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This chapter includes updates to the subject from that reported in the Draft EIR/EIS in April 2004.
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CHAPTER 8 - PUBLIC OUTREACH

8-1 PUBLIC OUTREACH DURING ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the public outreach efforts during the Alternative Analysis, EIS/EIR Scoping process, and the preparation of the final EIS/EIR. The Alternatives Analysis and its outreach were conducted by the Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority (the Construction Authority) in cooperation with the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) and corridor cities. The EIS/EIR public outreach efforts were conducted by the Construction Authority, the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in cooperation with the SGVCOG and each of the corridor cities.

The Alternatives Analysis (AA) process was initiated in the fall of 2001 and concluded in June 2002. The AA study was conducted and technical documents prepared to support a decision on a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA-AA) to meet transit needs in the San Gabriel Valley.

The focus of the public outreach effort during the AA study process was to work with each of the cities to help them develop and implement a city-specific work plan to reach the community members. Each of the cities developed a strategy for garnering input for consideration into the Alternatives Analysis process. The purpose of the outreach effort in each city was to exchange ideas and share project information. Issues that were brought forward by the public, city staff, and elected officials were helpful in identifying sensitive problems for study consideration.

Some common elements in developing the individual city strategies included:

- council briefings
- station area workshops
- community meetings/open houses
- stakeholder meetings
- collateral materials.

More than 60 public meetings were held throughout the corridor. Concerns raised at these meetings focused on the potential for noise impacts, introduction of a new visual element with the light rail transit overhead wire, and traffic delays at grade crossings.

A Study Steering Committee was formed by the SGVCOG and the Authority to oversee the planning and city participation in the study. Made up of a single delegate and alternate from each of 11 corridor cities in Los Angeles County, plus representatives from the Council of Governments and the Construction Authority, the committee met once a month to monitor the progress of the study, to review technical reports, and achieve consensus on the results of the AA.

The Steering Committee also provided a critical outreach function in conveying updated project information to the individual city councils and constituents. This critical connection will allow for a smooth decision making process to occur in the final selection and adoption of the LPA-AA.
Following adoption of the LPA-AA by the SGVCOC and corridor cities at the end of the AA process, project proponents initiated the federal and state environmental documentation processes, which began with Scoping.

**8-2 SCOPING**

Five Scoping meetings in four different cities along the Phase I and Phase II Foothill Extension study corridor comprised much of the public interaction during the Scoping period. However, the entirety of public outreach efforts and all receipt of comments are part of the Scoping process, which is summarized in this section. The full Scoping report, *Gold Line Phase II Extension Pasadena to Montclair Scoping Report, September 5, 2003*, is available upon request.

The length of the study corridor both provided and required opportunities to conduct extended community outreach. Since there would be stations in each corridor city, coordination between the public, cities, businesses, and agencies has been extensive. The economically and ethnically diverse project area compelled the project team to utilize a multimedia approach to ensure that communities were aware of the project study and were provided opportunities to provide input for the environmental impact analyses. Outreach included extensive mailings, newspaper advertisements, as well as staff participation during neighborhood and business association meetings, briefings for elected officials, and posting project information and meeting dates on the Construction Authority’s website. To distribute information about the environmental process and to invite attendance at upcoming meetings the project website, postal mail announcements, multi-lingual newspaper advertisements, postings at the Los Angeles Clerk, and the San Bernardino County Clerk’s Office, postings on the California State Clearinghouse website, and the Federal Register were utilized.

A stakeholder database was developed by researching the Los Angeles County Assessor records, San Bernardino County Assessor’s office, and the United States post office mail routes for residents, property owners, and business owners along the study corridor. In addition, the database of interested parties from Gold Line Phase I was incorporated, as well as names provided during consultation with elected officials who represented the area. The database was updated after each meeting, presentation, and briefing to include those participants who left their name, mailing, and email address contact information with the project team.

All five Scoping meetings were publicized at the same time, giving the public a choice regarding which meeting to attend. In total, approximately 23,000 postcards, and 414 Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intents were sent to residents and business owners along the study corridor, as well as to interested parties, responsible agencies and elected officials.

Project information has been posted on the authority’s website, www.metrogoldline.org. It includes project information such as completed reports, meeting information, and a way to contact the Construction Authority to comment on the project. The website has been updated as new information is available. All comments submitted have been responded to either directly, fulfilling the request, or has been considered in the environmental process.

The five Scoping meetings (four for the general public and one for agencies) were held in an open house format with information stations and illustrated display boards. The meetings were staffed by members representing the Construction Authority and the project consultant team, all of whom were well versed about the proposed project and potential environmental impacts. In addition to answering questions at the meeting, staff invited attendees to submit their comments in writing. Comment forms were provided at
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each Scoping meeting. Chinese and Spanish interpreters were present at the meeting for non-English speaking members of the public. Project fact sheets were also provided in English and Spanish.

Scoping Meetings were held in the following cities during the weeks of July 14 and 21, 2003. Table 8.1 shows the location, attendance, and number of comments received during each meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>No. of Comment Forms Received</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 2003, 5–8 p.m.</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16, 2003, 5–8 p.m.</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2003, 5–8 p.m.</td>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21, 2003, 5–8 p.m.</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 2003, 2–5 p.m.</td>
<td>Authority Offices, South Pasadena</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meeting for Public Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: An additional 43 comment letters were received by mail or e-mail. Source: Jones & Stokes, 2003.

8-3 CITY COORDINATION MEETINGS

In addition to the public agency Scoping meeting, additional meetings were held with each of the thirteen corridor cities, a total of three times per city. The thirty-six meetings, which occurred between September 2003 and January 2004, were meant to identify specific concerns of each city. The concerns centered around the effects to residents and business, station and parking locations, and other environmental impacts that are discussed in Chapter 3 of this document. For a full discussion of this effort, please see Chapter 6 – Agency Coordination.

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, additional meetings were held with each city staff between September 2004 and July 2005.

The results of the meetings have been incorporated into the environmental impact analysis process.

8-4 COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Outreach to the community included participation during neighborhood and business association meetings, briefing elected officials, and developing a community-friendly website. To distribute information about upcoming meetings, the project website, electronic and postal mail announcements, and multi-lingual newspaper advertisements were utilized. In addition, meetings with key individual parties along the alignment were briefed about the project.
The following meetings were held with the following public and interested parties:

- Scoping Meetings, see Section 8-2 above
- Corridor Cities Technical Meetings, see Chapter 6
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
- San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)
- San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG)
- County of Los Angeles, County Supervisor, Office of Gloria Molina
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink)
- Foothill Transit
- Pomona Valley Transit Authority
- Azusa Pacific University
- Citrus College
- Claremont University Consortium
- Fairplex
- Los Angeles County Arboretum
- Azusa Unified School District
- Duarte Unified School District
- Monrovia Unified School District
- City of South Pasadena
- City of Pasadena
- City of Arcadia
- City of Monrovia
- City of Duarte
- City of Irwindale
- City of Azusa
- City of Glendora
- City of San Dimas
- City of La Verne
- City of Pomona
- City of Claremont
- City of Montclair
- City of Upland
• Meetings with other interested parties:
  • Azusa Downtown Business Association
  • Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Company
  • City of Hope National Medical Center
  • Fiesta Floats/Tournament of Roses
  • Hillcrest
  • Miller Brewing Company
  • Santa Anita Racetrack
  • Wal-mart (Monrovia)
  • University of La Verne
  • Foothill Presbyterian Hospital
  • Xerox
  • Northrup Grumman
  • City Chambers of Commerce
  • Senior Center—City of La Verne
  • A & A Building
  • Fasching Car Wash
  • Bowden Development

8-5 PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

8-5.1. Scoping Notices

The NEPA Scoping period for the proposed project commenced on July 2, 2003, with FTA’s signing of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The NOI was published in the Federal Register on July 9, 2003 (FR 41749, Vol. 67, No. 118.). The NEPA Scoping period closed on August 1, 2003. A copy of the NOI is provided in Figure 8-1.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was sent by the Authority to the State Clearinghouse and to a project-specific mailing list on June 26, 2003. It was posted at the Los Angeles and San Bernardino County Clerks’ Offices on June 27, 2003. The NOP announced the Authority’s intent to prepare an EIR pursuant to CEQA. A copy of the NOP is provided in Figure 8-2.

8-5.2. Scoping Comments

Public comments were gathered and recorded through a variety of means throughout the entire Scoping process. They will continue to be accepted and reviewed through the length of the proposed project. These include: contact information (including phone numbers) provided in ads, handouts, and the website; public comment forms provided at the Scoping meeting; and submission via fax, mail and email.
Comments received during Scoping do not require a response or even specific acknowledgement in an environmental document. A summary of the comments received during Scoping, and location in the Final EIS/EIR with discussion of the issues raised, can be found in Table 8.2. Some comments were outside the scope of the environmental impact analysis and are thus not addressed. Copies of Scoping comments (comment cards, emails, and letters) are found in the Scoping Report, (as mentioned above in section 8-2) which is available upon request.
SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority (referred to hereafter as the Gold Line Construction Authority) intend to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for transit improvements between Pasadena and Montclair in Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties in California. The EIS will be prepared as a joint EIS and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to satisfy the requirements of both NEPA and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The purpose of this notice is to notify interested individuals, organizations, and business entities, affected American Tribes, and Federal, State, and local governmental agencies of the intent to prepare an EIS/EIR and to invite participation in the study. At present, four alternatives are proposed for evaluation in the EIS/EIR. These alternatives were developed during a Planning Alternatives Analysis undertaken by the Gold Line Construction Authority and the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) in 2001-2002. In addition, reasonable alternatives identified through the scoping process will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

Scoping will be accomplished through correspondence and discussions with interested persons, organizations, and Federal, State, and local agencies, and through public and agency meetings. FTA intends to invite the SGVCOG, the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SanBAG), the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), and the Federal Railroad Administration to be cooperating agencies in preparing the NEPA documents.

