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Comment 17-1
The revised Chapter 1, Purpose and Need, discusses future traffic conditions and transit options in the year 2025. Additionally, all environmental analysis was reevaluated to reflect 2025 conditions.

Comment 17-2
Stations are provided in each city through which the Foothill Extension would pass. The March 2005 Project Definition Report describes the station locations that were approved by each City Council.

Comment 17-3
The redevelopment of the Monrovia Gardens site is included in the forecasts of population, housing and associated traffic used for planning the Foothill Extension.

Comment 17-4
The proposed system would be operated by the LACMTA. The concern about operational issues expressed cannot be responded to by the Construction Authority.
Comment 18-1

No residential properties along Three Ranch Road will need to be acquired in order to implement the proposed project. Please see revised Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements, for a listing of the properties that would need to be acquired.
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Comment 19-1

No residential properties along Three Ranch Road will need to be acquired in order to implement the proposed project. Please see revised Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements, for a listing of the properties that would need to be acquired.
Comment 20-1

No residential properties will need to be acquired in order to implement the proposed project. Please see revised Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements, for a listing of the properties that would need to be acquired. Other potential impacts that may affect the neighborhood, such as noise and vibration and traffic, are discussed in other sections of Chapter 3. An overview of impacts is reported in the Executive Summary.
TRANSLATION OF SPANISH LETTER:

"I am concerned about the noise we are going to have when METRO Gold Line begins service and want to know if you are taking all steps necessary to reduce noise [related impacts]. We are also concerned about our particular house, in which we have lived, in Duarte, for 15 years. We would not want you to take our homes for construction [purposes] because we could not afford another home due to the fact that home prices have increased [significantly in recent years], and [house] payments would be [prohibitively] high for us.

We would appreciate it very much if you would keep our [comments in this] letter in mind."

(Spanish translation response follows English)

Comment 21-1

Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a complete description of how noise impacts were evaluated, where impacts occur, and how they will be mitigated, if found to be significant. In most situations, noise would be mitigated by providing noise barriers (soundwalls), in some locations by providing sound-insulating windows, or a combination of such measures. Translation of these chapters or other parts of the EIS/EIR is available if requested.

Comment 21-2

No residential properties along Three Ranch Road will need to be acquired in order to implement the proposed project. Please see revised Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements for a listing of the properties that would need to be acquired. Translation of these chapters or other parts of the EIS/EIR is available if requested.
Commentario 21-1

Favor de examinar el capítulo 3-11 como revisado (Noise and Vibration), para una descripción amplia de los efectos de ruido (cuando ocurren) y como fueron analizados, y las medidas que se tomarán para disminuir aquellos efectos (medidas de mitigación) si los efectos parecen significativos. En la mayoría de situaciones, los efectos de ruido serían mitigados por proporcionar unas barreras de ruido, o en otras localidades por proporcionar unas ventanas que disminuyan el ruido de afuera, o cuando indicado, proporcionando una combinación de estas medidas.

Una traducción de estos capítulos o otras partes del documento EIR/EIS están disponibles a petición.

Commentario 21-2

Ninguna de las propiedades residenciales en el Three Ranch Road se necesitan adquirir para implementar el proyecto proponido. Favor de examinar el capítulo 3-1 como revisado (Acquisitions and Displacements) para una lista de las propiedades que se necesitan adquirir para el proyecto.

Una traducción de estos capítulos o otras partes del documento EIR/EIS están disponibles a petición.
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Comment 22-1

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed parking location at the City of Hope has been moved to the north side of the railroad track, on an existing commercial lot, with access to be provided from Business Center Drive. The City of Duarte approved this parking location on February 22, 2005 (PDR, page 4-15). Pedestrian access to the parking and station would be provided from Business Center Drive, which links to Three Ranch Road.
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Comment 23-1
Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a complete description of how noise impacts were evaluated, where impacts occur, and how they will be mitigated, if found to be significant. In most situations, noise would be mitigated by providing noise barriers (soundwalls), in some locations by providing sound-insulating windows, or a combination of such measures.

Comment 23-2
The right to privacy is not a CEQA/NEPA issue. Nevertheless, the commentor’s concern will be considered by the Lead Agencies in deciding whether, and under what conditions, to approve the proposed project.
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Comment 24-1
Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a complete description of how noise impacts were evaluated, where impacts occur, and how they will be mitigated, if found to be significant. In most situations, noise would be mitigated by providing noise barriers (soundwalls), in some locations by providing sound-insulating windows, or a combination of such measures.

