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Comment 84-1

Information on right of way needs at the Santa Fe Basin was provided to the Corps of Engineers, beginning at a briefing on February 1, 2005.
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Comment 85-1

Please refer to Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a discussion of noise impacts and mitigation associated with the Foothill Extension project. Noise mitigation is proposed only in those portions of Arcadia where noise impacts are predicted to exceed the impact criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration. The locations where mitigation will be provided are reported in the revised Chapter 3-11 of the Final EIS/EIR. The “gap” will not be closed until the bridge needed to carry the light rail line from the middle to the south side of I-210 is constructed.
COMMENT LETTER 86

Response to letter 86

Comment 86-1

Please refer to Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a discussion of noise impacts and mitigation associated with the Foothill Extension project. Noise mitigation is proposed only in those portions of Arcadia where noise impacts are predicted to exceed the impact criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration. The locations where mitigation will be provided are reported in the revised Chapter 3-11 of the Final EIS/EIR. The “gap” will not be closed until the bridge needed to carry the light rail line from the middle to the south side of I-210 is constructed.
Comment 87-1

The noise conditions mentioned are existing conditions associated with freight and/or Metrolink train movements that are beyond the control of the Lead Agencies. It should be noted that safety regulations promulgated by the California Public Utilities Commission require trains to sound horns a quarter-mile in advance of grade crossings.

The EIS/EIR reports the noise impact associated with the proposed light rail project that would be built on the same rail right of way as the existing freight and Metrolink lines. The noise impact analysis accounts for the noise levels of these existing trains and the proposed light rail. Where noise levels are forecasted to exceed the impact criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration, mitigation will be provided. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for more information.
Comment 88-1
Your support for the proposed project is acknowledged.

Comment 88-2
Your comment on the public hearings is appreciated.
Comment 88-3
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. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives, for a detailed description of station design, including the number of parking spaces to be provided.

Comment 88-4
Any new development of transit services that link with Foothill Extension LRT stations would be at the discretion of the city in which the station is located.

Comment 88-5
The EIS/EIR reports the noise impact associated with the proposed light rail project that would be built on the same rail right of way as the existing freight and Metrolink lines. The noise impact analysis accounts for the noise levels of these existing trains and the proposed light rail. Where noise levels are forecast to exceed the impact criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration, mitigation will be provided. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for more information.

Comment 88-6
Please see Comment 88-5.
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Comment 89-1

The comment period for the project was the 45-days prescribed by the National Environmental Policy Act and the Federal Transit Administration for an EIS and by the California Environmental Quality Act for an EIR. As detailed in Chapter 8, Public Outreach, public noticing for the Draft EIR/S occurred through the following media: newspaper advertisements, posting of notices at the Los Angeles and San Bernardino County Clerks, and through direct mail to more than 20,000 addressees along the proposed alignment of the Foothill Extension and along the alignment of Phase I. The document was available for review in local libraries, at the Authority offices, and via the Internet. All notices included information about the times and locations of public meetings at which comments would be accepted, as well as alternative means for submitting comments (mail, fax, e-mail, and via the Internet).
**COMMENT LETTER 90**

**RESPONSE TO LETTER 90**

**Comment 90-1**

The topics noted in the comment were each addressed in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see revised Chapter 3 for updates to these topics.

**Comment 90-2**

The EIS/EIR reports the noise impact associated with the proposed light rail project using the approved noise impact assessment methodology of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The effect of warning devices at grade crossings is included in the methodology. Where noise levels are forecasted to exceed the impact criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration, mitigation will be provided. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for more information.

**Comment 90-3**

There will be no sound barriers for the portion of Phase II within the I-210 freeway right of way since the alignment is located in the middle of the freeway and there are no noise-sensitive receptors immediately adjacent to the LRT alignment. With the absence of noise-sensitive receptors, the FTA noise methodology does not call for mitigation. However, the City of Pasadena is initiating its own studies of this issue and may provide mitigation for Pasadena stations that are located within the freeway right of way.