DATES: Comment Due Date: Written comments on the scope of the EIS/EIR, including the alternatives and impacts to be considered, must be received no later than August 1, 2003. Written comments should be sent to the Gold Line Construction Authority at the address given below in ADDRESSES.

Scoping Meeting Dates: Four public open-house scoping meetings will be held from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. on July 15, 16, 17, and 21, 2003 at locations given below in ADDRESSES. An interagency scoping meeting will also be held on July 22, 2003, from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. at the Gold Line Construction Authority offices, 625 Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 200, South Pasadena, CA 91030.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to Susan Hodor, Gold Line Construction Authority, 625 Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 200, South Pasadena, California 91030; phone: (626) 493-5500; fax: (626) 795-8599; or by email: bhodor@sgvgoldline.org or by visiting the project Web site at http://www.metrogoldline.org.

The public open-house scoping meetings will be held at the following four locations. Identical information about the proposed project will be provided at each of the meetings and interested parties may participate at any of the meetings. There will be no formal presentation at the open-house scoping meetings; members of the public are invited to attend at any time between 5 p.m. and 8 p.m. on these dates:

July 15, 2003: City Hall, City of San Dimas, 245 E. Bonita Ave., San Dimas, CA 91773.

July 16, 2003: City Hall, City of Claremont, 207 Harvard Ave., Claremont, CA 91711.

July 17, 2003: Public Library—Community Room, City of South Pasadena, 1115 El Centro Street, South Pasadena, CA 91030.

July 21, 2003: City Hall, City of Arcadia, 248 W. Huntington Drive, Arcadia, CA 91007.

All meeting locations are accessible to people with disabilities. Any individual with a disability who requires special assistance, such as a sign language interpreter or a translator, should contact Susan Hodor at (626) 493-5500 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting so that arrangements can be made.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ervin Pons, Team Leader, or Mr. Ray Tellis, Program Specialist, FTA/PFWA Metropolitan Office, 889 S. Figueroa St., Suite 1550, Los Angeles, California 90017; phone: (213) 202-3950; fax: (213) 202-3961.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Description of Study Area and Scope

The purpose of the proposed action is to improve east-west mobility across the 24-mile long corridor in the San Gabriel Valley, to relieve congestion on existing transportation facilities, to increase connections to work and educational destinations within the San Gabriel Valley and the Los Angeles region, to support economic revitalization in each city along the corridor, and to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the natural environment. The corridor includes the cities of Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair; and the counties: Los Angeles and San Bernardino.

II. Alternatives

The alternatives proposed for evaluation in the EIS/EIR were developed during a Planning Alternatives Analysis that began in September 2001 and continued through June 2002. The Planning Alternatives Analysis can be reviewed on the project Web site at http://www.metrogoldline.org. The Planning Alternatives Analysis is focused on transportation conditions and possible solutions for improving mobility across the 24-mile-long corridor from Pasadena to Claremont. Seven alternatives were examined in this study and screened down to a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) selected by the Gold Line Construction Authority and the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG). The LPA is a continuation of the light rail transit (LRT) technology from the existing Sierra Madre Villa LRT station in Pasadena to the Claremont Transit Center. The Sierra Madre Villa LRT
station is the eastern terminus of the "Phase I area", in which LRT service was implemented from Los Angeles, through South Pasadena, to Pasadena. A further extension to the City of Montclair was subsequently added to the scope of the EIS/EIR.

The EIS/EIR will evaluate a No-Action alternative, a Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM) alternative, the LRT LPA to Montclair, and a shorter LRT alternative from the existing Sierra Madre Villa Station to the City of Irwindale. Alternative locations for a LRT maintenance and storage facility will also be evaluated. The LRT alternatives would use the former BNSF railroad right-of-way now owned by the Gold Line Construction Authority and the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBG). There are still a few freight movements that occur on the railroad line. The EIS/EIR will examine operating scenarios to determine whether time-separated joint-use can occur or whether freight operations must be supplanted. The No-Action Alternative is the continuation of existing bus service policies in the study area. Under the No-Action Alternative, increases in service would track with increases in demand due to population or employment growth in the area, in accordance with current transit service policies. The TSM/TDM Alternative consists of low-cost mobility improvements that attempt to serve the project purpose and need without building a transit guideway. The TSM/TDM alternative will be evaluated from the Gold Line Construction Authority in consultation with FTA to serve as the LPA to other projects nationwide competing for New Starts funding. Any additional alternatives that emerge during the scoping of the EIS/EIR, especially alternatives that reduce costs or impacts while providing comparable transportation benefit, will also be considered.

III. Probable Effects

The Planning Alternatives Analysis included a screening process to identify potential environmental impacts. This screening indicated the areas of probable effects of the project would be air quality, cultural resources, land use, noise and vibration, and traffic. Most impacts appear likely to occur in the vicinity of proposed stations and at the maintenance yard sites. Noise impacts, however, are possible along the entire corridor because of numerous at-grade crossings that would require the sounding of warning horns and the situation of grade-crossing warning devices as LRT vehicles move through the intersection. The full range of environmental topics will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR. The EIS/EIR will also evaluate whether the proposed LRT extension would generate environmental impacts in the Phase I area (Los Angeles, South Pasadena, and Pasadena).

IV. FTA Procedures

In accordance with FTA policy, all federal laws, regulations, and executive orders affecting project development, including but not limited to the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality and FTA implementing NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508 and 23 CFR part 771), the conformity requirements of the Clean Air Act, section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Executive Orders 11998, 11999 and 12898 regarding floodplains, wetlands, and environmental justice, respectively, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, and section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, will be addressed to the maximum extent practicable during the NEPA process.

The Draft EIS/EIR for the Gold Line Light Rail Extension from the Sierra Madre Villa Station in Pasadena to Montclair will be based on conceptual engineering of the alternatives, including stations, maintenance and storage facilities, and alignment options. Station designs, maintenance and storage facility layouts, and alignment options as well as operational elements, will be refined to minimize and mitigate any adverse impacts.

After its publication, the Draft EIS/EIR will be available for public review and comment, and one or more public hearings will be held. The actions taken in response to the comments on the Draft EIS/EIR will be presented in the Final EIS/EIR, which will be based on preliminary engineering of the LPA and other surviving alternatives.

Issued on: July 2, 2003.

Leslie T. Rogers,
Regional Administrator.
[FR Doc. 03-17306 Filed 7-4-03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4210-D-4

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION
[Docket Number: MARAD 2003-15556]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel CHIMERA.

SUMMARY: As authorized by Pub. L. 105-383 and Pub. L. 107-295, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below. The complete application is given in DOT docket 2003-15556 at http://dms.dot.gov. Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with Pub. L. 105-383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388 (58 FR 23084; April 30, 2003), that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application and address the waiver criteria given in § 384.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR Part 388.

DATES: Submit comments on or before August 8, 2003.

ADDRESS: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD-2003-15556. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room Pb-401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at http://dms.dot.gov/subm/. All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., R.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at http://dms.dot.gov.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel CHIMERA is: "Uninspected power vessel, six passengers or less for hire."
Figure 8.2: State Notice of Preparation

Notice of Preparation

To: Distribution List
From: Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority

625 Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 200
South Pasadena, CA 91030

Subject: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report

Lead Agency: Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority
Contact Person: Susan Hodor
Street Address: 625 Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 200
City/State/Zip: South Pasadena, CA 91030

The Construction Authority will be the lead agency for preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for proposed transit improvements from the existing Sierra Madre Villa Station in Pasadena to Montclair, California, in Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties. The EIR will be prepared in cooperation with the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). A joint document (EIS/EIR) will be prepared to satisfy both National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and CEQA requirements. The FTA will be the federal lead agency.

The project description, location, and the potential environmental effects are contained in the attached materials. A copy of the Initial Study is attached. An expanded NOP and a summary table of environmental impacts identified in an earlier stage of planning are attached.

Due to the time limits mandated by State Law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to Susan Hodor at the address shown above. We will need the name for a contact person in your agency.

Project Title: GOLD LINE PHASE II EXTENSION (PASADENA TO MONTCLAIR) DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Project Locations: Los Angeles and San Bernardino

City (nearest) Los Angeles
County

Project Description: The EIS/EIR will evaluate the impacts of a continuation of the light rail transit (LRT) technology from the existing Sierra Madre Villa LRT station in Pasadena to Montclair. The EIS/EIR will also evaluate a No-Action alternative, and a TSM/TDM alternative, and a shorter LRT alternative from the existing Sierra Madre Villa station to the City of Irwindale. Alternative locations for an LRT maintenance and storage facility will also be evaluated. The LRT alternatives would use former BNSF railroad right-of-way, known as the Pasadena Subdivision, which is now owned by the Gold Line Construction Authority and SANBAG. There are still a few freight movements that occur on the railroad line. The EIS/EIR will examine operating scenarios to determine whether joint-use can occur or whether freight operations will be supplanted. The No-Action Alternative is the continuation of existing bus service policies in the study area. Under the No-Action Alternative, increases in service would track with increases in demand due to population or employment growth in the area, in accordance with current transit service policies. The TSM/TDM Alternative consists of low-cost mobility improvements that attempt to serve the project purpose and need without building a transit guideway. The TSM/TDM alternative will be developed by the Gold Line Construction Authority in consultation with FTA to serve as the New Starts baseline for comparing the LPA to other projects nationwide competing for New Starts funding. Any additional alternatives that emerge during the scoping of the EIS/EIR, especially alternatives that reduce costs or impacts while providing comparable transportation benefit, will also be considered.

