RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-51

See revised Chapter 3-11 for information on noise impacts and mitigation.

Comment PH 7-52

See revised Chapter 3-11 for information on noise impacts and mitigation. Where gaps in noise walls must occur –at intersecting streets- other mitigation measures would be provided.

---

they don't want it? Those are all of the comments I have. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KENDRICK: Thank you.

MR. FRICK: Good evening. My name is Curtis Frick. I'm a 50-year resident of La Verne down on Second Street. And I sense from the planning commission that there is sympathy to noise. That is a very impacted corridor down there as we live down there with freight trains, with Metrolink, and I'm not naive enough to think that there isn't going to be traffic issues with all of the building that's going on to the east, so from my standpoint living there, and I think as a city, we need to try to work it to our best advantage as far as improving crossings, sound walls, those kinds of things, we may in the process of doing this be able to make some improvements on what we have and help us with the noise that's already down there.

So in looking at some of the maps, I haven't spent a lot of time looking at it, there isn't sound walls all along our corridor. I'm on the east end, in other words, between maybe F to Garvey, I didn't see sound walls there, so I would hope that someone would take a look at that and we would have sound walls all along that corridor and not leave little gaps like we have on the freeway that have to go back and get to later, that someone would look at that all of the way through, and every decision that

---

It seems that there is a lack of clear guidelines for replacing missing text or asking questions as per the guidelines, as the content provided does not offer any additional information.
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you are making I can sense you are looking at sound
1 anyway, but we've got to take a look at each one of these
2 as we make some of the decisions that we make. Thank you.
3 MS. SILVEIRA: Good evening. I'm Geral Silveira. I
4 live on B and Second Street, and I have just four issues
5 to address if the train should go through.
6
7 The first I think most important is the station
8 location, mainly because of what the other gentleman
9 mentioned is the parking and noise and traffic. We are
10 already very heavily impacted by the parking noise,
11 traffic problems connected with the University of La Verne
12 which are ongoing, and I don't think it would be wise to
13 add to that. It seems like an initial just looking here
14 that the Fairplex would be an ideal location for it.
15
16 The other problem that I think is important for
17 the long term that Mr. Sanchez brought up is the
18 aesthetics, what's it going to look like. That corridor
19 in the time that I have lived in La Verne for the last 20
20 years has improved dramatically, the landscaping on Arrow
21 and whatnot. If you are going to put really ugly, ugly
22 wires and ugly walls, well, you know, it's ugly.
23 So I think the aesthetics are important.
24
25 And also the noise. We already have freight
26 trains down there, and I don't know if you guys remember
27 the old Lucy show where there is one scene where the train

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-53

The station location at E Street was approved by the City in March 2005.

Comment PH 7-54

See revised Chapter 3-11 for information about noise impacts and mitigation.

Comment PH 7-55

Parking for the LaVerne LRT station would be provided at the Fairplex.

Comment PH 7-56

The importance of the Deodar cedars to residents is recognized, as reported in revised Chapter 3-17, Visual.

Comment PH 7-57

Overhead wiring is a required part of the LRT technology. The appearance of noise walls will be developed in consultation with the City.

Comment PH 7-58

The effect of current freight traffic is accounted for in the noise impact assessment and in defining mitigation measures. See revised Chapter 3-11.
LA VERNE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

Comment PH 7-59

Information on impacts and mitigation for the issues of noise and vibration is provided in revised Chapter 3-11; about aesthetics in revised Chapter 3-17; and about traffic in revised Chapter 3-15.

Comment PH 7-60

The station location has been defined by City Council to be at E Street.

Comment PH 7-61

The support of Fairplex for the Foothill Extension is acknowledged.

Comment PH 7-62

As noted by the commentor, parking for the LaVerne Station would be located at the Fairplex.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

PH 7-59

PH 7-60

PH 7-61

PH 7-62
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-63

Coordination with Metrolink about ridership and operations issues has occurred and will continue.

Comment PH 7-64

The commentor’s perspective on the location of LaVerne relative to the region is noted.
LA VERNE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

1. goes south, and that's appealing I think to the travelers
2. and should be appealing to the city of La Verne is now you
3. become a change point and potentially transit oriented
4. development and that area becomes very viable.
5. So I wish to convey those points and the
6. willingness to work with the city in coming up with a
7. solution. Thank you.

PH 7-65

8. CHAIRMAN KENDRICK: Thank you, Dwight.
9. Anybody else?
10. Mr. WORLEY: I'm Brian Worley with the University of
11. La Verne. I don't speak entirely here for the university,
12. but I would like to voice support for looking at a working
13. relationship with Fairplex, certainly the university would
14. be interested in doing that. I know that money is going
15. to drive a lot of the decision making process on the
16. station location. I also have a question and that is what
17. is the process that we are going to go through in terms of
18. selecting the station location?