**Comment 90-4**

a) Pedestrian crossings of the rail alignment would be designed in accordance with ADA guidelines. The proposed intersection design of at-grade crossings also include pedestrian gates that would be actuated when LRT vehicles approach.
Comment 90-4

b) Warning lights and bells sound in advance of crossing gates descending. Stripes are painted on the street to indicate where a car should stop. It is a driver’s responsibility to comply with safety regulations.

c) See Comment 90-4 b. The functions of intersections near Huntington Hospital are an existing condition not within the study area of this EIS/EIR. It should be noted that LRT vehicles pass through an intersection in approximately 45 seconds.

d) An increase in the frequency of trains passing near Huntington Hospital is the result of operational decisions by LACMTA. It should be noted that proposed increases to 10 minute peak headways are a result of service upgrades planned as part of LACMTA’s Eastside Extension, which is currently under construction. Those proposed headways would be in effect prior to the proposed construction of the Foothill Extension.

Comment 90-5

All of the LACMTA LRT system is powered by overhead wiring and is a design standard that would be required for the Foothill Extension, subject to some variation in the appearance of the support poles. The potential impact to scenic vistas is limited to a narrow band along the rail right of way. Beyond that distance, the overhead wiring would generally not be visible. Also, the scale of the overhead wiring network, which is generally less than 30 feet in height, is insufficient to block the view of mountains. When seen from any vantage point along the alignment, the overhead wiring only affects views in the foreground and perhaps middle ground; it does not affect views in the background, such as the 8,000–10,000-foot heights of the San Gabriel Mountains.
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Comment 90-6

Parking demand for stations in the Foothill Extension has been forecasted based on, and linked to, the forecasted ridership in 2010 and 2025. It should be noted that the parking supply in Phase 1 was not developed using this methodology.

Comment 90-7

The proposed LRT trains 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 impacts associated with traffic intersections were evaluated and mitigated.

Comment 90-8

Signalized intersections were analyzed using Circular 212 (ICU) Planning Level method for signalized intersections, which uses the capacity of approaching lanes. The Draft EIS/EIR did not propose signal timing as a mitigation measure; rather signal phasing was used to mitigate, if appropriate. Examples of signal phasing are switching phasing from permitted to protected left turns, or providing a shared through left and changing from permitted to split phasing, or having an overlapping right turn phase.

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.

Phase I cities are existing conditions and are not subject to analysis in the EIS/EIR.
RESPONSE TO LETTER 90

Comment 90-9
All grade crossings in the proposed Foothill Extension would be designed in accordance with the standards and requirements of the California Public Utilities Commission, which has the primary authority and responsibility to safety issues. Grade crossings in Phase I cities are existing conditions that are not subject to analysis in the EIS/EIR.

Comment 90-10
The proposed Foothill Extension would be designed in accordance with ADA standards, which include provisions for accessibility for those with mobility, hearing, and sight impairments.
Comment 91-1

Your support for the proposed project is acknowledged.
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Comment 91-2
Your support for the Option B station site is acknowledged. 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 91-3
Your support for the reuse of the A.T. & S.F. station for the Monrovia stop is acknowledged. The City of Monrovia confirmed on February 15, 2005, the existing historic station as the site for the Foothill Extension LRT station (PDR, page 4-12). Restoration of the station has been undertaken by the City of Monrovia.

Comment 91-4
On February 22, 2005, the City Council of Duarte approved the station location to be across from the City of Hope (PDR, page 4-13). However, proposed parking was removed from the City of Hope location as shown in the Draft EIS/EIR and is to be located on an existing commercial parcel on Business Center Drive (PDR, page 4-13). Please see revised Chapter 2 Alternatives for more information.