Date June 27, 2003

Signature Richard D. Thorpe
Title Chief Executive Officer

Telephone (626) 799-0080

Reference: California Code of Regulations, Title 14, (CEQA Guidelines) Sections 15082(a), 15103, 15375.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name or Agency</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Monique Clemmer</td>
<td>Noise, privacy</td>
<td>Wants a wall.</td>
<td>Noise &amp; Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security Section 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Lyn Frazier</td>
<td>Noise, safety, property values, community impact, vibration</td>
<td>Concerned.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Community Facilities and Services Section 3.4, Safety and Security Section 3.13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Gil Gonzalez</td>
<td>Transportation centers, car concerns</td>
<td>Wants transportation centers in remote areas to keep cars out of downtown.</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Section 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Mike Hillman</td>
<td>Art Program, expediting process</td>
<td>Are a percentage of the funds being set aside for the art program? Who will choose designs? Wants to expedite process.</td>
<td>Not in scope of EIS/EIR; Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Michael Hillman</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>How heavily will medians be landscaped? Wants to be on mailing list.</td>
<td>Visual Impacts Section 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Janet Iliff</td>
<td>Noise, Lights, Design</td>
<td>Light/noise could affect individuals as trains use bridge at night. Wonders if bridge will be widened. Concerned about construction noise. Believes second Glendora station should be near Kohls.</td>
<td>Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Mark R. Johnston</td>
<td>Different Alignment</td>
<td>Wants to turn route to go to Pomona Transit Center, Downtown Pomona. Extending line to Montclair or farther is too long.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Jill Jones</td>
<td>Positive, General comment</td>
<td>Appreciates information and looks forward to completion of the project.</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>John Macri</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Concerned about &quot;horn&quot; noise at crossing at San Dimas Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Judy Miller</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Would like to see &quot;woodland&quot; landscaping.</td>
<td>Not appropriate to rail right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Judy Miller</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Adequate parking is essential.</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Section 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Jim Nizolek</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Whistle blowing is unnecessary; standard traffic signal lights and other safeguards should be used instead.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8-2: SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY AND LOCATIONS IN FINAL EIS/EIR WHERE ISSUES ARE Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name or Agency</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Krishna Patel</td>
<td>Traffic, station development, visual, drainage</td>
<td>Concerns include increased traffic at Bonita Ave./Cataract Ave., public involvement in intermodal station development, existing Spur line at Bonita/Cataract, negative aesthetics, and drainage impacts.</td>
<td>Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15, Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Water and Water Quality Impacts Section 3-18, Land Use and Planning Section 3.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Jeff Templeman</td>
<td>Aesthetics, road crossings, noise, parking</td>
<td>Impacts related to aesthetics of lines and poles, road crossing at Bonita/Cataract, noise, parking.</td>
<td>Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security Section 3.13. Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Catherine Thornton</td>
<td>Traffic, road crossings</td>
<td>Concerned about increase in traffic; suggests using bridges, etc. to minimize traffic on streets.</td>
<td>Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15, Safety and Security Section 3.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7/14/2003</td>
<td>Foothill Village Homeowners Association</td>
<td>Noise, safety of youth, Maintenance</td>
<td>Concerned about noise from trains, horns, and bells; concerned for safety of youth going to Sanburg Middle School, maintenance of right-of-way.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security Section 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Spoku (?) Acheampone</td>
<td>Positive General comment</td>
<td>Supports the project.</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Jeffrey Davidson</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Consider using the old Pacific Electric ROW, not Metrolink, from Claremont to Montclair.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Christopher Denes</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Wants prompt completion of project.</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Clem Hamilton</td>
<td>Parking, stations, endangered species</td>
<td>Wants sufficient parking for local tourism for Claremont. Inefficient if Gold Line stations are different from Metrolink stations. Wants to be vigilant with study of endangered species.</td>
<td>Biological Resources Section 3.13, and Land Use and Planning Section 3.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Andrea Harrington</td>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td>Wants bicycles to be allowed at all times, without a permit.</td>
<td>MTA operational issue, not within scope of DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Gus Hyland</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Comments that there is no need for so much noise, especially when gates are down.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7/13/2003</td>
<td>Cecil A. Karstensen</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Consider large parking facilities for each station.</td>
<td>Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Cecil A. Karstensen</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Use the old Pacific Electric ROW between Claremont and Montclair.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Victoria Koenig</td>
<td>Design, Marketing</td>
<td>Wants pedestrian access from transit center south to Arrow Highway and the Montclair Plaza. Interested in allowing use of company name for marketing in support of Gold Line.</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Section 3.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Margot MacDonald</td>
<td>Study of Phase I, parking</td>
<td>Use study of Phase I to see if Phase II the Foothill Extension would actually be used; provide a parking structure for Claremont station and local businesses.</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Section 3.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Anthony Madrin</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Sound wall needed; reduce number of horns used as a warning, especially during early/late hours.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Ross R. Moore, Jr.</td>
<td>Stations, alignment, extra connecting lines</td>
<td>Have station at Baldwin Ave. &amp; I-210 serving Santa Anita Fashion Mall, race track, arboretum with pedestrian bridge; have Duarte station DIRECTLY serve City of Hope Medical Center; have West San Dimas Station and Maintenance Facility near Auto Center Dr. &amp; Gladstone Ave. to serve shopping complexes and take advantage of cheap land; use old Pacific Electric ROW from Claremont to Montclair; eventually have a connecting line from Gold Line along I-605 to Long Beach; have connecting line between Union Station and Washington St. Blue Line Station.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>William R. Mussatto</td>
<td>Bicycles, station sites</td>
<td>Station siting needs more detail regarding how tracks will be laid out in depot area; concerned about way to handle bicycles on train for last mile.</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Section 3.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>E. Pugino</td>
<td>Positive General Comment</td>
<td>Wishes it would be opened sooner than 2009.</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Alan Robinson</td>
<td>Positive General comment</td>
<td>Wants it built.</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Michael Viera, Citrus College</td>
<td>Positive General Comment</td>
<td>Supports project; if a resolution from Citrus College Board of Trustees is needed, contact him.</td>
<td>Chapter 6, Agency Coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Elliott Caine</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise is a major problem that needs to be solved.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security Section 3.12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Jesusa B. Castico</td>
<td>Noise, facility, night schedule</td>
<td>Horns, bells are a major problem affecting sleep; maybe use strobe lights instead. At facility between Meridian and Mission, rethink horns and bells at small intersections; train schedule at night.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Jesusa B. Castico</td>
<td>Natural habitats</td>
<td>Habitats of birds or animals are disrupted.</td>
<td>Biological Resources Section 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>William E. Coleman, Jr.</td>
<td>Design, sharing ROW, maintenance facility, station locations</td>
<td>Wants grade separation at Santa Anita Ave., Arcadia ONLY; support sharing ROW with freight trains, but on separate tracks Irwindale East to end; each city should be consulted about station locations; should a branch go to Santa Anita Racetrack? New maintenance facility should be built near San Gabriel River in Irwindale.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Jeffrey Davidson</td>
<td>Train horns</td>
<td>Put train horns on crossings rather than on trains.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Paul Gedigian</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Would like to make a presentation of an alternate to at-grade design.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Lynne Heffley</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>Feels strongly about having the stations as near as possible to various destinations with main public interest.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Harold Leacock</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>At Arcadia Station, need connection to Race Track and shopping center; Going to Montclair is good; wants stations that are at or near places of interest.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Marshall Lew</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Run line South to I-210/SR 57 Diamond Bar, could also serve Cal Poly Pomona.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Charles Mountain</td>
<td>General comment, question</td>
<td>Supports the project; will there be one day passes on all rail and bus trips?</td>
<td>Support noted; not in scope of EIS/EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Judith B. Mussotto</td>
<td>Freight, parking</td>
<td>Concerned about moving freight to the street, parking concern in Claremont; how will ticket price compare to Metrolink?</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2, Land Use and Planning Section 3.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Tom Nelson</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Horns and bells are a problem; sound walls would not help much. Grading should be done when funds allow; perhaps grease wheels to avoid squealing.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Joanne Nuckols</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise is a huge problem and new technology should be used in Phase II of the Foothill Extension to avoid these problems.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Joanne Nuckols</td>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>Are there different types of gates?</td>
<td>Safety and Security Section 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Richard A. Rosilh (?)</td>
<td>Parking, Stations</td>
<td>Please include parking structures at stations; include bus feeder lines into stations</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2, Land Use and Planning Section 3.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Geri Silveira</td>
<td>Noise, power lines, La Verne station, aesthetics</td>
<td>Concerned about noise; there should be no above ground wires; La Verne Station is not downtown.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Utility Disruptions and Relocations Section 3.16, Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Land Use and Planning Section 3.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Betty Sue Smith</td>
<td>Noise, senior citizens</td>
<td>Bells are a huge problem; senior citizens don't have enough time to get across the street.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Craig F. Thompson</td>
<td>Connector line</td>
<td>Should be a connector line on Alameda Street between the Gold Line and Blue Line.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Craig F. Thompson</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>New alignment needs grade separation at many locations; URGENT need for a bridge over Santa Anita Ave. in Arcadia; areas where the track runs across the top of a &quot;hump&quot; can be easily grade separated.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Craig F. Thompson</td>
<td>Power for the Trains</td>
<td>Substations are not powerful enough for three-car trains, may need a change for eastern extension.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>John Ullohs</td>
<td>Less Parking, No Grade Separation, Bikeway, redistribute project costs, technology sharing</td>
<td>Don't build more giant parking lots; avoid underground and aerial, don't waste money; go to the county line ASAP; tear out roads instead of grade separating; include a bikeway where ROW width allows; externalize unnecessary costs (most sound walls and landscaping don't move people); buy out NIMBYs; put more funds from roadways into public transit; consider crossing gates from both sides of wide roadways, current gates don't look like they'll last; use technology sharing among all of the MTA rail lines; maintain a public office (like the one used for Gold Line I), which is superior to MTA's &quot;general lack of outreach;&quot; externalize costs of stations to the communities.</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Section 3.10, Chapter 5 Financial Analysis and Comparison of Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Charles Woolf</td>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
