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6:00 p.m.

MR. BALIAN: Good evening, everyone. My name is Habib Balian and I'm the CEO of the Construction Authority.

I would like to welcome you all to this very important meeting, our scoping meeting. It's good to see a good crowd. We've been very happy with crowd that we've had at all four, this is the fourth of the series of scoping meetings.

There are many staff here from the Construction Authority. If you would raise your hand, so you can be identified. They're all around. They'll be available to you throughout the evening to answer questions.

I want to first start by introducing some of the folks who have been supportive of the project. It's very important for us to have these. We are working jointly with the FTA. The FTA is a partner, the Federal Transit Administration, along with the Construction Authority as we clear this project, environmentally clear the project. We
will be clearing it both under the federal standard and the state standard.

And it is important to have all of your input, all of your comments as we move forward with the project.
want to introduce -- Charlene Lee is here from the FTA.

Charlene is supporting the project with the regional office, and we appreciate all of their help and support. We also have some staff of elected officials. Gary Neely was here from Senator Huff. I think he had to go to another engagement, but he was here. We appreciate that.

Phil Hawkey is here from the University of La Verne. Phil is an old friend from Pasadena, who was instrumental in making sure that the first phase of the project got built. And he moved out here to make sure the next phase of the project got built. So thank you very much, Phil.

Elected officials, we have John Ebiner here from city council. John, thank you for being here, and for supporting it and making the facility available. As well as Denis Bertone, thank you Denis for being here. And Denis is a member of our JPA and he's, you know, always there when he need him. We really appreciate your help, Denis.

And, of course, the city council is only as good as the city manager, and Blaine Michaelis is here. Blaine, thank you very much. And Krishna Patel. Where is Krishna?
22 I know he's here. There he is. Thank you, Krishna.

23 Larry Stevens is here as well. And that's all the people

24 that I have. Is anybody else important here that I haven't

25 mentioned?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Marco, stand up.

MR. Balian: Marco, please stand up.

Who is Marco?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's in our planning department.

MR. Balian: Oh, he is important then. Thank you for coming, Marco. Just going to quickly go through what we would like to get you in touch with this evening. There will be a technical presentation in a few minutes. Eugene Kim is here and he'll be making that presentation.

But I want to walk you through the project overview, talk about the process that we're going to go through to clear this project and make sure we understand the ramifications of the project, understand what the scoping process is all about. And then make sure that we get your comments on record. This project is only going to be as good as the comments we take in to make sure we're building what the community wants. We go through all of these cities along the alignment, and we only can build what the cities want to be built. And that's what tonight is about.

So we'll have many opportunities for you to give us
your comments, and I'll talk about that in a second. We
started at promptly at 6:15 as promised. We would like to
go to about 7:00 through this presentation, and then we'll
go from 7:00 to about 8:00 where we'll have available
project staff, we'll walk around the room, you'll have
specific questions answered. If we don't know the answer to
a specific question, it's important for us to hear what the
question is. And it's important for us to log the comment
in.

As far as getting your comments on the record,
following the technical presentation, Lisa Levy Buch, who is
in the back of the room, will take the microphone and she
will officiate over taking comments. You can take comments,
the court reporter is here. And the court reporter will
take your comments as you step up to the mic. If you would
like to present your comments and not come to the
microphone, but you would like to present your comments, you
can do so in a couple different ways.

You can fill out a comment card, which is in the
back, and that will be part of the official record. Or at
7:00, you can come to the court reporter and speak privately
with the court reporter and make your comments, and she will
take them into the official record.

As far as speaking tonight after the technical
presentation, on your seats there is a speaker card. Please
fill it out and hold it up and someone will pick it up from

you while the technical presentation is going on. So if you

have a comment card already filled out, please raise your

hand, and we'll give you an opportunity to speak as part of
As far as the project overview goes, it's about a 12.5-mile project. It goes through six stations, six cities and six stations along the alignment. It's the historic railroad alignment, we're mostly at-grade system, but for two grade separations. One in Pomona, one in Glendora, and we'll talk about why there's grade separations at those two locations in a bit.

We have a shared corridor. We have a 100-foot railroad right-of-way in most parts. We will not share track. We will have dedicated track for the light rail. It will be east-and-westbound tracks dedicated to passenger light rail service. Then there will also be another set of tracks that will be used for freight or for Metrolink.

This project is not fully funded. I tell people that before you get in line for funding, before you get a hunting license, you have to go through this very important process that identifies what the impacts are, talks about the project itself and make sure that we're building what the community wants.

We are consisting this project with Metro's
long-range transportation plan. In 2009, they adopted a plan.

It incorporates a lot of different elements of the overall county system, and our project is within the county system.

It's funded mostly through Measure R., at least the phase
from Pasadena to Azusa, which is under construction. And we'll have some residual funding available for the next stage of the project.