Comment 24-2
The right to privacy is not a CEQA/NEPA issue. Nevertheless, the commentor’s concern will be considered by the Lead Agencies in deciding whether, and under what conditions, to approve the proposed project.
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Comment 25-1
Your support for the project is acknowledged.

Comment 25-2
Station locations have been determined through consultation between the Authority and affected cities, with input from the engineering team, railroad agencies, and the public. Any new development of pedestrian or bike access that would link with Foothill Extension stations would be at the discretion of the city in which the station is located.

Comment 25-3
Parking demand for each Foothill Extension station was forecasted based upon expected patronage at each station. Parking levels for opening day service and to be in place by 2025 have been defined. As reported in the March 2005 Project Definition Report, each city has made a decision on the location(s) of parking and the number of spaces to be provided on opening day and in 2025. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives, for a detailed description of station design, including the number of parking spaces to be provided.
Comment 26-1

Your comment on the meeting is acknowledged.
Comment 27-1

California Public Utility Commission rules require that freight train horns be blown approximately one-quarter mile in advance of a grade crossing; this is an existing condition. By contrast, LRT warning devices would be sounded 20 seconds or 300 feet in advance of a grade crossing. There are also differences in the noise levels of train horns and LRT horns. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a complete description of how noise impacts were evaluated, where impacts occur, and how they will be mitigated, if found to be significant.

Comment 27-2

Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives, for a complete description of the proposed project and which sections will be at-grade or above grade. There are no portions of the alignment that are proposed for tunneling.

Comment 27-3

The proposed LRT trains would pass through intersections at higher speeds than freight trains and would not be likely to block intersections for more than about 45 seconds. Please see Chapter 3-15, Traffic and Transportation, for a detailed description of impacts and mitigation associated with traffic intersections.
Comment 28-1

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, Segment 1 has been redefined to extend from the Sierra Madre Villa station in Pasadena to Azusa. Previously, Segment 1 ended in Irwindale. The Final EIS/EIR addresses the resulting change in environmental impacts. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives, for revised descriptions of the proposed project.
Comment 29-1

California Public Utility Commission rules require that freight train horns be blown approximately one-quarter mile in advance of a grade crossing; this is an existing condition. By contrast, LRT warning devices would be sounded 20 seconds or 300 feet in advance of a grade crossing. There are also differences in the noise levels of train horns and LRT horns. The noise and vibration analysis considers these regulatory requirements and proposes mitigation where noise levels generated by the project would exceed the criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for the results of the analysis and mitigation.

It is important to note that your address at 927 E. Ada is more than 700 feet from the proposed alignment and the nearest at-grade crossing. At these distances, your property would likely not be subject to a noise impact as defined by the Federal Transit Administration and would not require mitigation.

Comment 29-2

The proposed LRT trains would pass through intersections at higher speeds than freight trains and would not be likely to block intersections for more than about 45 seconds. Please see Chapter 3-15, Traffic and Transportation, for a detailed description of how traffic intersection impacts were evaluated and mitigated.
Comment 30-1
Station locations have been determined through consultation between the Authority and affected cities, with input from the engineering team, railroad agencies, and the public. The Glendora City Council approved the station location to be 180 feet east of Vermont Avenue on February 22, 2005 (PDR, page 4-25).
Comment 31-1

Generally, light rail technology is quieter than other rail technologies because it runs on electricity. The locations that have the most potential for noise and vibration impacts are at-grade crossings where the train engineers must sound the horn, and bells must be rung to warn pedestrians and auto traffic that a train is approaching. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a complete description of how noise impacts were evaluated, where impacts occur, and how they will be mitigated, if found to be significant. No portion of the project is proposed to be underground.
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Comment 32-1
Your comment in support of the southern route is acknowledged. Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the southern station route was chosen as the preferred alignment. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives, for more information.

Comment 32-2
A pedestrian, horse and bike trail on the northern (Pacific Electric) right of way east of the proposed Montclair station is out of the scope of the proposed project and is not under the jurisdiction of the Lead Agencies.
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Comment 33-1
Rail service via Metrolink currently extends eastward beyond the Montclair terminus.

Comment 33-2
Safety considerations would preclude an equestrian trail from running alongside an LRT alignment.
Comment 34-1

The concept of a loop linking the northern and southern alignments at the eastern terminus of the Segment 2 was considered and eliminated. The southern alignment option was selected as the preferred alignment for the Montclair station. The City Council of Montclair approved the location of the station to be north of the existing Metrolink platform (PDR, page 4-47) and concurred with the southern alignment (PDR, page 4-49). Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives.
Comment 35-1
Your comment in support of the project is acknowledged.
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Comment 36-1
Your positive comment about the public hearings is acknowledged.