<td>Should have closer coordination between the construction authority and the cities' street departments.</td>
<td>Chapter 6 Agency Coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Raymond Lu</td>
<td>New Station at Montebello</td>
<td>Wants the Gold Line to go to Montebello Station for easy transfer to Metrolink.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>William D. Zuke</td>
<td>Noise, ADA compliance</td>
<td>People with disabilities or handicaps need to be included; consider access for power wheelchairs; bell system is too noisy.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security 3.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td>Wants Metro Silver Line Via Exposition Blvd. to Santa Monica; Metro White Line or Purple Line to Canoga Park/West Hills.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Noise, speed</td>
<td>Noise impacts have not been resolved; speed of trains will kill people; don't build.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security 3.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>7/18/2003</td>
<td>Daniel Walker, Co-Chair Sierra Club Transportation Committee (Los Angeles Chapter)</td>
<td>Support, Bikeway, study improved Metrolink Service, add Ontario Airport, safety/grade separation, cost, eliminate freight, governance, parking, TOD</td>
<td>Supports the project. Try to add bikeway along as much of the ROW as possible; study improved/ more frequent Metrolink service from Montclair to Claremont to Pomona to LA Union Station; widen scope or add separately to include Ontario Airport via the Gold Line or Metrolink; early on, define potential intersections that may be close to residential areas or busy street at-grade crossings and provide possible grade separation improvements and rough cost estimates; define where single track operation may be feasible and provide cost savings estimate and later cost to upgrade to full double track operation; define continuing freight operations, alternatives, and cost to eliminate freight completely from the ROW; Phase II Foothill Extension - how would JPA / governance change if/when extended to Montclair (San Bernardino county)?; adequate parking planned for each station?; bus interface to new stations, potential new local buses within some cities to quick link to Gold Line; possibilities for TOD / Joint development near planned stations; is there sufficient ROW width for current Pomona to Claremont to Montclair double tracking project plus double track Gold Line Light Rail for easy platform-to-platform transfer; location of maintenance yard?; potential route for downtown LA connector to link Gold Line directly to Blue/Green (and Expo) LRT lines.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2, Safety and Security 3.13, Land Use and Planning Section 3.10, Financial Analysis and Comparison of Alternatives Chapter 5, Agency Coordination, Chapter 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Diane Barlow</td>
<td>Noise, visual, vibrations, safety</td>
<td>Concerned that noise, vibrations, view of the electric lines would be detrimental to the building she owns; concerned the train will crash into her building.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Safety and Security section 3.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Louise R. Bigley</td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>Electric lines and poles affect the view from downtown Pasadena; expected an underground power source.</td>
<td>Visual Impacts Section 3.17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Emily Cao</td>
<td>Tracks close to houses</td>
<td>Tracks too close to houses on California Street; could be dangerous for residents.</td>
<td>Safety and Security section 3.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Robert L. Davis</td>
<td>Alignment Changes, Traffic, Historic</td>
<td>Build through Azusa instead of Irwindale if needed; wants rail to go through Monrovia; Monrovia corn silo could move to Irwindale or El Monte, Miller could be served by ex-Pacific Electric (now Metrolink) branch; comment on public's concern about traffic obstruction; rarely sees trains in S. Pasadena even though he wants to see them.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15,Cultural Resources Section 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Dorothy Fleck</td>
<td>New Station</td>
<td>Wants consideration for a station in La Verne to serve the Fairplex and Cal Poly Pomona.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Paul Greenwood</td>
<td>Expedition of project</td>
<td>EIS needs to address accelerated implementation at those parts of Phase II Foothill Extension that have funding in place and/or for which ROW exists.</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Dirk Hudson</td>
<td>Positive General comment</td>
<td>Supports the project.</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>M.J. Humphrey</td>
<td>Map on Metrogoldline.org</td>
<td>Would like a more detailed map of Phase II Foothill Extension on metrogoldline.org website.</td>
<td>Completed by Construction Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Elisabeth L. Karsana</td>
<td>Schedule, property values</td>
<td>Time between trains is too close, especially at 2 a.m.; will property values go down because the trains are going so close to homes? Will MTA compensate the difference if house values go down?</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Raub Mathias</td>
<td>Arcadia Station Location</td>
<td>Doesn't think Arcadia needs or wants the Gold Line; the only place where a station should be considered is in the parking lot between the mall and the racetrack.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Jim McKellar</td>
<td>Positive General comment</td>
<td>Glad that Phase I is ahead of schedule and would like to see Phase II Foothill Extension open as soon as possible.</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Helen Morales</td>
<td>Information request, noise</td>
<td>Interested in information regarding environmental studies and noise in the area; would like a sound wall.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Charles Mountain</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Suggests that buses show “Gold Line Connection” on sign after route number and destination.</td>
<td>Not in scope of EIS/EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Cipoiano Pineda</td>
<td>ROW Acquisitions</td>
<td>How many tracks or how much square footage would be used between Monrovia and Second Ave in Arcadia? What options do the property owners along the tracks have?</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Displacements, Section 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Buzz Spellman</td>
<td>Positive General comments</td>
<td>Well designed displays and knowledgeable consultants.</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Matt Walleck</td>
<td>Sound wall - Unrelated to project</td>
<td>What is the status of a sound wall being made near San Luis Rey Rd. and I-210?</td>
<td>Not in scope of EIS/EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Homer Wilcox</td>
<td>Parking, Operation Comment</td>
<td>Make sure there is parking at both Monrovia and Duarte stations; bays for electric cars to park and charge (conductive charging preferred) would be nice.</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Section 3.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Betty Willis</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Please consider noise along freeway section.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>Alexander Zajac</td>
<td>Positive General comment</td>
<td>Supports the project.</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Design/Construction Process, safety and security, freeway barriers, traffic</td>
<td>Design contract should be separate from construction contract; inspection should be by a different independent contractor; security should be provided for Park and Ride; freeway barriers should be reconstructed to be higher and safe for stronger impact; on Santa Anita, 1st, 2nd must be under crossing or tunnel; what happens to traffic if there is a derailment?</td>
<td>Safety and Security Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>7/22/2003</td>
<td>Linda Wright, Caltrans District 7</td>
<td>Caltrans concerns</td>
<td>Consult with Caltrans early in the process concerning potential impacts on state facilities.</td>
<td>Community Services Section 3.4, Agency Coordination Chapter 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Michael Hudson, City of Montclair</td>
<td>Support, identify alignment in Montclair ASAP</td>
<td>Montclair Transcenter is an ideal terminus with ample parking. Identify alignment in Montclair to facilitate impact discussion quickly - former PE ROW makes sense - lists positives and negatives of this.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2, Agency Coordination Chapter 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>7/25/2003</td>
<td>Robert L. Hoherd</td>
<td>General comment, elevated tracks</td>
<td>Supports project, appreciates the information provided to him, would like to see the track above Santa Anita Blvd. and 1st Ave. elevated.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>7/28/2003</td>
<td>Mary Dougherty</td>
<td>Graded crossings, construction costs vs. dispersed costs over the life of the system</td>
<td>Dispersed costs: installation of crossing gates and signals; police and staff to educate public; writing of local ordinances to regulate grade crossings; enforcement of regulations and ordinances; maintenance and repair of crossing gates and signals; disruption of sleep and lifestyle of those living in proximity to the bells and horns; delays of emergency services, commercial traffic, and everyday errands caused by at-grade crossings; lost time caused by slower transportation through the region for all riders on the Gold Line; need for train operator rather than computer-controlled operation; human injuries and property damage caused by accidents that will predictably happen; damage to train cars, tracks, and other equipment from accidents; further delays for all, and indirect costs from accidents; other foreseeable costs; costs of litigation and settlements/judgments as a result of grade-level crossings; costs of separating grade-level crossings after construction has been completed and trains are operational.</td>
<td>Chapter 2 Alternatives, Community Facilities and Services Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security Section 3.13, Financial Analysis and Comparison of Alternatives Chapter 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>7/20/2003</td>
<td>Dennis Awad</td>
<td>Duarte Station</td>
<td>Duarte station should be at the corner of Duarte Rd. &amp; Mountain, across from the Walmart &amp; Home Depot.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>7/14/2003</td>
<td>Gregory Mantila</td>
<td>Ontario Airport</td>
<td>Lengthen the line to Ontario Airport if it goes to Montclair; may help decrease congestion at LAX. Don’t make the mistake of the Red Line and Green Line, which both stop short of Burbank Airport and LAX respectively.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8-2: SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY AND LOCATIONS IN FINAL EIS/EIR WHERE ISSUES ARE ADDRESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name or Agency</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Robert H. Olander II</td>
<td>Poles, Cataract Ave. and Bonita Ave. crossing, stations, housing, funding</td>
<td>Make gate crossing at Cataract Ave. and Bonita Ave. to be no more than 2 minutes; conceal or modify poles; each city should be allowed to personalize its stations; state should not make each city have a mandatory housing component in the development zones; build Phase II Foothill Extension completely or wait until all funding is approved.</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Section 3.10, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15, Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Financial Analysis and Comparison of Alternatives Chapter 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>7/2/2003</td>
<td>Stephen Buswell, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief, Caltrans District 7</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Includes a list of items for traffic analysis, including assumptions and methods for modeling, consistency of modeling with other forecasts, volumes for existing and future conditions, discussion of mitigation measures, and specification of developer's share of the cost.</td>
<td>Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>7/3/2003</td>
<td>Jack Fry, Anaheim Fiber Operations, Sprint</td>
<td>Construction impacts on Sprint's fiber optic lines along RR ROW in San Dimas</td>
<td>Very concerned about impact on fiber optic infrastructure; requires 2-foot by 5-foot separation from any new structures, as well as compensation for all activities related to this project.</td>
<td>Utility Disruptions and Relocations Section 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>7/9/2003</td>
<td>Duncan Robb, MTA Real Estate</td>
<td>Ownership of ROW</td>
<td>Clarifies ownership of ROW between Claremont and Arcadia; owned by Pasadena Blue Line Construction Authority. Responds to question from Lynne Goldsmith (MTA Bikeway Modal Lead) who was concerned about a Class 1 bikeway designed on the ROW between San Dimas and Claremont.</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Displacements, Section 3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8-2: SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY AND LOCATIONS IN FINAL EIS/EIR WHERE ISSUES ARE ADDRESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name or Agency</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Ruth Frazen, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Project could affect Districts’ trunk sewers that are located under or parallel to the proposed project alignment. In order to issue a detailed response, they will need project plans and specifications that incorporate Districts' sewer information.</td>
<td>Utility Disruptions and Relocations Section 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Gil Gonzalez</td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>Requests a photo of the concept for the station near Azusa City Hall.</td>
<td>Visual Impacts Section 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Christopher Veirs, City of Claremont</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Requests information on maximum sounds levels (dB max rating) to consider when reviewing another residential project being built north of the Gold Line ROW in Claremont.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Mark Smith</td>
<td>Alignment Location</td>
<td>Thinks that a location in Pomona would be better than one in Irwindale.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>7/23/2003</td>
<td>Gary Iverson, Office Chief, Caltrans District 7</td>
<td>Historic, Traffic, Hazardous Materials, Seismic Design Criteria</td>