Comment 91-5
The station location at Irwindale has changed from that shown in the Draft EIS/EIR. On March 1, 2005, the City Council of Irwindale approved the station to be located to the east of Irwindale Boulevard, with access to be provided via Montoya Street (PDR, page 4-17). The capacity of the Irwindale Operations and Maintenance Facility has been reduced from that reported in the Draft EIS/EIR due to limited availability of property. See revised Chapter 2 for further details.
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Comment 91-6

Your support for the historic A.T. & S.F. station site in Azusa is acknowledged. On February 22, 2005, the Azusa City Council approved the location of the downtown LRT station near the historic ATSF station (PDR, page 4-20). The proposed redevelopment on the Monrovia Nursery site is not within the scope of this project. Neither of the Lead Agencies has any role in that matter. On February 22, 2005, the Azusa City Council approved the location of the downtown LRT station near the historic ATSF station (PDR, page 4-20). On February 22, 2005, the Azusa City Council approved the location of a second LRT station, near Citrus Avenue (PDR, page 4-21). The proposed Citrus Avenue station location is intended to serve future development that is planned for the Monrovia Nursery site and to be within walking distance of Citrus College and Azusa Pacific University.

Comment 91-7

Your support and comments for the Glendora station are acknowledged. The Glendora City Council approved the station location to be 180 feet east of Vermont Avenue on February 22, 2005 (PDR, page 4-25). Transit oriented development in the vicinity of the station would be under the purview of the City of Glendora. All stations will have landscaping and bike parking. For a description of the Glendora station, please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives.

Comment 91-8

Your comments regarding the San Dimas station are acknowledged. Subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR, the potential station at the historic depot was eliminated from consideration. The City of San Dimas has selected a site west of Eucla Avenue, north of Bonita Avenue (PDR, page 4-30). This site was not included in the Draft EIS/EIR, but has been evaluated in the Final EIS/EIR. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives for more information.
COMMENT LETTER 91

Comment 91-9
Subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR, further consultation about station locations was conducted. On February 22, 2005, the LaVerne City Council determined that the LRT station would be located at the E Street location option identified in the Draft EIS/EIR (PDR, page 4-35). Parking for the La Verne Station will be located at the Pomona Fairplex. On February 22, 2005, the LaVerne City Council confirmed that parking for the LRT station would be provided at the Pomona Fairplex (PDR, page 4-35). Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives for more information.

Comment 91-10
The proposed LRT station would not make use of the historic Santa Fe depot at Garey Avenue. On February 28, 2005, the Pomona City Council selected to LRT station site near Garey Avenue (PDR, page 4-39); the Towne Avenue station option was eliminated from further consideration.

Comment 91-11
Since the Draft EIS/EIR was released, alternative layout options for the Claremont station were developed and studied to determine whether LRT, Metrolink, and freight service could be accommodated within the existing rail right of way. After consultation with Metrolink and MTA operations staff, these options proved not to be feasible. It has been confirmed that the Claremont station needs to provide for two LRT tracks on the north side of the Construction Authority-owned right of way with a center platform station, with two Metrolink/freight track and two side platforms on the south side. This layout was developed in conjunction with the City of Claremont, MTA, and Metrolink staff. The station layout would require approximately 30 feet of additional right of way on the south, between Indian Hill and College Avenue. Access to the LRT platform would be provided from the existing, historic Claremont Depot. Access to the Metrolink plat-
forms would be provided from College Avenue. Parking would be provided in a structure on the existing Metrolink parking lot. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives for more information.

**Comment 91-12**

There are no proposals to relocate the cited building as part of this project.

**Comment 91-13**

The LRT station will be located at the TransCenter to take advantage of the existing parking and to connect to Metrolink service. 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 91-14**

The City of Upland was included in the project study area.

**Comment 91-15**

The potential extension of rail service to the Ontario Airport would be the responsibility of the San Bernardino Associated Governments and local cities.
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Comment 92-1
The university’s support for the proposed project, and for the Citrus Avenue station in particular, is acknowledged.

Comment 92-2
Information on the university’s specific plan is included in Chapter 3-10, Land Use and Planning.
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Comment 92-3
Information on the City of Azusa specific plans covering university property is included in Chapter 3-10, Land Use and Planning.