Comment 36-2
The terminus of Phase I was established by planning initiated in the late 1980s. The location of the Sierra Madre Villa Station in the middle of I-210 is required since that is the location of the rail right of way.

Comment 36-3
Rail alignments have been determined through consultation between the Authority and affected cities, with input from the engineering team, railroad agencies, and the public. Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the potential use of the Pacific Electric right-of-way was eliminated. Please see revised Chapter 2 Alternatives for more information.

Comment 36-4
Station locations have been determined through consultation between the Authority and affected cities, with input from the engineering team, railroad agencies, and the public. No need to grade separate the Pomona LRT station has been identified. The LRT station will be located north of the existing Metrolink station, linked by a pedestrian walkway. A grade separation analysis was completed on the 43 grade crossings along the entire alignment and resulted in intersection and crossing improvements to improve safety and allow optimal operation of the crossings and streets. A grade separation of White Avenue was not found to be warranted.
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Comment 37-1
Your comment in support of the project is acknowledged.
Comment 38-1

All stations, facilities, platforms, and trains are designed to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) as a standard part of the design process. Current MTA policy provides for discounted fares that can be obtained by disabled persons.
Comment 39-1

Funding for the project would come from a variety of Federal, State, MTA, and city sources. The currently proposed funding plan does not include new taxes. Please see revised Chapter 5, Financial Analysis and Comparison of Alternatives, for more information.
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**Comment 40-1**
Impacts that occur as a result of the operation of Phase I are not within the purview of this EIS/EIR.

**Comment 40-2**
Operation of the Phase system I is not within the purview of this EIS/EIR.
Comment 41-1
Station locations have been determined through consultation between the Authority and affected cities, with input from the engineering team, railroad agencies, and the public. In general, one station per city has been provided and this scenario produces adequate ridership to justify the line. Although more closely-spaced stations are possible, adding more stations would slow the overall performance of the line. Please see the revised project description in revised Chapter 2 Alternatives.

Comment 41-2
Please see Comment 41-1. The City Council of Arcadia determined on February 15, 2005, that the LRT station would be located at the southeast corner of N. First Street and Santa Clara (PDR, page 4-5). This is the same as Station Option A identified in the Draft EIS/EIR.

Comment 41-3
Additional stations in Phase I are not within the scope of this project.

Comment 41-4
It is assumed that local bus service would connect to new LRT stations. Please see revised Chapter 2, Table 2-6.
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Comment 42-1

All models used in assessing impacts in the EIS/EIR are approved by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for federally-sponsored projects. The criteria used to assess impacts in Phase I were not those of the FTA since federal funds were not used for the Phase I project. The frequency of trains passing through South Pasadena is not dependent on the Foothill Extension project. The frequency of trains will increase as a result of LACMTA’s Eastside Extension project, which includes planned peak headways of 10 minutes for service to East LA and the Phase I cities. The Eastside Extension project has been funded and is underway. The Foothill Extension is a proposed project that has not yet received funding.

Comment 42-2

Data inputs used in the models for noise and vibration for the EIS/EIR include existing, measured noise, and vibration data. The noise and vibration impacts in the EIS/EIR are determined using FTA criteria and impacts are reported on the basis of the incremental change between existing conditions and a future condition (proposed operation of the planned Foothill Extension, which begins in Pasadena). Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a discussion of the methodology.

Any increase in noise attributable to more trains passing through South Pasadena arises from the operating plan of LACMTA’s Eastside Extension, which is currently being built. The number of trains passing through South Pasadena if the Foothill Extension were implemented would not increase over the number associated with the Eastside Extension operating plan. It is important to note that Phase I was developed using LACMTA criteria, not those of FTA; that methodology was appropriate since no federal funds, which would have required use of the FTA criteria, were used for Phase I.

Comment 42-3

Analysis of current traffic operations (an existing condition) within the Phase I area is not within the scope of the proposed Foothill Extension project.
Comment 43-1

Your support for grade separation within the City of Arcadia is acknowledged. On February 15, 2005, the City of Arcadia approved a grade separated crossing at Santa Anita Avenue, with the incremental costs to be borne by the City (PDR, page 4-5). Train frequency varies by time of day, as described in revised Chapter 2, Alternatives. Please also refer to revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a discussion of bell and whistle use.