PH 7-66

19. Mr. FREDERICKSEN: It's an ongoing discussion.
20. We intend to have more meetings this month and certainly a
21. number before this year is through in selecting the final
22. alternative if you will if there is to be a final
23. alternative, and we expect the Fairplex to be part of that
24. discussion, we expect certainly the university to be and
25. the public as well, and there will continue to be

PH 7-67

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-65

See response to Comment PH 7-62.

Comment PH 7-66

The interest of the University of La Verne in cooperative planning is acknowledged.

Comment PH 7-67

The City of La Verne staff and City Council have been consulted about station location options. The City Council selected to E Street Option in March 2004.
Comment PH 7-68

The commentor’s perspective on the economic value of transit is acknowledged.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-69

See response to Comment 7-65 and 7-66.
LA VERNE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-70

The commentor’s perspective on ridership on Phase I is acknowledged.

Comment PH 7-71

Overhead wiring is a standard component of the LRT system throughout Los Angeles County.
Responses to Comments

LA VERNE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

1.
I just think having wires overhead is bad, and that's my only objection to it, because I think it's ugly.
And I know we have one group come in here and they were paid a million dollars to come up with this design and it was a fait accompli. It was a million bucks to prove something that somebody already wanted, and it offended my sensibility at the time. I happen to be a contractor. When I go into a city, they require me to put wires underground. So I think it should be required by government to put wires underground. Unfortunately it's not, so that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN KENRICK: Thank you.

Mike.

PLANNING COMMISSIONER SANCHEZ: I took some stray notes about listening to the public comments. I think a lot of them were very good and brought up some good points. Californians do love their automobiles, there is no doubt about that, and sometimes I think that as ugly as it might be, California might be better served by having double decker freeways than it would be by building light rail like this, but I do happen to agree with you, Al, that I think this is coming.

And my personal experience is a few years ago I broke my foot, I wasn't able to drive, and I had to take the Metrolink in to work, and those trains are crowded at
LA VERNE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-74

No response to this comment is needed.
LA VERNE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-75

See revised Chapter 3-2 for information on air quality.
Comment PH 7-76

See response to Comment PH 7-86.

Comment PH 7-77

One of the goals established early in the corridor planning process was to take advantage of existing publicly owned right of way. See Chapter 2.

Comment PH 7-78

No information about parking in Downtown LaVerne is provided in the EIS/EIR.
LA VERNE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-79

The commentor’s perspective on economic benefits is acknowledged.

Comment PH 7-80

The City Council selected the E Street Option.
LA VERNE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

1. parking lot also.
2. One adverse condition in my opinion would be the
3. Deodar cedar trees. I live on a street that has a lot of
4. them, I have grown to appreciate them, and I would love to
5. see those if they cannot be -- if they have to be taken
6. out, I would love to see something like that put back in
7. its place.
8. From Hemet to the West Coast including all of
9. Southern California, we have more densely population than
10. any other place on this continent in North America. We
11. have more people coming into California than any other
12. place in this country. We are going to get more crowded.
13. The population in the next 20 to 25 years is going to go
14. up 22 percent. Where are these people going to go? They
15. are going to go into our communities, and if we don't do
16. something to try and get these people to their jobs, we
17. are going to be literally standing still.
18. I think the one last issue that has to be a
19. primary concern which Curt Frick brought up and that is
20. the noise. I think it's imperative that special
21. consideration be given to those intersections and
22. everything that goes through those intersections so that
23. we can program and channel the noise to the intersection
24. and not to the outlying residential areas. If it's
25. industrial, commercial, I think that's one thing, but you

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 7-81

The commentor’s perspective on the need for mobility is acknowledged.

Comment PH 7-82

See revised Chapter 3-11 for information on noise impacts and mitigation. Where gaps in noise walls must occur –at intersecting streets- other mitigation measures would be provided.
MONROVIA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

MONROVIA, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 2004
AT 6:00 P.M.
---00---

MS. MAH: My name is Alice, last name is M-a-h. 336 Genoa Street, Monrovia.

I am really very concerned about the noise.
We are only about one house over from the railroad track.
I’m on the corner of Magnolia and Genoa, and so it’s very close to the intersection, and I worry about the horn every time when you pass by, and I don’t think I will be able to sleep if it comes by. Because I know where I teach in Alhambra, the railroad track is about three blocks away from my school, and a lot of time it gets pretty noisy and I have to compete with it, and I have to stop. I also taught at San Gabriel High School which is about half a block away from the train track. I definitely cannot teach when the train comes by.