Our project history really begins in 1999, when the state legislature took the project from Metro and created a separate, sole purpose entity, which we are, the Construction Authority. This used to be a Metro project. We have now the rights and responsibilities to build a project independent of Metro. Once a project is built, we turn it over to Metro to operate it. So as we go through this planning phase and construction phase, we have Metro looking over our shoulder to make sure that they, as the ultimate owner, are able to operate the system most efficiently.

With regard to the work that we've done, we began the Alternative Analysis, understanding what the project is going to be in 2003. And then we went through the steps through 2003, 2004, 2005. And then, finally, in 2007, identifying the project and having it environmentally cleared to a point where we understood what the project was going to be.
And then in 2008, the county sales tax measure, Measure R., was passed. And it set aside about 735 million dollars for the project from Pasadena to Claremont. That's the good news.
The bad news is the project from Pasadena to Claremont, is about 1.2 billion dollars. So we have a funding shortfall. But the Board took the 735 million dollars and set aside enough funding to build from Pasadena to Azusa. And that's under construction now.

So as we go through this process and we identify the project, and understand the impacts of the project and the mitigations of the project, we'll then be able to estimate the project and then we will have that hunting license, after we go through this process, and be able to go to Washington and lobby our congressional representatives to make sure that we get the funding that's necessary to build the project.

As I mentioned, we were freshening up this -- the project at the environmental stage, both at the federal, the NEPA standard and the CEQA state standard. That process started in 2010 and will continue through this year and the early part of next year. Ultimately having this cleared at both levels so we can go after funding both at the state and the federal, as if the state has any money.

I'm now going to introduce you Eugene Kim, and Gene
will be walked you through the environmental stage of the project. And after he's done, Lisa will take over; we'll take questions and comments. I also wanted to mention that Diane Williams is here. There she is -- from
Rancho Cucamonga -- Diane, thank you -- from city council.

Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: And representing Sandbag.

MR. BALIAN: And representing Sandbag. Great. We need some money from Sandbag.

MR. KIM: Thank you, Mr. Balian. I like to talk a little bit about what it takes to actually to build a project. It involves five steps. The first is called the Alternative Analysis process. And that is the process for trying to figure out what alternatives make the most sense, and why do we want to build it. After you get to a project that really you want to commit to, the next step is called the environmental process.

And the environmental process is important, because it is required to state and federal law. This scoping meeting is the beginning that environmental process for this project the Azusa to Montclair extension of the Gold Line. After that process is completed and that project is environmentally cleared, the next phase is going into more detailed engineering, so that we know what exactly we're going to build.
The fourth stage is actually construction building a project. That takes about three, sometimes four years to build, depending on the length and the scope of the project. And then the final is opening the system for services. So
we're in step 2 right now. We have got quite a bit of work ahead of us. But as Habib said, there's been quite a bit of thinking that's gone into these alternatives. A lot of you have seen some concepts before, and we'll welcome opportunity to kind of talk to you about the stations and the alignments and particulars of the project.

So that's second step is called the environmental process. You see word up there. It says, "EIS/EIR." That stands for Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. The Environmental Impact Statement is the Federal Environmental Impact Report. It's Environmental Impact Statement that's prepared to meet the federal environmental law. It's called NEPA, National Environmental Policy Act. The EIR, the Environmental Impact Report, is what has to prepared in accordance with California law. And the California environmental law is called the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA.

In our case, we're preparing both as a combined document, although, they will be reviewed separately. The thing to point out, is that for the Federal Environmental Document, the EIS, the certifying agency of that document is
the Federal Transit Administration, representing here today,

and the certifying agency for the state document, the EIR,

is Foothill Construction Authority.

So there are really two steps in the environmental
process. We kind of break them out as the draft environmental and the final environmental. And, really, with the draft environmental process, what we're doing is, we're talking a look at our alternatives and we're refining them and defining them in more detail. And we need to do that because what we have to measure the impacts of the project. And we can't really do that until we know exactly what we're looking at.

We also want to be able to clearly identify what the project benefits are and what the impacts of the project are. So the scoping meeting tonight is very important, because this is an opportunity for the Authority, for us to hear from you, about what you -- what you believe are the impacts of the project. How should we focus or environmental document on those areas of concern based on what you know about the study area. Okay?

So then the conclusion of that draft environmental process is something called draft environmental document. And that's going to be publicly circulated. It's going to be published and then you're going to have a chance to look at it. And there's a public comments period, where you get
to read it and you get to look at all of the analysis and
you to do everything -- everything you want in terms of
commenting on that document. We're required by law to
incorporate those comments, and then fold that back into a
final environmental document. Now, in between the draft and the final Environmental, there is an important step. The Authority is actually going to select something called a "Locally Preferred Alternative."

And so the Locally Preferred Alternative is actually the project that is going to end up being environmentally cleared. In some cases, it's possible to take some options or a few variations into that draft environmental process, but at point in this process, we have to commit to one project, to clear one project. And that has to happen before be commence into the final environmental document. Okay.

