

AZUSA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

1 at this time? Does the commission have any comments that
2 they want to make?

3 COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I look forward to the Gold
4 Line coming in to town. There are some issues that have
5 been answered tonight or we've addressed that we will make
6 good on it. I'm concerned about the number of trains that
7 come through and whether they have to blow a horn at every
8 crossing, and I would like that to get on the record as a
9 concern of mine for the noise that it would make.

PH 15-30

10 COMMISSIONER FLOWERS: Anybody else? Mr. Hanks.

11 COMMISSIONER HANKS: I'd like to take just a minute
12 and make a couple of comments.

13 As I read through the table on the Construction
14 Impact Summary in particular, there are a couple of
15 comments that I think are important. One of the
16 mitigations that is proposed or compliances with
17 regulatory requirements is voluntary compliance with local
18 regulations and guidelines. I think that we need to have
19 a formalized permitting process in our local cities and
20 agreements that are binding both on ourselves and on the
21 construction agency. There are several places through
22 there that this shows up. For example, ES 104, the first
23 mitigation, ES 107 and ES 108 respectively, the first
24 mitigations. We as a local city I think need to be able
25 to agree with what the limits of feasibility will be where

PH 15-31

19

PRECISION COURT REPORTING SERVICES (909) 981-1300

Comment PH 15-30

See revised Chapter 3-11 for information on noise impacts and mitigation. This analysis accounts for the number of trains that will pass through the city.

Comment PH 15-31

The Construction Authority adopted in March 2005 to comply with local noise requirements during the construction process. Other, similar cooperative efforts will be undertaken for the development of the project.

AZUSA PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

1 it states in here that compliance will be made with local
2 ordinances to the extent feasible. It is important to us
3 to be able to have input on that and an agreement on what
4 those limits will be.

5 I think the engineering standards of the design
6 need to include requirements for interfering utility
7 relocation without considering these relocations as
8 betterments or upgrades and to be done at no cost to the
9 local city. Where we have crossing utilities across the
10 tracks, fortunately we probably won't have parallel
11 utilities in Azusa, but we will have crossing utilities.
12 It's impossible to maintain a utility underneath a track,
13 and so we need to have sleeves installed with provisions
14 for maintenance activity and future repairs or replacement
15 as it may be required. As an example, ES 109, the first
16 impact, and it should become a requirement for the
17 Construction Authority to include whatever moves,
18 protections or sleeveings as part of their engineering
19 design, and so I move that as cost to the municipality.

PH 15-32

20 I think we need to have vibration reducing
21 designs for the noise and vibration sensitive locations.
22 This should be included as part of the engineering
23 planning.

PH 15-33

24 I have some other comments, but I'll provide
25 those in writing.

Comment PH 15-32

Utility relocation costs are included in the project budget. See revised Chapter 5.

Comment PH 15-33

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