So I was thinking I have up to 2009 to try to move away, and so he said I should talk to you and let you know my concern. I was very glad when they no longer used the tracks for any trains at all.

MS. SOWELL: My name is Lorraine Sowell, S-o-w-e-l. My address is 329 West Genoa Street, Suite 8, in Monrovia.
**MONROVIA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT**

1. I am concerned about the noise of the safety arms going up and down, but other than that, I’m in favor of the train being built, but I am real concerned about the noise because it’s going to be every ten minutes all day long, and so that’s what my concern is.

MS. NAZMI: My name is Gail Nash, 1412 Encino Avenue in Monrovia.

My concern is I live at the end of Encino, and there is currently a train bridge behind just north of my property, and so my concern is the noise level if there is going to be a new bridge constructed. Is that bridge going to require a signal, some kind of a tone when it comes over the bridge? The bridge crosses over the wash. Basically that’s my only concern.

(End of verbal public comments section.)

**RESPONSE TO COMMENT**

**Comment PH 8-3**

See response to Comment PH 8-1.

**Comment PH 8-4**

A new rail bridge across the wash would not require any warning devices. Warning devices are required only where there is street traffic.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-1

Both of the Build Alternatives discussed in the Final EIS/EIR would not include freight service west of Irwindale.

Comment PH 9-2

Freight service now exists west of Irwindale, but only as far east as Monrovia.
 Responses to Comments
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RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-3

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the project was refined to eliminate the need for 3 tracks west of Irwindale. See revised Chapter 2.

Comment PH 9-4

See Response to Comment PH 9-3. The attendant cost savings have been accounted for the revised financial analysis, Chapter 5.
A potential grade-separation in South Pasadena is outside the scope for the Foothill Extension project. Existing conditions are not evaluated. The increase to 3-car trains in Phase I of the Gold Line is an operating plan of LACTMA that would be implemented upon completion of the Eastside Extension, regardless of whether the Foothill Extension occurs or not.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-6

See response to comment PH 9-5.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-7

A standard plan for station design that meets LACMTA requirements would be provided and funded by the Foothill Extension project budget. Enhancements above that standard would be done as determined by each city.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-8

Alls stations will be designed to meet ADA standards.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-9

Parking forecasts were made that correspond to expected ridership in 2010 and 2025. See revised Chapter 2.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-10

See response to Comment PH 9-9. The costs for parking are included in the financial analysis in revised Chapter 5.

Comment PH 9-11

The forecasted increase in ridership for the South Pasadena station with both the Eastside Extension and the Foothill Extension, as reported in Chapter 2, is only 35 boardings per day. This increase would not be sufficient to generate a substantive traffic impact.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-12

See revised Chapter 5 for a discussion of funding and project elements. It does not include funds for improvements in Phase I.
**Response to Comment**

**Comment PH 9-13**

The Foothill Extension does not create impacts in South Pasadena. Impacts that may occur in South Pasadena as a result of additional trains or longer trains arises from implementation of the LACMTA operating plan for Phase I following completion of the Eastside Extension. This LACMTA action occurs independently of the Foothill Extension.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-14

The modeling used to forecast ridership has been approved by the Federal Transit Administration.

Comment PH 9-15

This issue is not within the scope of the Foothill Extension EIS/EIR.

Comment PH 9-16

Impacts associated with operation of Phase I are not within the scope of the Foothill Extension EIS/EIR.

Comment PH 9-17

See response to comment PH 9-16.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-18
See response to comment PH 9-16.

Comment PH 9-19
See response to comment PH 9-16.

Comment PH 9-20
See response to comment PH 9-16.

SOUTH PASADENA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

doing that, especially the last comment, I was interested
in knowing her address.

MS. ERVIN: She did give it.

MS. BALSAM: She did.

MR. HYLAND: My name is Gus Hyland, and I live at 913
Magnolia Street. I think there is a glaring omission on
this summary that was just referred to. I frankly think
there should be a title underlying quality of life, and
it’s something that those of us who live in this Phase I
have basically lost, and we’ve been promised all kinds of
solutions, but to this date, other than the changing of
the bells at a few of the intersections, nothing has been
done, and I don’t understand what the delay is, and I’ll
give you an example.

Mission Street and Meridian Avenue, there has
been a lot of talk about placing the guards parallel to
the tracks and eliminating the pedestrian guard on the
northwest corner so that people can reach the shops and
those buildings.

And then the most glaring problem for our
neighborhood is those god awful bells. Now, I don’t know
what it takes — what’s so difficult about lowering the
noise of the bell? Why don’t you just do it and give us
some relief. I realize this hearing is for basically I
assume Phase 2, but frankly, from my viewpoint, you’ve got
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-21

See response to comment PH 9-16.