We are looking to conclude the environmental process really by early 2012. And we're looking forward to our next meeting with you guys, when we have more information to share about the progress of our environmental study.

Tonight is the initiation of the environmental process I just talked about. It's called "public scoping."

And, really, the point of the public scoping is for us to sort of present to you guys what the proposed action is. What is
the proposed project. We want to talk about the project

Purpose and Need. The Purpose and Need is a very important
document. It's kind of like a framing document for the
alternatives -- I mean for the Environmental report. It
sort of says, Why do we need the project? What purpose is
it the project going to serve? Do those match up really up
well?

We're going to talk about the alternatives under
consideration momentarily. And as I said, what's really
important for us to know is how we should focus our
environmental study. We are going to show you a little bit
later on all the environmental topics that we're required by
law to take look at, but which of those are the ones of most
concern to you. We want to hear from you. So fill out a
comment card, fill out a speaker card. Let us know.

So let's talk about the alternatives that we're
studying in this environmental process. There are three.
The first is called "No Build." It's pretty
self-explanatory. The No Build is what if we didn't do
anything? What would things be like in 2035, if no action
were taken? Would this alternative fulfill the Purpose and
Need? That's what I want you guys to think about.

The next alternative is called the "Transportation
System Management" or TSM alternative. And you can think of
the TSM alternative as what is the best that we can do
without actually building something new. Okay? What is the best we can do without building something new? To meet that
Purpose and Need for the project.
In our cases, the TSM that we're looking as part of
the environmental document, we call a "best bus alternative."

And the best bus alternative is a high frequency bus service that has stations -- stop locations that are similar to the ones that are shown, but it operates on existing streets. We're not building any new roads, we're not taking any traffic lanes away for a dedicated bus line. But it will be enhanced by some operational strategies, like traffic signal priority, queue jumping, ways to get buses through the network as fast as possible.

The final alternative is called the Build Alternative. And for this environmental document, we're looking really only at one Build Alternative. And it's the one that we've mentioned. It's the extension of Gold Line from Azusa to Montclair. There are six proposed stations as part of this extension from west to east from Glendora, San Dimas; where we were today, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont and Montclair.

This is a map of the first two alternatives I talked about. I'm not going to really explain the No Build. I think that's pretty self-explanatory. I kind of want to focus on the TSM alternative. The TSM alternative, as I
said, it's a bus. It's a high-frequency bus service that operates along existing streets. The configuration that you see there basically runs along Foothill Boulevard, down Lone Hill, across Bonita and then on the eastern end, it
just goes along Arrow Highway.

You can see that it does resemble the corridor.

The stop locations are pretty close to ones that are proposed for the Build Alternative. There are six locations that are proposed. And as I said before, there's nothing being built with this alternative, but we would be looking at ways to enhance the service.

The thing about this alternative is that it is a bus that goes from end to end, Montclair all the way to Azusa. A passenger who boarded at Montclair, took it once, would get off at the end of the line and have to transfer on a Gold Line train in order to continue west, if they wanted to go to Pasadena, for example.

Now, we want to talk about the Build Alternative.

As we mentioned, the Build Alternative is an extension of the existing Gold Line. It would operate on its own tracks, not shared with freight service or with Metrolink. Okay? A couple things about it. It, basically, will run within the existing freight corridor for the whole 12.5 miles from Azusa to Montclair. It is, generally speaking, an at-grade running system.
However, there are two locations where the Gold Line tracks actually have to switch sides with the sub-tracks. Those two locations are at Lone Hill in Glendora and at Towne Avenue in Pomona. The only way to do
that is really take the tracks and fly them up and over the freight track and land on the other side. So at those two locations, there are what we call "grade separations," where the tracks will actually kind of go up and over the freight track and the tracks won't go through the existing streets, Lone Hill or Towne. Okay?

I mentioned that there are six stations. I'll mention them again, the locations: Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont and Montclair. The other thing I wanted to mention is that basically right around La Verne, east of La Verne, comes four track, four tracks that generally fit within the right-of-way. Two tracks for Gold Line and then two tracks that are actually shared by freight trains and Metrolink. Okay?

There's a picture of the Build Alternative, the one Build Alternative we're talking about. This is a picture of a Gold Line train currently in operation between Union Station, Eastside in Pasadena. The characteristics of the trains, I want to talk about. These trains are light rail trains that are powered by electrical overhead wires. This is the light rail technology. There would be a set of wires
and poles that support the wires through the length of the actual track, above the track. The vehicles can be linked together into three-car sets. And they can accommodate up to 500 passengers per three-car set per hour. That's a lot
of capacity.

It will require traction power substations that
sited about a mile, mile and a half apart. For the most
part, these substations can fit within the right-of-way.