<td>Bridges should be included in APE and evaluated for historic significance; traffic should address freeway impacts; Traffic Management Plan (TMP) should be developed; hazardous materials study should address presence of lead; any proposed bridges will need to conform to Caltrans design and seismic requirements.</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Section 3.5, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15, Hazardous Materials Section 3.19, Geologic-Seismic Impacts Section 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>7/24/2003</td>
<td>City of San Dimas</td>
<td>Aesthetics, Traffic</td>
<td>Light Rail equipment (particularly overhead wiring and poles) has potential to create negative aesthetic impacts, especially in Frontier Village. Requests evaluation of feasibility of a grade separation at Bonita/Cataract; traffic mitigation and visual impact plan should be developed. Relocation of existing spur line at Bonita/Cataract should be analyzed. Project mitigation should consider expansion of bus, bicycle, pedestrian and auto access.</td>
<td>Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>7/21/03</td>
<td>Delaine Shane, MWD</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Notes potential impacts to Middle Feeder, Orange County Feeder, Yorba Linda Feeder, and Upper Feeder pipelines, as well as to the La Verne Pipeline and the Weymouth Filtration Plant. Requests consideration of these facilities in all environmental documents and emphasizes need for continued access to these facilities. Also concerned about impacts of parking lots, structures, train stations, and other facilities on their facilities. Enclosed a copy of &quot;Guidelines for Developments in the Area of Facilities, Fee Properties, and/or Easements of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.&quot;</td>
<td>Utility Disruptions and Relocations Section 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>7/24/03</td>
<td>John Poindexter, City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Public Agency Coordination, Construction Impacts, Traffic, East Pasadena Station</td>
<td>Requests that the EIS/EIR clearly state what approvals or actions will be required from various public agencies and governments along the route. Requests a construction staging plan for all construction impacts, including those to public parking lots. Also requests traffic analysis describe all mobility corridors that could be affected and the impact of bus traffic on East Pasadena. Also requests consideration of construction impacts on East Pasadena Station, which will be in operation. Finally, parking impacts on Pasadena if the project isn’t extended should be addressed.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15, Agency Coordination Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>7/24/03</td>
<td>Morgan Wehtje, CA Dept. of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Biology, Permitting, Water Resources</td>
<td>Requests assessment of flora and fauna adjacent to project area; discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on biological resources; full evaluation of alternatives, including mitigation measures. Also requests a CESA permit if there is potential for “take” of endangered plants or animals. Opposes elimination of watercourses or wetlands. Suggests a pre-project or early consultation meeting.</td>
<td>Biological Resources section 3.3, Water and Water Quality Section 3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>7/28/2003</td>
<td>Naresh Varma, Chief, San Bernardino County Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Requests that a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) report per Congestion Management Program (CMP) be prepared.</td>
<td>Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>Nova Blazej, EPA</td>
<td>No comments; just requests three copies of document be sent to the San Francisco office when filed with Washington, DC office.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Added to mailing list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>7/31/2003</td>
<td>John Ulloth</td>
<td>Alignment; Traffic, Noise, Shade</td>
<td>Suggests building the Gold Line out to Upland, as well as including a stop at the Ontario Airport. Also suggests studying using DMU operations, prioritizing access of all non-automotive modes at proposed rail lines, considering retaining freight potential on the railroad, and studying how the rail development might assist adjacent cities with historic goals. Also suggests putting more trees in parking to increase shade and putting in noise barriers to reduce noise.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Alternatives Chapter 2, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15, Visual Impacts Section 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>7/30/2003</td>
<td>James Noyes, Los Angeles County Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>Trash, Utilities, Geotechnical issues</td>
<td>Cites Los Angeles County Building Code sections pertaining to landfills/trash, proximity to oil/gas wells, and hazardous waste management. Requests that the EIR address the geotechnical and seismic issues identified in the NOP/IS. Also requests coordination with MTA for unincorporated areas. Concerned about potential traffic and light intrusion impacts and will review the documents upon completion. Requests investigation of watershed management opportunities.</td>
<td>Utility Disruptions and Relocations Section 3.16, Geologic-Seismic Impacts Section 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>7/31/2003</td>
<td>Sean Joyce, City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>Scope of Project, Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Noise/Vibration, Socio-Economics, Public Services/Facilities, LRT &amp; Traffic Operations, Corridor Transportation Patterns/Impacts</td>
<td>Concerned that scope of project needs to include potential impacts on South Pasadena, including; aesthetic impacts resulting from potential construction of additional facilities in South Pasadena; impacts of additional LRT traffic on historic resources, noise, demand for further redevelopment, headways and emergency response times, and cumulative impacts.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2, Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Socio-Economics Section 3.14, Community Facilities and Services Section 3.4, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>7/31/2003</td>
<td>City of Baldwin Park</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concerned that regional transportation services (such as Foothill Transit) may reduce their service levels in response to Gold Line service being available. Also, they're concerned that there may be increased traffic impacts on north-south arterials through Baldwin Park from commuters going up to the Gold Line.</td>
<td>Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>7/31/2003</td>
<td>Paul Samuras, City of Pomona</td>
<td>Parking, Traffic</td>
<td>Concerned about parking, vehicular, and pedestrian circulation impacts at the proposed Garey station.</td>
<td>Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>8/1/2003</td>
<td>Reuben Arceo, City of Irwindale</td>
<td>Facilities, Circulation, Socio-Economic, Land Use, Aesthetics, Traffic</td>
<td>Reserves the right to not approve siting of any maintenance facilities in Irwindale. Requests that the EIS/EIR consider grade separation issue from Miller plant to Irwindale Ave. Requests analysis and recommendations regarding transportation planning, land use, and development. Notes that city design guidelines call for Spanish/Mission architecture. Requests analysis of traffic along Irwindale Ave. from Foothill to Arrow Hwy.</td>
<td>Community Facilities and Services Section 3.4, Land Use and Planning Section 3.10, Socio-Economic Section 3.14, Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>7/22/2003</td>
<td>James Nizolek</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Concerned about negative noise impacts from Glendora residents; recommends eliminating horns in favor of more lights.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>7/30/2003</td>
<td>Harlan Jeche, Glendale Office, DTSC</td>
<td>Hazardous</td>
<td>Requests that the EIR identify whether any uses in the project area could result in hazardous wastes/substances, identify any potentially contaminated sites, and provide suggested remediation. Notes that if there is any soil contamination, construction must stop and the EIR should indicate how remediation would proceed.</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials Section 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>7/31/2003</td>
<td>Elisabeth Karsana, et al (Arcadia Residents)</td>
<td>Noise, Vibration, Safety, Operation, Property Values</td>
<td>Concerned about noise and vibration during construction and operation; safety and possibility of derailment; hours of operation and frequency of use; impact on property values.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security Section 3.13, Acquisitions and Displacements, Section 3.1, Land Use and Planning Section 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>7/29/2003</td>
<td>Miles Rosedale, Monrovia Growers</td>
<td>Noise, Traffic</td>
<td>Although the Monrovia Growers property may be developed into residential dwellings, a school, parks, and trails, the EIR should also evaluate the noise, traffic, and circulation impacts on the existing use as a nursery.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>8/1/2003</td>
<td>William Kelly, City of Arcadia</td>
<td>Aesthetics, Traffic, Land Use, Public Safety, Noise, Hazardous Materials, Construction/Phasing</td>
<td>Concerned about: aesthetic impact of bridges, wiring and poles; traffic impacts, including grade separations at Santa Anita Avenue, and at-grade crossings; impact of rail station on traffic; land use of station, including parking and changing land uses in the vicinity of the station; safety impacts, including the potential for increased crime and access for public safety vehicles; noise from construction, trains, and traction power sites; construction vibration; presence of hazardous materials; construction impacts, including staging areas, public safety access, adequate review time, and impacts on parks.</td>
<td>Visual Impacts Section 3.17, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15, Land Use and Planning Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials Section 3.9, Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security Section 3.13, Agency Coordination Chapter 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>8/1/2003</td>
<td>Stephen Fox, MTA</td>
<td>Facilities, Traffic</td>
<td>Requests analysis of the MOS to Irwindale. Notes requirement to prepare a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and lists the required components.</td>
<td>Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>7/30/2003</td>
<td>Jeffrey Smith, SCAG</td>
<td>Regional Significance</td>
<td>The project is regionally significant and directly relates to SCAG’s RCPG and RTP. Therefore, SCAG expects the DEIR to cite appropriate SCAG policies and address the manner in which the Project is consistent with applicable core policies.</td>
<td>Socio-Economics Section 3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>8/5/2003</td>
<td>Belinda Faustinos, San Gabriel &amp; Lower Los Angeles Rivers &amp; Mountains Conservancy</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Encourages close consultation with the RMC to minimize impacts on recreation, open space, and habitat/wildlife.</td>
<td>Community Facilities and Services Section 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>7/30/2003</td>
<td>Katherine Perez, Transportation &amp; Land Use Collaborative of Southern California</td>
<td>Outreach, Noise/Vibration, Storm Drains, Water Quality, Safety</td>
<td>Criticized the public outreach effort for being unfocused and conducted in a passive manner; notes that materials didn't seem available in other languages and that there weren't enough public meetings. Encourages coordination with grass-roots organizations. Recommends that the EIR evaluate a full range of options to reduce bell and horn noise. Also recommends that design of facilities incorporate elements to reduce runoff. The EIR’s water quality analysis should include a full review of options for surface water and groundwater. The EIR should also include analysis of safety concerns, taking into consideration other light rail systems.</td>
<td>Public Outreach Chapter 8, Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Water and Water Quality Section 3.18, Safety and Security Section 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>8/25/2003</td>
<td>Douglas Bernash, City of Monrovia</td>
<td>Pedestrian/train interaction, interaction of light/heavy rail, noise</td>
<td>Requests that the team address: pedestrian interaction with light rail vehicles at stations, the mixing or separation of light rail and heavy rail operations within a limited right-of-way, noise impacts in areas where tracks are elevated above single/multi-family residences, potential use of landscape buffers in conjunction with appropriate safety fencing along the right-of-way.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>8/25/2003</td>
<td>Michael Robertson, California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>PUC approval required, PUC is a responsible agency under CEQA</td>
<td>PUC approval required to construct new, or modify existing, rail crossings. A Safety Certification Plan shall be submitted to the Commission staff for review and approval by the Commission prior to preliminary engineering. PUC is a responsible agency for this project.</td>
<td>Agency coordination Chapter 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>8/20/2003</td>
<td>Dave Robeck</td>
<td>New stop at Ontario Airport</td>
<td>Suggests that Ontario Airport would be a good stop for Gold Line. Lists reasons.</td>
<td>Alternatives Chapter 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name or Agency</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location of Issue Discussion in DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>8/1/2003</td>
<td>Arlene Andrew, City of La Verne</td>
<td>Noise, Traffic, Parking, Aesthetic, Safety, Economics, Station Location</td>
<td>Concerned about noise impacts late at night and early in the morning, traffic impacts created by the ROW separating businesses and residents from emergency vehicles, aesthetics impacts - overhead poles and wiring, economic concerns - modest budget for new station and TOD on existing small businesses. La Verne has not yet selected a station; unlikely to be at location on D Street. EIR should not make this assumption.</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration Analysis Section 3.11, Safety and Security Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation Analysis Section 3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8-5.3. Comments on Draft EIS/EIR

