita Ave/Cataract Ave will be experiencing almost 40 to 50 seconds delays of closure every 5 minutes when considering the estimated train frequency of 12 trains per hour in both directions. In addition to signal stoppage delays, the intersection would most likely result in all automobile operations being stopped during the LRT crossing every 5 minutes. This delay or closure would significantly impact traffic operations and adversely impact traffic in the heart of downtown San Dimas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2011</td>
<td>County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Stephen R. Maguin</td>
<td>Proposed project may impact existing and/or proposed District's trunk sewers over which it will constructed. Existing and proposed sewers are located directly on and/or cross directly beneath the proposed project alignment. The Districts cannot issue a detailed response to or permit construction of the proposed project until project plans specifications that incorporate Districts' sewer lines are submitted. In order to prepare plans, submit a map of the proposed project alignment, then the Districts will provide the plans for all Districts' facilities that will be impacted by the proposed project. Then, when revised plans incorporate the sewers have been prepared, please submit copies of the same for review and comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2011</td>
<td>Southern California Edison, Ben Wong</td>
<td>The project as described has the potential to impact SCE's existing transmission, distribution and communication facilities as well as SCE's easements and land rights. In order to provide a more thorough review of the project's potential impact to SCE facilities and land rights, SCE will require more detailed project information for the proposed LRT alignment and all supporting infrastructure, appurtenant facilities, and for the six proposed transit transitions, including location maps and surveyed drawings illustrating all LRT structure elevations and profiles. Where LRT elements cross existing SCE transmission, distribution, or telecommunication facilities, surveyed drawings must include SCE structure locations and profiles. In addition, the location and highest elevation of the LRT's electric power system crossing under each of SCE's lines would need to be indicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT "15"

### Weekday Service

#### Northbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stillwell Av</th>
<th>Kings Hwy</th>
<th>Ave</th>
<th>Jay St-Metrotech</th>
<th>Broadway-Lafayette</th>
<th>W 4 St</th>
<th>4 St</th>
<th>47-50 St</th>
<th>Rock Car</th>
<th>Lex Ave</th>
<th>Roosevelt Av</th>
<th>21 St</th>
<th>Grand Blvd</th>
<th>Roosevelt Av</th>
<th>Fraw Hills Av</th>
<th>Union Tpke</th>
<th>Jamaica 179 St</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Then every 9 minutes.*

| 7:05 | 7:26 |
| 7:15 | 7:36 |
| 7:30 | 7:51 |
| 8:15 | 8:36 |
| 8:30 | 8:51 |
| 9:15 | 9:36 |
| 9:30 | 9:51 |
| 10:15 | 10:36 |
| 10:30 | 10:51 |
| 11:05 | 11:26 |
| 11:30 | 11:51 |
| 12:05 | 12:26 |
| 12:30 | 12:51 |

*Then every 9 minutes.*

| 12:35 | 12:56 |
| 13:05 | 13:26 |
| 13:30 | 13:51 |
| 14:05 | 14:26 |
| 14:30 | 14:51 |
| 15:05 | 15:26 |
| 15:30 | 15:51 |
| 16:05 | 16:26 |
| 16:30 | 16:51 |
| 17:05 | 17:26 |
| 17:30 | 17:51 |

*Then every 9 minutes.*

| 17:35 | 17:56 |
| 18:05 | 18:26 |
| 18:30 | 18:51 |
| 19:05 | 19:26 |
| 19:30 | 19:51 |
| 20:05 | 20:26 |
| 20:30 | 20:51 |
| 21:05 | 21:26 |
| 21:30 | 21:51 |

*Then every 9 minutes.*

### Service to Stillwell Av, Brooklyn, via 63 Street Connector:

- **7:03**
- **7:15**
- **7:25**
- **7:35**
- **8:03**
- **8:15**
- **8:25**
- **8:35**
- **9:03**
- **9:15**
- **9:25**
- **9:35**
- **10:03**
- **10:15**
- **10:25**
- **10:35**
- **11:03**
- **11:15**
- **11:25**
- **11:35**
- **12:03**
- **12:15**
- **12:25**
- **12:35**

*Train departs from Avenue X*
EXHIBIT "16"
Making Great Cities

There is no ideal city, but many have proposed ideals from the Renaissance City in the past – the Garden City, the Radiant City and more recently the Green City or New Urbanism. Yet every city can be better than it is and strong principles can help it along the way. People’s expectations depend on their stage in life, their personal preferences, the opportunities they have, need or desire, their lifestyle and their ambitions. This is why some love and take pride in very large cities and others in smaller, more intimate ones. Every city can be great in its own way.

Great places embody seven elements. They are places of anchorage, they feel like home, there is with a sense of stability, tradition and distinctiveness. They are places of possibility, 'can do', stimulation and buzz. They are places of communication and networking, where it is easy connect, interact and move around, the outside world is accessible, and you feel you are part of a bigger, extensive web. They are places to self-improve, learn and reflect. They are places of inspiration. Culture is alive and, finally, a great city is well put together through design.

The best places are diverse and provide a rich register of experiences some of which can be profound. They have choices: many numerous work opportunities, housing at different price points, varied amenities, wide ranging facilities. The physical fabric and public realm is well designed. The conditions for life for all kinds of moods and interests are well catered for. They are emotionally pleasing.

Great places have a good balance. They are alive and vibrant, yet provide spaces for calm and tranquillity. They are dense and encourage mixing, yet also create room for separateness and privacy. Much in them is ordinary, yet interspersed with some extraordinary features.

Some vast cities are wonderful and liveable, others are depressing. Some smaller cities are a delight and convenient. Others are small minded and claustrophobic.

The great city has a clarity of purpose and it knows where it is going. It is a blend of hardware (its physical fabric like streets buildings and parks), software (its activity base like its enterprise, its cultural life or its shopping experiences), and ‘orgware’ (how it is organized, managed and governed).