Typically, when agencies build light rail systems, that's
their strategy. Put them in the right-of-way, put them in
part of the station envelope. And this is the train that's
currently in operation in Southern California. Metro
operates three lines: The Gold Line, the Green Line and the
Blue Line using this technology.

From Montclair to Azusa, the travel time based on
our Operations Analysis is about 18 minutes. Okay? The
trip from Montclair to Pasadena is a little over 40 minutes.

In terms of standard service, we're talking a traditional
schedule, a little before 6:00 a.m., 5:45 a.m., to a little
bit after midnight. The service is not like Metrolink.

There is frequent peak and off-peak service. During the
peak period, we're talking six trains per hour. So every
ten minutes, if you're arriving at the station, a train will
come and pick you up and take you where you want go. At the
off-peak, we're talking about four or five trains an hour.
This is a long list of the environmental topics that we are required to study by federal and state law. I'm not going to go through the entire list. I think the point here is, we want to receive comments from you about which of
these environmental topics you think are most relevant for this study based on the alternatives that I've talked about. And did we miss anything? Let's us know.

There are several ways that you can provide comments to the Authority. You can comment tonight by filling out a comment card. We'll be happy to give you one, if you don't have one already. Fill one out, at your leisure, and stuff it the comment box, which is located over there, right over there. You can also make a comment. If you would like, there are speaker cards on your chairs.

What you say goes on the record. We have a court reporter that's typing it in. And what you say becomes part of the administrative record of the environmental document. Your words get into the environmental document. Okay?

You can also send a comment by mail. So if you don't quite know what you want to say, you have some concerns, take a comment card, think about it, and mail that comment card to this address. You can also this E-mail your comment to this E-mail right here, llevybuch@foothillextension.org.

This is the last of four scoping meetings.
However, the scoping-comment period continues until February 7th. So if you do decide to mail a comment, make sure it’s postmarked on or before February 2nd, the end of the comment period. Your feedback is very important to us.
So with that, I would like to hand it over to Lisa.

MS. LEVY BUCH: You skipped over the Purpose and Need.

MR. KIM: Oh, did I? I thought there was something that was missing. There it is. I'm so sorry. Purpose and Need. I told you I was going to talk about it and I forgot all about it. The need for the project, let's talk about the 210; it's congested right now. It's not going to be able to accommodate the peak future traffic. It's a big problem.

We have some limited bus and commuter rail service, so there's an opportunity here, perhaps, to expand transportation capacity. The arterial network, it's very congested. And then, finally, we've looked at projections of population and employment. It's going to grow in our study area, which means more trips and more congestion.

So the purpose of the project, and I talked about the alternatives -- this is how I want you to think about the alternatives. How well do meet the purpose and ability to service the need we've identified here?

Improved transit access. That's actually being able to get to places within the study area, activities
centers, better, faster than you can today. Reliability of transit service. We're talking shorter travel times, more reliable travel times, a better schedule that you can count on. An alternative to the 210 -- there's a lot of folks who
just don't have a lot of choices for the types of trips they have to make out there.

So they get in the car, they get on the congested 210. There's not an alternative. Is there a way that we can make a convenient alternative available?

Enhancing connections to Metrolink, regional and local buses. Metrolink takes a lot people from the San Gabriel Valley in to Downtown, but what if a lot of those folks wanted to go to Pasadena?

Now, we have the ability with the alternative that we've been talking about to transfer at Montclair and be able to take a Gold Line train in to the west part of the San Gabriel Valley or to Pasadena. And then, finally, to encourage load shift. Most of the trips in the study area in the region are by car. And we have the heavily burdened highway and road network. What can we do to encourage a more balanced system, and to put some service out there that gives people more choice? What that results in is reduced air emissions and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

So the Purpose and Need is important. We want to hear your thoughts about that. We want to hear what you
think are the alternatives that best meet the Purpose and Need Statement that you just heard.

With that, I'm going to hand it over to Lisa.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Do we have any speaker cards handed in
yet? If you have a speaker card that you would like to speak, raise your hand and I'll pick them up.

We'll do our best to answer questions either at this point or afterwards. Some of the information we'll know after we do more of the environmental review.

Raise your voice, so the court reporter can hear you.

MS. GRAVES: My name is Carol Graves. We all have our own personal agenda concerns with this. I'm general partner of the Storage Center over on 195 East Arrow Highway. And this beautiful fuchsia color that includes our proposed area of the station and our business is in there.

Well, it's an aging business and we were looking forward to making some repairs and some upgrades. And, of course, we don't want to spend money if it's going to be -- have the eminent domain taken. So that is my concern, that we would like to see ahead of time. And there are a lot of people who have, I'm sure, homes in the area that have the same concern.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Do you want to talk about the right-of-way and what, when they're looking at the maps, the
of concepts where the parking and this process we're going to go through to really select where the sites are going to be?

MR. KIM: The fuchsia that you're referring to, you use
the language "proposed." I'd say, maybe, a better word would be "potential sites."