FTA and the Construction Authority issued Notices of Availability (NOA) and set a 45-day circulation period for agencies and the public to review the Draft EIS/EIR and to submit comments. The circulation period was May 7 through June 21, 2004.

Public comments on the Draft EIS/EIR will be sought at a series of public hearings and other means identified in the NOA. Each of the Phase I and Phase II–Foothill Extension corridor cities has been invited to co-host a public hearing. The format of information presentation and of solicitation and recording of comments varies among the cities. Some cities have opted for open-house formats, where information is presented throughout a meeting and comments can be submitted in writing or dictated to a court reporter at any time; others desire conducted formal presentations and formal public hearings as part of commission or council meetings; or combinations of these two basic approaches. The Gold Line Joint Powers Authority also will hold a Public Hearing.

The NOA provided a list of all means and addresses at which comments can be submitted: These included:

- Written comments to the FTA.
- Written comments to the Construction Authority postal addresses (i.e., 625 Fair Oaks, Suite 200, South Pasadena, CA, 91030)
- E-mail comments to the Construction Authority website: eircomments@metrogoldline.org
- Written comments by fax (626-799-8599)
- Written comments at any public hearing or meeting,
- Dictated comments at any public hearing or meeting.

All comments submitted at the Public Hearings, or by other written means during the circulation period, will be considered by FTA and the Construction Authority. Substantive comments will be responded to in the Final EIS/EIR (Chapter 13), which is anticipated to be released in mid-2005.

Public Hearings were scheduled as shown in Table 8-3:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time/Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wed., May 19 | Claremont Council Chambers 225 Second St., Claremont | 5-7 pm - Open House  
7:00 pm - Presentation & Public Hearing with Traffic & Transportation Commission |
| Thur., May 20 | Teen and Family Center 241 W. Dawson Ave., Glendora | 5:30-6:30 pm - Open House  
6:30 pm - Presentation & Public Hearing.  
Town Hall format with City Council and Transportation Commission |
| Wed., May 26 | Duarte Community Center 1600 Huntington Dr., Duarte | 6:00 pm – Open House |
| Tues., June 1 | Ramona Hall Community Center 4580 N. Figueroa St., Los Angeles | 5:30-7:30 pm – Open House & Public Hearing |
| Thur., June 3 | Monrovia Community Center 119 W. Palm, Monrovia | 6-8 pm – Open House |
| Mon., June 7 | Montclair Council Chambers 5111 Benito St., Montclair | 5-7 pm - Open House  
7:00 pm - Presentation & Public Hearing |
| Tues., June 8 | San Dimas Council Chambers 245 E Bonita Ave., San Dimas | 5:30 pm- Open House  
7:00 pm - Presentation & Public Hearing |
| Wed., June 9 | La Verne Council Chambers 3660 D St., La Verne | 5:30-6:30 pm - Open House  
6:30 pm - Presentation & Public Hearing with Planning Commission |
| Wed., June 9 | Pasadena Council Chambers—Due to seismic refit, city hall will be closed. Call 626-744-4009 for location | 5:15-6:15 pm - Open House  
6:15 pm - Public Hearing with Planning Commission |
| Thur., June 10 | South Pasadena Council Chambers 1424 Mission St., So. Pasadena | 6:30-7:30 pm - Open House  
7:30 pm - Presentation & Public Hearing |
| Mon., June 14 | Ganesha Park Community Center 1575 N. White Ave., Pomona | 6-8:30 pm - Open House |
| Mon., June 14 | Arcadia Council Chambers 240 Huntington Dr., Arcadia | 7:00 pm - Presentation & Public Hearing |
| Tues., June 15 | Irwindale Council Chambers 5050 N. Irwindale, Irwindale | 5-6 pm - Open House  
6:00 pm - Presentation & Public Hearing |
| Wed., June 16 | Azusa Council Chambers 213 E. Foothill Blvd., Azusa | 6:30 pm - Open House  
7:30 pm - Presentation & Public Hearing with Planning Commission |
| Thurs. June 17 | Duarte Community Center 1600 Huntington Dr., Duarte | 4:30 pm Presentation & Public Hearing with San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments Joint Powers Authority |
8-6 DISTRIBUTION AND NOTICING OF THE AVAILABILITY OF DRAFT EIS/EIR

8-6.1. Document Distribution

Copies of the Draft EIS/EIR were distributed to the following agencies, persons and organizations during the week of April 26-30, 2004:

Federal Agencies

- Amtrak, Washington DC
- Federal Aviation Administration Western Pacific Region, Los Angeles
- Federal Railroad Administration, Washington DC
- Federal Transit Administration, Washington DC
- Federal Transit Administration Region 9, San Francisco
- FTA/FHWA Los Angeles Metro Office, Los Angeles
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Arcadia CA
- U.S. Department of Interior, Washington DC
- U.S. Dept. of Agriculture - Natural Resources Conservation Services, Lancaster CA
- U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development, Los Angeles
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Carlsbad CA
- U.S. Surface Transportation Board, Washington DC

State Agencies

- State of California, Dept. of Transportation District 7, Los Angeles
- State of California, Dept. of Transportation District 8, San Bernardino CA
- State Board of Education