Comment PH 9-22

Your support for the Foothill Extension is acknowledged.
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RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-23

No response to this comment can be made by the Lead Agencies.

Comment PH 9-24

See response to Comment PH 9-23
SOUTH PASADENA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS
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Comment PH 9-25
Impacts associated with operation of Phase I are not within the scope of the Foothill Extension EIS/EIR.

Comment PH 9-26
See response to Comment PH 9-25.

Comment PH 9-27
See response to Comment PH 9-25.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-28

Impacts associated with operation of Phase I are not within the scope of the Foothill Extension EIS/EIR. Information on the noise impacts associated with the Foothill Extension are reported in revised Chapter 3-11.

Comment PH 9-29

See response to Comment PH 9-28.

Comment PH 9-30

See response to Comment PH 9-28.
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-31
See response to Comment PH 9-28.

Comment PH 9-32
See response to Comment PH 9-28.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-33

Information on noise impacts and mitigation measures for the Foothill Extension project is reported in revised Chapter 3-11.

Comment PH 9-34

See response to Comment PH 9-28.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-35

The Draft EIS/EIR included and reported analyses of whether the Foothill Extension would create any “spill-back” impacts to Phase I; none were shown to occur.

Comment PH 9-36

See response to Comment PH 9-28.
SOUTH PASADENA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-37

See response to Comment PH 9-28. Issues associated with increased headways that may arise are the responsibility of LACMTA, the operator of Phase I.

Comment PH 9-38

See response to Comment PH 9-37. Note that changes in operating plans are not subject to environmental analysis.

Comment PH 9-39

See response to Comment PH 9-38.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-40

Impacts associated with operation of Phase I are not within the scope of the Foothill Extension EIS/EIR.

Comment PH 9-41

See response to Comment PH 9-40.

Comment PH 9-42

There are no elements of the Foothill Extension project that would be built in South Pasadena.

Comment PH 9-43

Information on air quality is presented in revised Chapter 3-2.

Comment PH 9-44

See revised Chapter 3-15 for traffic impacts in the cities in the Foothill Extension. In general, LRT vehicles would pass through a street intersection in about 40 seconds.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-45

The commentor’s perspective on the benefits of increased density around rail stations is acknowledged.

Comment PH 9-46

Changes in development around rail stations is under the authority of each city, which is responsible under CEQA for assessing impacts. The Construction Authority has no role in approving such development.

Comment PH 9-47

The Draft EIS/EIR identified a menu of potential mitigation measures for potential impacts that were identified in the Foothill Extension geographic area. No impacts to Phase I cities were identified, so no mitigation measures for these cities are needed. The Final EIS/EIR identifies specific mitigation measures for all impacts in the Foothill Extension geographic area.

Comment PH 9-48

Cumulative impacts are addressed in Chapter 4 of the Draft and Final EIS/EIR.

Comment PH 9-49

The Draft and Final EIS/EIR address each of the topics listed.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-50

The addition of traction power substations within Phase I is a project of LACMTA, not of the Construction Authority.

Comment PH 9-51

No response to the comment can be made by the Lead Agencies.
SOUTH PASADENA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 9-52

See response to Comment PH 9-51.
RESPONSE TO COMMENT

Comment PH 10-1

Signalized intersections were analyzed using Circular 212 (ICU) Planning Level method for signalized intersections, which uses the capacity of approaching lanes. For the analysis of unsignalized intersections, the HCM delay method was used. The proposed mitigation for impacts is typically to provide signalization. Once an unsignalized intersection was proposed for signalization, it was then subjected to the ICU capacity method.

PASADENA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2004
AT 6:15 O'CLOCK P.M.

CHAIR SIEGEL: Robert Wittry.

ROBERT WITTRY: Thank you. I haven't had a chance to read this document yet. I understand the close of public comment is next week. And, of course, I'm overwhelmed with this DEIR part of the City of Pasadena that we're looking at closing in less than 45 days.

My major concern with this particular document, without even seeing it, is the at-grade crossings. And primarily, my issues are noise, traffic, and safety. We already have a problem with the belts. We already have a problem with the at-grade crossings on Fillmore -- sorry — Glenarm, California, and Del Mar getting backed up three or four blocks, several light signals. Now we're talking about adding more trains, more often. And it's going to impact those three at-grade crossings. But we also have all the at-grade crossings that are in the extension area.

I don't think the IR properly addresses this. Part of the problem is, the intersections where analysts analyzed in the EIR's, typically with the ICU method — the Intersection Capacity Utilization method — of a traffic analyst, which considers how much traffic the