MS. GRAVES: What's the difference?

MR. KIM: I'll explain the difference.

MS. GRAVES: Okay.

MR. KIM: There is a desire to have parking for every station. There are locations, for example, like the Claremont station, where there are -- there's an activity center in the downtown that close by. But, really, the market for the Green Line is going to be folks who are going to be able to use it and their mode of access is going to be automobile.

So for every station, we would like to identify potential sites for some type of parking. But we have some work ahead of us. And identifying a site will involve a lot of factors and variables at this point. So as part of the project, we will be clearing parking. But it's going be a very deliberate process at this point. We build a determination about specific sites at this location. At any other station locations, we have identified sites that we think will work in order to provide the type of access for
parking and the platform that's going to be necessary, but

that's ahead of us over the next several months.

MS. GRAVES: So it will be something that possibly we

will be notified the type --
MS. LEVY BUCH: I just need the court reporter to be able to hear.

MS. GRAVES: So the question is: Will we have plenty of time to know before property is going to be purchased for the exact -- we're probably years away from project actually being fully funded and completed?

MS. LEVY BUCH: With regard to -- I'm not sure we said that, but for all of the 12.6 miles of corridor, the vast -- the 100-foot width of right-of-way is actually owned by Metro. And so there won't be a need to purchase a lot of properties, but the parking areas are probably some of the locations where we would have to do that.

Philip Hawkey from the University of La Verne?

MR. HAWKEY: Thank you. I took a moment to write comments, but this question came up earlier than I thought.

I'm from the University of La Verne. My name is Phil Hawkey. And I've worked closely with City of La Verne as well as with Fairplex in anticipation of the light rail station, the extension of Gold Line, and it's supported by the community and by the University and by the Fairplex.

And there's a great opportunity for many
substantial developments to happen in that area generated and supported by the Gold Line. The Fairplex has 500 acres, the University of La Verne has a 50-acre vacant parcel about a mile and a half from the site. And the University of
La Verne where our main campus has about 38 acres. And the city is already talking about redeveloping the neighborhood immediately adjacent.

I wanted to ask about -- one possibility is incorporating a Metrolink site in the same area adjacent to the Gold Line station, and, maybe, even adding to that a bus transit center, a transfer station. So it would be a multi-mode kind of transit center that would substantially encourage private investment development, dense development, commercial retail development. They asked something -- the Metrolink, I know, is not in your jurisdiction, but the Gold Line certainly would be affected and it would increase the benefits that come from the Gold Line.

MR. KIM: There are some great opportunities in the City of La Verne for a transit station like the one you proposed. Metrolink is an agency that the Authority is coordinating with very closely for a number of reasons. One being the consolidation of sort of needs, station needs for both Metrolink and in the Gold Line, and particularly in the area of parking.

So going forward, they will be a partner of ours,
particularly as we get to the stage of more detailed engineering and design review. So those things, we hope to have happen.

MS. LEVY BUCH: The Authority is also looking at buses
and how they interact with our future stations, so we're doing a study on that right now.

MR. EBINER: I'm John Ebiner. I'm on the city council in San Dimas. And I certainly support the Gold Line. I just want to suggest, one, aspect to make sure is included in the EIS/EIR and that's a realistic estimate of how many cars are going to be coming and going in San Dimas. And also, maybe, a percentage of the mode of arrival, you know, like, bicycle, bus transfers, that kind of thing. That's just something to make sure is covered.

And then can you elaborate any on how a decision is made about where parking might be, where land might be used for that? We, obviously, have a city yard in that area. We have public storage and some other spots.

MR. KIM: As Lisa mentioned, the Authority is investing time in, I guess, what I would call a multi-mode circulation plan for each station. So mode of access to the station is a very important consideration in how it functions, how it worked, and, particularly, related to parking, scale in parking. How much parking you actually need, based on characteristics of travel, mode of travel for that
particular station location. And every station location is
different.
So we have a ridership model. It does provide
output that is helping us understand that. And that's kind
of one of our starting points really is, how much parking is
actually going to be needed at that station. After we know
how much parking is going to be needed, then we go into the
process of actually looking at potential locations where
that does make sense. It doesn't happen in a vacuum.
I can assure you that the Authority is working very
closely with each city. For this particular scoping meeting,
we're in the City of San Dimas. I can tell you firsthand
that we've been in close coordination with Krishna and
Blaine sharing some concepts with them. And the City of
San Dimas, representatives of the city, have done a great
job letting us know the issues that important to the city.
We have talked about maintenance year quite a bit.
And in my opinion, there is plan out there that can
kind of integrate the needs of the city and requirements,
parking requirements for the Gold Line, but it's going to
take being creative. It is a partnership with the city, and
the city helps us understand what really can work and what
can't work at all. So those conversations will intensify
over the next couple of months, because we are under
pressure on the schedule to be able to put a zero in on the
footprint around each station location. And it does include parking.