County and Regional Agencies

- South Coast Air Quality Management District, Diamond Bar CA
- Southern California Regional Rail Authority, Los Angeles
- Southern California Association of Governments, Los Angeles
- San Bernardino Association of Governments, San Bernardino CA
- San Bernardino County Offices of Education
- San Gabriel Valley Association of Governments, Pasadena CA
- LA County Metropolitan Transit Authority, Los Angeles
- Omnitrans, San Bernardino CA
- Foothill Transit Service, West Covina CA

Railroad Companies

- BNSF, San Bernardino CA

Local Governments and City Libraries

- City of Arcadia
- City of Azusa
- City of Claremont
- City of Duarte
City of Glendora  
City of Irwindale  
City of La Verne  
City of Los Angeles  
City of Monrovia  
City of Montclair  
City of Pasadena  
City of Pomona  
City of San Dimas  
City of South Pasadena  
City of Upland

**Local School Districts**  
Arcadia Unified School District  
Azusa Unified School District  
Bonita Unified School District  
Claremont Unified School District  
Glendora Unified School District  
Los Angeles Unified School District  
Monrovia Unified School District  
Ontario-Montclair School District  
Pasadena Unified School District  
South Pasadena Unified School District

**Private Schools**  
Damien High School, La Verne  
First Lutheran School, Monrovia  
Holy Name of Mary School, San Dimas  
Life Center Christian School, Pomona  
Our Lady of Assumption, Claremont  
Saint Dorothy Elementary School, Glendora  
Saint Francis of Rome Elementary School, Azusa

**Colleges/Universities**  
Azusa-Pacific University  
California Institute of Technology  
California Polytechnic University, Pomona  
Citrus College  
Claremont University Consortium Pasadena City College  
Fuller Theological Seminary  
Mt San Antonio College  
Mount Sierra College  
University of La Verne

**Other**  
Miller Brewing Company
8-6.2. Notices of Availability

The following agencies, organizations and persons were sent Notices of Availability during the week of April 26-30, 2004. The list of individuals is in random order, based on the project mailing list.

State Agencies:
- California Department of Conservation, Office of Government and Environmental Relations
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Housing and Community Development
- California Department of Parks and Recreation, Environmental Design, Planning Acquisitions and Local Services
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- California Department of Water Resources, Division of Planning and Local Assistance
- California Energy Commission
- California Environmental Protection Agency
- California Environmental Protection, Air Resources Board
- California High Speed Rail Authority
- California Highway Patrol
- California Lands Commission, Environmental Planning and Management
- California Public Utilities Commission
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana River Region
- California Transportation Commission
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Rivers and Mountains Conservancy
- State Historic Preservation Office
- State of California, Department of Transportation (Headquarters)

Agencies:
- County of Inyo, Administrative Officer
- County of Kern, Clerk of the Board
- County of Kern, Transportation Development Engineer
- County of Los Angeles, Fire Prevention Division
- County of Riverside, County Executive Officer
- County of San Bernardino, Environmental Management
- County of San Bernardino, Flood Control Planning
- County of San Bernardino, Public Works Department
- County of San Bernardino, Public Works Department, Traffic
- County of San Bernardino, Public Works Department, Planning
- County of San Bernardino, Public Works Department, Transportation Design
- County of Ventura, Clerk of the Board
- County of Ventura, Transportation Planning
- Inyo Mono Transit
- Los Angeles City/County Native American Indian Commission
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Director of Facilities, Airports
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Flood Control Planning
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Transportation Planning
- Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning County of Los Angeles, Pasadena Glen Community Services District
- Los Angeles County Sheriff Department
Los Angeles County, Department of Parks and Recreation  
Los Angeles World Airports  
Orange County Transportation Authority  
Riverside County Transportation Commission  
Riverside Transit Authority, Transportation and Land Management Agency  
San Bernardino Transportation Commission  
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
Ventura County Board of Supervisors, Clerk of the Board Division  
Ventura County Transportation Commission.

Individuals and Organizations (from mailing list):
  
  CBG Trademark LLC, Joel C. Bryant,
  City of Claremont, Craig L. Bradshaw
  City of La Verne, Arlene B. Andrew, AICP
  Dorothy Fleck
  California State University at Pomona, Dr. Tomas Morales
  Sierra Club, Los Angeles Chapter, Daniel Walker
  RJ Sarasua
  Helen Morales
  Alexander Zajac
  Highland Oaks Home Association, Jim McKellar
  Jackie Glover
  Raymond Fleck
  Louise Bigley
  Steven M. Rogers
  Margie Hernandez
  Xido Ling
  Philip Young
  City of Pasadena, Eric Shen
  Bert & Bo Sawyer
  Ralph I. Roth
  Yueh-Shen Failing
  Gail Nash
  Ling Xue
  John Jay Ulloth
  Murray Roth
  Paul Greenwood
  Charles Mountain
  Doug Failing
  Mary Dougherty
  Robert Canto
  Dirk & Sharon Hudson
  Jon & Lomita Benken
  ACE, Paul Hubler
  GLT, Laura Anla
  Onyx Architects, Dale Brown
  USDA Forest Service, Sonja Bergdahl
  New Life International, Leonard Karsana
  Arcadia Chamber of Commerce, Beth Costanza
  Nancy Fu
  City of Arcadia, Don Penman
Betty Willis
S. Issa
M. Humphrey
Joel Humphrey
Travis Dixon
Volcan, Rick Hofmans
Catalina Pineda
Northeast Observer, Margaret Arnold
Kim Chan
Hugh K. Myers
Homer Wilcox
Buzz Spellman
Robert L. Davis
City of Monrovia, Steve Sizemore
Diane Barlow
Keno Baca
Robert Powell
Charles Coyer
Henry Boradbrut
Peter Lill
Elisabeth Karsana
Bob Herdly
City of Duarte, Jason Golding
Don Schuil
Dorothy Fleck
Sean Skehean
City of Irwindale, Camille Diaz
Raub & Susan Mathas
Matt Walleok
Aicanoo & Gladys Silva
SCRRRA/Metrolink, Deadra Knox
Bob Hoherd
Mike Tkach
Hans Faber
South Pasadena City Council, Blue Line Construction Authority
Foothill Village, Joyce Gruman
Gil Gonzalez
Roland Sammelman
City of Azusa, Dick Stanford
Richard Klingbail
Citrus College, Mike Hillman
Monique Clemmer
Denise Bertone
San Dimas, Krishna Patel
City Council, Jeff Templeman
Nancy Floyd
Al Leigia
Judy Miller
Shanin Behdin
Brad R
William Emerson
David Margrave
Cobrar Rosse
Gold Line Committee Member, Robert H. Olander II
Baldwin Park, Kara Bonton
Ron Ketcham
Thomas Thornton
Gary Kift
Mark R. Johnston
City of Azusa, Larry Onaga
Foothill Village HOA, Marilyn Nixon
Cindy Bierman
City of San Dimas, Shari Garwack
John Marci
David Oosterhof
Jill Jones
Jim Nizolek
Foothill Christian Cente, Bernice Lowell
Catherine Thornton
Foothill Village, Helen Baerd
City of San Dimas, Mark McAvoy
Mullin Consulting, Victoria IB Hernandez
Janet & Ion Iliff
Jacquelin Macri
Lyn Frozier
J. Stipanuh
Judith B. Musatto
Robert Chang
Arlene Andrew
Cecil A. Karstensen
Sharon L. Caldwell
Jerry L. Voorhis
Andrea Harrington
Bob Tener
Citrus College, Micahel Viera
William R. Musatto
Union Pacific RR, Dan Caldwell
City of Pomona, David Nelson
Margot McDonald
Victun Koenig
Kim Denes
Chris Denes
City of Claremont, Planning Division, Chris Veirs
Karen Rosenthal
Montclair Council, Bill Raul
Fairplex, Dwight Richards
Geri Silveira
Ross R. Moore, Jr.
Al Leiga
City of Montclair, Mike Hudson
Beanica & Dan McCarthy
Steve Schulz
Jeluce Lince
Jeff Davidson  
Alan Robinson  
Gpoku Acheampong  
Jess Johannsen  
Anthony Madrid  
Anne McLoughlin  
Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden, Clem Hamilton  
T. Willard Hunter  
Phyllis Frazer  
Jim Cavener  
E. Piraino  
Charles Woolf  
J. Miller  
Albert Colon  
Transportation & Land Use Collaborative, Katherine Perez  
City of South Pasadena, Karen Heit  
Zack Electronics Inc., Dennis J. Awad  
Golden Oaks, Betty Smith  
Lynne Heffley  
Charles & Nancy Mountain  
Joanne Nuckols  
Dale Hanover  
Robert Nowiaki  
Alice Harris  
Friends 4 Expo Transit, Gerald J. Pass  
Dominique Heffley  
Mount Washington Association, Gold Line Committee, Paul Ahrens  
Nancy Sole  
Pacific Railroad Society, Richard Finley  
Citizens for Better Mobility, Craig F. Thompson  
Jesus B. Castilo  
Raymond Lu  
Elliott Caine  
Lorraine Baldwin  
Marshall Lew  
John Stallkamp  
Richard Rosich  
Abbott Laboratories, Eddie L. Thomas  
ERHA, John Heller  
PRS, William E. Coleman  
Larry McGrail  
Honk Friczo  
City of South Pasadena, Mike Ten  
Mac Teverbaugh  
Ellen Fusco  
Gary Gutt  
Frank Sele  
Paul Gedigian  
California Democratic Party, William D. Zuke  
Citizens for Better Mobility, Harold Leacock  
Tom Nelson
B. Szabo Inc.
Alan K. Weeks
Beatrice Siev
Algird Leiga
Richard, Watson & Gershon, Steven Dorsey & Mike Estrada
Paul Ahrens
David Margrave
Michael A. Cacciotti
Brown, Winfield & Canzoneri, Ken Brown
South Pasadena Review, Bill Glazier
Lewis & Company, Michael Lewis
Gilchrist & Rutter, Amy Freilich
LA Mayor's Office of Minority Business Opportunity Committee, Tina Ton
Padilla & Associates, Melanie Holquin
Carter & Burgess, Inc., Joe Siebold/Sheila Given
Los Angeles Times, Kurt Streeter
Robinson & Pearman, Robert Pearman
Rail Passenger Assoc. of CA, Richard Silver
Schafer Communications, Emma Schafer
Bayne and Associates, Bill Bayne
Gannett Fleming, Sarah Lal
D’Leon Consulting Engineers, Domingo F. Leon, P.E.
James Washington, Jr.
South Pasadena Review Bill Glazier
Mary E. Dougherty
R.L. Hoherd
Esther Monreal
Octavio Chaidez
Lourdes Palacios
Dennis J. Awad
David Oosterhof
Robert Sarasua
Consuelo Martinez
Nereen Guirguis
Gerald Delker
Steve Edwards
Sam Sammelman
Jim Nizolek
Stanton & Estelle Smith
Steve Slaky
George Stamp
Karl Felcher
James & Marilyn Nixon
Marshall Mouw
Mary Kay Watson
Roy Schall
Marianne Delia
Richard Marvin
Tina & Laura Gregoire
Michelle Godfrey
Bruce Danielson
Jolie Elman
Idella Cloutman
Mark Miller
Peter Lin
Ella Graffins
Jeff Morton
Phil Currie
Jane Singleton
Rick Mc Alpin
City of La Verne, LD Johnson
City of La Verne, Don Kendrick
City of La Verne, Hal G. Fredricks
Inland Valley Times, Paul Anderson
Pomona Fairplex, Jack Moriarty
University of La Verne, Brian Worley
Benjamin Sandoval
Doug Kregill
John & Eula Gibson
Betty Kalowski
Ron Padilla
Geri Silveria
Craig Walters
Bert Sawyer
Jackie Fehrenbach
Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority, Sharon Neely
SGV Economic Partnership, Frank Marquez
SGVCOG, Nicholas Conway
AARP, Tom Porter
Boeing Satellite Systems, Inc., Daniel Walker
Latin Business Association, Edgar Mejia
Automobile Club of Southern California, Carol Thorpe
Fannie Mae Foundation Western Region, Vera de Vera
Labor Community Strategies Center, Eric Mann
Weingart Foundation, Fred Ali
Department of Justice Community Relations Service, Ron Wakabayashi
Southern California Transportation Advocates, Pat Moser
Citrus Valley Association of Realtors, Bill Rush
Asian Pacific Policy & Planning Council, Executive Director
Communities for a Better Environment, Executive Director
Action Now, Executive Director
Asian Pacific Planning Council, Executive Director
Barrio Planners, Inc., Executive Director
Black Women's Forum, Executive Director
California Environmental Projects, Executive Director
California Public Interest Research Group, Executive Director
Center for Law in the Public Interest, Executive Director
Charro, Executive Director
Coalition to Bridge the Gap, Executive Director
Committee to Bridge the Gap, Executive Director
Community Coalition for Change, Executive Director
Community Coalition of Los Angeles, Executive Director
Concerned Citizens of South Central LA, Executive Director
Diverse Strategies For Organizing, Executive Director
El Sereno Organizing Committee, Executive Director
Friends of the San Gabriel River, Executive Director
Inquilinos Unidos, Executive Director
Korean Immigrant Workers Advocates, Executive Director
Livable Places, Executive Director
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy,
Madres del Este de Los Angeles Santa Isabel
Mexico Information Project
Morgner Technology Management, Carolos E. Morgner
Mothers of East Los Angeles, Executive Director
National Health Law Program, Executive Director
Natural Resources Defense Fund, Executive Director
North East Trees, Executive Director
Philippine Action Group for the Environment, Executive Director
Residents for a Better Alhambra, Tom Meehar
Soledad Enrichment Action, Executive Director
Trust for Public Land, Executive Director
Union Y Fuerzas, Executive Director
San Manuel Band Of Serrano Mission Indians, Executive Director
Citrus Community College District, Louis E. Zellers,
City of Hope National Medical and Research Center, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Azusa-Pacific University, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Claremont Colleges Consortium, Tim Morrison
Miller Brewing Company, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Los Angeles Botanical Gardens, Peter Atkins
Santa Anita Park, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Methodist Hospital of Southern California, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Santa Teresita Hospital, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Rainbird Sprinklers, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Monrovia Nursery, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Foothill Presbyterian Memorial Hospital Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
East Valley Hospital, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
University of La Verne, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Los Angeles County Fairplex, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Western University of Health Sciences, Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Lynne Goldsmith
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Lori Huddleston
Southern California Regional Rail Authority, Naresh Patel
City of San Dimas, Joe Yacca
City of Claremont, Chris Veirs
City of La Verne, Arlene Andersn
La Opinion, Mr. José Ignacio Lozano
LA Times, Mr. John P. Puerner
Pasadena Star News, Editor
Chinese Free Daily News, Editor
San Gabriel Valley Tribune, Editor
San Bernardino Sun News, Steve Lambert
Inland Valley Daily Bulletin, Editor
The Transit Coalition, Bart Reed
Sierra Club, Los Angeles Chapter, Executive Director
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition, Ron Milam
Samuel H. Dunlap
Beverly Salazar Folkes
Ti'At Society, Cindi Alvitre
Island Gabrielino Group, John Jeffredo
John Valenzuela
Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson
Gabrieleno/Tongva Tribal Council, Anthony Morales
Craig Torres
Coastal Gabrieleno Digueno, Jim Velasques
Gabrieleno/Tongva Tribal Council, Alfred L. Valenzuela
Concerned Citizens of South Central LA
Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians of CA, Susan Frank