Comment 43-2

Station locations have been determined through consultation between the Authority and affected cities, with input from the engineering team, railroad agencies, and the public. The City Council of Arcadia determined on February 15, 2005, that the LRT station would be located at the southeast corner of N. First Street and Santa Clara (PDR, page 4-5). This is the same as Station Option A identified in the Draft EIS/EIR. The environmental impacts of potential aerial stations were initially disclosed in the Draft EIS/EIR and are also reported in the Final EIS/EIR.
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1. Lengthy operation hour
2. Frequent operating schedule
3. Station + bus-parking station
4. Plan A vs B vs C,
5. Traffic hour vs 

February 2007
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Comment 44-1

It would be impractical to mail all of the information presented at the public meeting to all residents.
Comment 45-1
Station locations have been determined through consultation between the Authority and affected cities, with input from the engineering team, railroad agencies, and the public. The station location in Glendora has been selected by that City to be in the downtown area. The Glendora City Council approved the station location to be 180 feet east of Vermont Avenue on February 22, 2005 (PDR, page 4-25). No station near the Glendora Marketplace is planned.

Comment 45-2
The commentor is correct that the Canyon City Coach program is no longer in operation.
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Comment 46-1

Your support for the project is acknowledged. The project schedule is largely dependent on the availability of funding. The first segment of the Foothill Extension project, revised subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR to extend from Pasadena to Azusa, is planned to be in operation by 2009, with the second segment from Azusa to Montclair planned to be in operation by 2014.
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Comment 47-1
Your support for the project is acknowledged.

Comment 47-2
Station locations have been determined through consultation between the Authority and affected cities, with input from the engineering team, railroad agencies, and the public. Any new development of pedestrian or bike access that would link with Foothill Extension stations would be at the discretion of the city in which the station is located.

Comment 47-3
Parking demand for each Foothill Extension station was forecasted based upon expected patronage at each station. Parking levels for opening day service and to be in place by 2025 have been defined. As reported in the March 2005 Project Definition Report, each city has made a decision on the location(s) of parking and the number of spaces to be provided on opening day and in 2025. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives, for a detailed description of station design, including the number of parking spaces to be provided.
Comment 48-1

It is noted that no comments were received at the Pomona public hearing.
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Comment 49-1
Your comment on the project is acknowledged.

Comment 49-2
Your support for the use of the Pacific Electric right of way is acknowledged. Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the potential use of this alignment was dropped from consideration. Train frequency past a particular location would vary by time of day, as described in revised Chapter 2, Alternatives. Please also refer to revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a discussion of bell and whistle use.
Comment 50-1
A member of the project team met with Mr. Morales to discuss his concerns about appropriate tribal representation.
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Comment 51-1

Your opposition to the train station being located at Myrtle Avenue and Duarte Road in Monrovia is acknowledged. Station locations have been determined through consultation between the Authority and affected cities, with input from the engineering team, railroad agencies, and the public. The City of Monrovia confirmed the existing historic station as the site for the Foothill Extension LRT station on February 15, 2005 (PDR, page 4-12). The LRT platforms would be located just west of the historic depot (PDR, page 4-9). The proposed LRT trains would pass through intersections at higher speeds than freight trains and would not be likely to block intersections for more than about 45 seconds. Traffic impacts have been analyzed for the intersection adjacent to the proposed station location with the train in operation. Please see the revised Chapter 3-15, Traffic and Transportation.
Comment 52-1

LRT vehicles would not stop on cross streets, only at stations. The proposed LRT trains would pass through intersections at higher speeds than freight trains and would not be likely to block intersections for more than about 45 seconds. A grade separation analysis was completed on the 43 grade crossings along the entire alignment and resulted in intersection and crossing improvements to improve safety and allow optimal operation of the crossings and streets. Grade separations in Monrovia and Arcadia were not found to be warranted under the methodology used. However, on February 15, 2005, the City of Arcadia approved a grade separated crossing at Santa Anita Avenue, with the incremental costs to be borne by the City (PDR, page 4-5). Please see revised Chapter 3-15, Transportation and Traffic for more information.
Comment 53-1

Construction of sound walls near the two property addresses provided is part of a Caltrans project. The construction schedule for that project is not tied to the proposed Foothill Extension project.
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Comment 54-1

Your address has been added to the project mailing list so that you will receive future notices regarding the proposed project.
Comment 55-1

Your support for this project is acknowledged. The proposed LRT would be extended as far east as Montclair.