MS. LEVY BUCH: I'm out of cards. Does anybody want to say anything in front of everyone? We have after this
portion, we would invite you to stay and ask questions of
the staff. We'll be here until 8:00 or as long as you would
like us to be here. The court reporter will be here, so if
you're more comfortable speaking directly to her without a
public watching and listening, you can do that, and the
comment sheets are also available.

Please state your name.

MS. SLOAN: Shelley Sloan. Do I understand correctly
that you don't have the financing for this yet?

MS. LEVY BUCH: If you can finish your comments, then
we'll answer them.

MS. SLOAN: If you don't have the money for it, what
good is it at this point? And where are you getting your
money from for what we're doing?

MS. LEVY BUCH: Do you want to talk about the process of
how the project is funded and where this phase is within
that process?

MR. BALIAN: We're at the very early stages. We have
funding that provides for this phase of the study through
federal grant. Once we get through this phase of study, we
then can get in line for construction dollars, and that's
22 down the road several years.

23 MS. SLOAN: Uh-huh.

24 MR. BALIAN: You can't get a hunting license until you

25 do the homework.
MS. LEVY BUCH: Would anybody else would like to make a comment?

State your name for the court reporter.

MR. KETCHUM: My name is Ron Ketchum. Based on three years of operation all the way up to Pasadena, what kind of feedback have you gotten from communities within the 500-mile -- 500-foot radius regarding noise?

MS. LEVY BUCH: Can you start -- I'm sorry.

MR. KETCHUM: What kind of feedback have you received from your existing neighborhoods that are being served by the Gold Line regarding noise?

MR. BALIAN: Usually one -- you know, I encourage everyone and we will be doing some of this in the months ahead to come to Pasadena, come to South Pasadena, come to Highland Park and experience the system for yourself. In the old days, we used to ask people to go to Portland or go to San Diego.

We've have had very positive feedback in Pasadena and those cities that I just mentioned. This system is very quiet. It's surprising how well it's been received, so I don't -- you have to see for yourself to understand it,
and we will encourage you to do that.

MR. KIM: Compared to a Metrolink train, which is a
diesel locomotive engine, it's kind of loud. You know what
the noise signature is for that. The electric train is
considerably quieter than that. It's powered by overhead wires, as I said, so there's no engine, there's no rumbling that there would be with an engine, that contributes to the noise. It's really -- as it comes through a fixed location, it's really kind of the whiz of the vehicle as it goes by.

It's just a lot quieter than a Metrolink vehicle.

MS. LEVY BUCH: We have one more comment.

MR. DUVALL: Randy Duvall. I've lived here in San Dimas now for 27 years. My family goes back over a hundred years in this town. I mean, when they moved here, lemon groves were everywhere and avocados. We're obviously growing; we need the Gold Line. I've used it before where it goes into Pasadena; it doesn't stretch far enough.

You know, I get on the 210, I'm a commuter, on even a Saturday or Sunday and it's bumper to bumper. All the other major cities in the United States have wonderful infrastructures, except for California. We need the Gold Line. And I don't know -- I don't understand why it takes so long.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. Anyone else?

MR. DIAZ: Tony Diaz. I live in San Dimas. Basically,
everything that he said, I totally agree with him. I fully
support the project. And I just urge you to, please, you
know, work as fast as you possibly can to get this built.
Again, I don't understand why it takes such a long time.
But now I have a better understanding. So, again,
I fully support your project. And it will fulfill a need,
as you mentioned. And go for it, please.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Anyone -- anyone else? One more.

MR. AWAD: My name is John Awad. I had a question about
the F-grade crossings. Do they -- are they have safety
gates that come down automatically or are they just light
controlled like an intersection, because we've got a number
of F-grade crossings?

MS. LEVY BUCH: They are. There's two arms that come
down. It's secure --

MR. AWAD: Like a regular train?

MS. LEVY BUCH: -- the intersection. I don't know if
you want to give a more detailed answer?

MR. KIM: I don't know if it's more detail, but, yes,
there are gates that come down, physically block vehicles
from entering the intersection. In some locations on the
Gold Line, there are pedestrian gates also, if there are
a lot of pedestrian crossing as well, in order to enhance
pedestrian safety at that location.

We're going to go case by case with the grade
process of the project and take a good, hard look at the
amount of traffic and amount of movement at that location
and come up with a design that makes sense.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you.
MR. RHINEHART: Hi. Ken Rhinehart from San Dimas.

Will this project be self-supporting financially through generation of peers or will it be like Amtrak, where it's always running in the red and heavily dependent on taxpayer subsidy?

MS. LEVY BUCH: I don't think there's any train system in the country or the world that actually pays for itself. It's public funding.

Gene, do you want to say something?