8-6.3. Public Notices

Public Notices were published in the *Los Angeles Times* and the *San Gabriel Valley News* on Friday, April 30. The notices stated:

- the availability of the Draft EIS/EIR for review and comment
- the 45-day comment period
- the dates, locations and times of public hearings
- the locations of where copies of the Draft EIS/EIR were available for review
- the means available for submitting comments.

A Notice of Completion (a CEQA requirement) was submitted by the Construction Authority to the State Clearinghouse in Sacramento on April 27, 2004, along with a printed copy and 15 electronic copies of the Draft EIS/EIR. The NOC included a list of the distribution of copies of the Draft EIS/EIR, a list of persons, agencies and organizations receiving written Notices of Availability, and a copy of the Construction Authority’s Notice of Availability. Copies of the NOC were filed with the County Clerks of Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties on April 27, 2004.

A Notice of Availability was published by the FTA in the *Federal Register* on May 7, 2004.

Meeting Notification

Prior to the public hearings, notification of the meetings was completed to ensure active community participation from those interested and affected parties along the project corridor cities. The notification process included four main elements:

1. Database development
2. Notification flyers
3. Reminder post cards
4. Media advertisements
Public Outreach

Database development
In preparation for the distribution of the public hearing notification flyers and project newsletter a comprehensive project database was developed. This database totaled 34,130 records including the following categories:

- Parcel records within a block or two of the alignment (including both owner and situs records)
- Specialty city records used for other projects or purposes
- Ethnic and minority lists used by cities
- Resource agency list
- Scoping meeting attendees and other sign-in lists from previous meetings
- Elected officials
- Key stakeholders
- Phase 1 master database

Notification Flyers
Coinciding with the public release of the DEIS/DEIR on April 30, 2004, an official notification flyer was mailed May 7, 2004, to the large database outlined above. This direct mail flyer outlined all 15 public hearing meetings and the 45-day public comment period environmental process. The flyer also listed the repositories where the DEIS/DEIR document could be reviewed.

Reminder Post Cards
In addition to the official public hearing notification flyer sent May 7th, a reminder post card was sent one week prior to the public hearings for each city beginning in June. This city specific mailing ensured that the public was notified of the public hearings within a reasonable time frame of the actual meeting.

Media advertisements
As part of the effort to inform the public of the notice of availability to review the DEIS/DEIR and schedule of formal public hearings, advertisements were placed in major regional newspapers as well as local periodicals. In a coordinated strategy with the notification flyers and reminder post cards, the newspaper advertisements were placed during three main release dates to provide the best coverage and meeting notification. Legal ads were placed in the Los Angeles Times coinciding with the release of the DEIS/DEIR document and display ads were placed in all the selected regional and local papers informing the readers of the availability of the DEIS/DEIR for review and the schedule and location of public hearings. Ethnic newspapers were also chosen to provide the best coverage along the corridor.

Project Newsletter
During the development of the DEIS/DEIR a project newsletter was established to keep the community and cities informed of the project developments and upcoming events for the Metro Gold Line project. The first edition of the "Foothill Extension News" was released prior to the series of public hearings and was distributed to the same large database used to notify the public of the public hearings. In addition, the newsletter listed the public hearings for all the cities and the JPA meeting.
City Website Coordination
To better facilitate project information, the Construction Authority worked with corridor cities to link their websites with the Metro Gold Line project website. This link continues to provide users with a seamless way to transfer project information to their computers, including all the relevant information for the public hearings and environmental process.

Project Helpline
As a tool to encourage the public to follow-up on questions, concerns and comments they may have regarding the Metro Gold Line project, a help line was established to document these inquiries and provide a mechanism for the public to get project information. This helpline also served as a tool during the public comment period allowing persons with special communication issues to notify the Construction Authority prior to their attendance of the public hearings.