GENE KIM: Yes. The short answer is that this is public transport. Every passenger transportation system in the United States is subsidized, because the fare just does not cover the operating cost. That's the reality today. But there are sources of revenue to help pay for the cost to operate and maintain the service. And that's part of the operating plan that the Authority is required to put together, part of the financial plan for this project.

The FTA takes a good hard look at that as well.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Anyone else? Well, again, we have a little under an hour. Again, we'll stay as long as we need to answer your questions. You have until February 2nd to
get your comments in writing. On your handout, it has my
address and my E-mail address, so I'll be the one receiving
them.

If you have questions after tonight, we'll do our
best to respond to those as well. So please take the time to make sure you get a comment, if you do have one on the project or the Environmental Analysis. Thank you very, very much.

(Proceedings concluded at 8:00 p.m.)
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Scoping Meeting Photos
January 12 – Pomona
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Process

**EIS/EIR Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft EIS/EIR</th>
<th>Final EIS/EIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoping Meetings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prepare Final EIS/EIR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepare Draft EIS/EIR</strong></td>
<td><strong>Draft EIS/EIR &amp; Public Hearing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chosen Final EIS/EIR &amp; Public Hearing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Generate Preferred Alternative (APA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APA &amp; Authority Final Report &amp; Final EIS/EIR</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prepare Final EIS/EIR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final EIS/EIR &amp; Record of Decision (ROD)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Record of Decision (ROD)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**January 2011** | **Mid-2011** | **Fall 2011** | **Early 2012**

**EIS/EIR Purpose**

- Establish the Purpose and Need of the project
- Describe alternatives
- Study potential environmental benefits/impacts of alternatives
- Evaluate measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts
January 13 – Glendora
January 20 – San Dimas
Appendix M

Scoping Meeting Display Boards
Project Development Process

5 Main Stages of Project Development

- Alternatives Analysis
  - Completed 2003

- Environmental (EIS/EIR)
  - Where We Are Now

- Engineering

- Construction
  - Anticipated 2014-2017

- Transit Service

Future Phases
1999: Creation of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
2003: Initiation of Foothill Extension from Pasadena to Montclair Alternatives Analysis (AA) and Board Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
2005: Board selection of revised LPA
2007: Board decision not to pursue federal funds for Pasadena to Azusa Extension; completion of Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)
2008: Measure R approved, partial funding for Azusa to Montclair Extension
2009: Reactivation of Azusa to Montclair Extension Environmental Clearance
**Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Process**

**EIS/EIR Process**

**Draft EIS/EIR**
- Scoping Meetings
- Prepare Draft EIS/EIR
- Circulate Draft EIS/EIR & Public Hearings

**Public Input**

**Final EIS/EIR**
- Select Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
- FTA & Authority Board Approve Start of Final EIS/EIR
- Prepare Final EIS/EIR
- Record of Decision / Notice of Determination

January 2011  
Mid-2011  
Fall 2011  
Early 2012

**EIS/EIR Purpose**

- Establish the Purpose and Need of the project
- Describe alternatives
- Study potential environmental benefits/impacts of alternatives
- Evaluate measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts
# Environmental Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Topics to be Reviewed in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic &amp; Circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land Use &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Real Estate &amp; Acquisitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communities &amp; Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual &amp; Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Noise &amp; Vibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ecosystems &amp; Biological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Geotechnical / Subsurface / Seismic / Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical, Archaeological &amp; Paleontological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parklands &amp; Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic Development &amp; Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safety &amp; Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growth Inducing Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cumulative Impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Purpose and Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve transit accessibility to major activity centers along the Gold Line</td>
<td>• I-210 cannot accommodate current and forecasted peak-hour travel demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduce more reliable transit service that shortens travel times</td>
<td>• Bus and commuter rail service is limited in the corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide an alternative mode for commuters currently using I-210</td>
<td>• The corridor’s arterial network is congested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance connections to Metrolink, and regional and local buses</td>
<td>• Area population and employment are forecasted to increase, worsening traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage mode shifts to transit, reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 26 total at-grade crossings between Azusa and Montclair (18 exist currently)
• 3 grade separations at Lone Hill Boulevard (Glendora), Towne Avenue (Pomona), and Monte Vista Avenue (Montclair)
• Detailed grade crossing analysis to be performed during the Draft EIS/EIR
“No Build” and “Transportation Systems Management (TSM)” Alternatives

“No Build” Alternative

- Represents the Study Area in 2035, if the Project is not built
- Includes all existing highway and transit route facilities, and the committed highway and transit projects specified in:
  - Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
  - Metro 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)
  - Includes the Pasadena – Azusa Extension, currently under construction (completion anticipated late 2014)

“TSM” Alternative

- Includes:
  - Intersection improvements
  - Signal synchronization
  - Rapid bus line that resembles service of the Build Alternatives
Build Alternative

Proposed Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension — Azusa to Montclair

- Extends Metro Gold Line 12.6 miles from Azusa to Montclair
- Operates on two light rail tracks next to freight track along the existing Metro-owned right-of-way, also currently used by Metrolink
- Serves up to six new stations in Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair
Transportation Systems Management (TSM) & Build Alternative Technologies

**TSM - Rapid Bus**
- Powered by diesel, hybrid/electric, CNG, or fuel cell
- Capacity of 60-65 passengers per vehicle
- Requires minimal infrastructure, and can operate on existing roadways
- Operational strategies include transit signal priority (TSP) and signal synchronization
- Examples: Foothill Transit Silver Streak (bus), Metro Rapid (bus)

**Build - Light Rail Transit (LRT) Vehicle**
- Electrically powered by overhead wires
- Vehicles can be linked together to accommodate up to 500 passengers per 3-car train
- Requires traction power substations every mile along tracks
- Example: Metro Gold Line between East Los Angeles and Pasadena
## Ways to Provide Comments

**Tonight**

- Ask a Question during Q&A
- Complete Comment Card
- Speak to a Court Reporter

**After Tonight**

- **Comment by Mail:**
  Lisa Levy Buch  
  Director of Public Affairs  
  Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority  
  406 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 202  
  Monrovia, CA 91016  
- **Comment by Email:**
  llevybuch@foothillextension.org  

**Comments must be postmarked on or before February 2, 2011**
Appendix N
PowerPoint Presentation
Purpose of Tonight’s Meeting

- Present a Project Overview
- Explain the Environmental Review Process and Purpose of Public Scoping Phase
- Provide an Opportunity for the Public to Ask Questions and Submit Comments
Meeting Schedule

- **6:15 - 7:00 p.m.** – Presentation and Opportunity for Comments/Questions
- **7:00 – 8:00 p.m.** – Open House (talk one-on-one with project staff)

3 Ways to Provide Comments for the Record:
- Fill out a speaker card and speak during Q&A
- Complete a comment sheet
- Provide your comments to the court reporter
Project Overview

Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension - Azusa to Montclair

- 12.6 miles, 6 cities, 6 stations
- Two new grade-separated crossings to align light rail and freight tracks (at Lone Hill Ave - Glendora and Towne Ave - Pomona)
- Shared corridor (freight throughout, Metrolink from La Verne east)
- Partially funded through Measure R/needs additional funding
Project History

- **1999:** Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority created
  - SB1847 provided necessary powers to complete the project from Union Station to the LA County line
- **2003:** Alternatives Analysis initiated for Pasadena to Montclair segments
- **2004:** Circulated Pasadena to Montclair Draft EIS/EIR (selected LPA)
- **2005:** Board selected revised LPA
- **2007:** Pasadena to Montclair Final EIR completed/FEIR certified for Pasadena to Azusa only
- **2008:** Measure R approved, fully funding Pasadena to Azusa
- **2010:** ‘Fresh’ environmental review (EIS/EIR) for Azusa to Montclair initiated
  - NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
  - **Federal Transit Administration (Lead Agency)**
  - CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act
  - **Construction Authority (Lead Agency)**
Project Development Process

Five major phases:

1. Alternatives Analysis
   - Completed 2003
2. Environmental (EIS/EIR)
   - Where We Are Now
3. Engineering
4. Construction
   - Anticipated 2014-2017
5. Transit Service

Future Phases
EIS/EIR Process

**Draft EIS/EIR**
- Define/refine alternatives
- Study potential benefits/impacts of alternatives
- Evaluate measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts
- Select a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)

**Final EIS/EIR**
- Respond to comments received during circulation of Draft EIS/EIR
- Respond to potential engineering issues
Purpose of Public Scoping

- Initiates NEPA and CEQA environmental clearance process
- Helps refine scope of environmental review by including public feedback on:
  - Proposed Project
  - Project Purpose and Need
  - Alternatives Under Consideration
  - Environmental Issues to be Studied in EIS/EIR
## Project Purpose and Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I-210 cannot accommodate current and forecasted peak-hour travel demand</td>
<td>• Improve transit accessibility to major activity centers along the Gold Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bus and commuter rail service is limited in the corridor</td>
<td>• Introduce more reliable transit service that shortens travel times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The corridor’s arterial network is congested</td>
<td>• Provide an alternative mode for commuters currently using I-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area population and employment are forecasted to increase, worsening traffic</td>
<td>• Enhance connections to Metrolink, and regional and local buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage mode shifts to transit, reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternatives to be Studied

- **No Build:**
  - Study Area in 2035 if Project is not built

- **Transportation Systems Management (TSM):**
  - Improvement to the No Build featuring a ‘best bus’ alternative, signal synchronization and other non-capital improvements

- **Build:**
  - Light Rail extension of the planned Gold Line from Azusa (Citrus Ave) to Montclair (Central Ave) and serves six (6) new stations:
    - Glendora
    - San Dimas
    - La Verne
    - Pomona
    - Claremont
    - Montclair