Comment 92-4
Potential vibration impacts at Azusa Pacific University educational facilities were evaluated in Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration in the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation measures to reduce vibration levels to below the FTA criteria were also identified in the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for more information.

Comment 92-5
Drainage along the rail right of way will be analyzed during Preliminary Engineering to ensure that flooding along and adjacent to the alignment is prevented.

Comment 92-6
Construction noise impacts were evaluated in the Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, in the Draft EIS/EIR. Construction activities will be limited to daytime hours (usually 7 AM to 6 PM), and other noise-limiting practices will be employed to reduce potential construction noise impacts. Please see Chapter 3-11.3 for the noise mitigation measures to be employed during construction. Please see Chapter 3-2.3 for the air quality mitigation measures to be employed during construction.
Comment 92-7
Current regulations require the sound of warning devices in advance of at-grade crossings. For LRT vehicles, this distance is 20 seconds or 300 feet in advance of the crossing. No warning sounds are required for grade-separated crossings (new Palm Drive and Citrus Avenue). Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for more information. Mitigation measures to reduce noise levels to below the FTA criteria are identified in Chapter 3-11.3

Comment 92-8
It is assumed that both Palm Drive and Citrus Avenue would be grade-separated from the LRT alignment. No other grade separations in the area are planned.

(A duplicate letter was also sent, dated June 17, 2004)
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Comment 93-1
The EIS/EIR reports the noise impact associated with the proposed light rail project that would be built on the same rail right of way as the existing freight and Metrolink lines. The noise impact analysis accounts for the noise levels of these existing trains and the proposed light rail. Where noise levels are forecasted to exceed the impact criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration, mitigation will be provided. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for more information.

Comment 93-2
The EIS/EIR reports the vibration impact associated with the proposed light rail project that would be built on the same rail right of way as the existing freight and Metrolink lines. The vibration impact analysis accounts for the vibration levels of these existing trains and the proposed light rail. Where vibration levels are forecasted to exceed the impact criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration, mitigation will be provided. Please see Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for more information.

Comment 93-3
The potential visual impact of overhead wires is acknowledged and is discussed in Chapter 3-17, Visual Impacts.
**Comment 93-4**

The FTA technical assessment procedures for noise and vibration impacts require the recording of data with microphones and other instruments. This allows the assessment to be based on objective data, rather than subjective experience.

**Comment 93-5**

Residential land uses within 125 feet have the potential to experience temporary construction noise impacts. Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, describes the noise conditions that would be expected during construction, as well as mitigation measures that would be enacted to reduce construction-period noise levels.

**Comment 93-6**

Except under emergency conditions, or in circumstances requiring track changes when train movements are not occurring, construction would be limited to those hours allowed by the City of Claremont.
Comment 94-1

References to the 2001 RTIP will be updated to the 2004 RTIP in the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment 94-2

Notice of the project in April 2003 Intergovernmental Review Clearinghouse Report is acknowledged.
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Comment 95-1

The support of the Sierra Club for the proposed project is acknowledged.

Comment 95-2

Accommodations for bicycles are a part of the standard design process. Your comments regarding the need for a bike path along the route are acknowledged. However, because of safety considerations, such paths should not be in the same right of way as the rail line. Potential bike paths leading to the stations would be under the jurisdiction of the local cities and/or are included in LACMTA regional bike plan. Stations are designed to link to bus lines. Please see Chapter 2, Table 2-3 and Section 2.2.3.4 for the bus routes that are planned for connection to the LRT stations.

Comment 95-3

Your suggestion for reduced student fare is acknowledged. Ticket fares are established by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, which would be operating the proposed project.

Comment 95-4

Support for transit-oriented development is acknowledged.

Comment 95-5

Environmental impacts associated with noise and air quality are discussed in Chapter 3.

Comment 95-6

Station design issues relating to safety, landscaping, and aesthetics are
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COMMENT 95-7

We recommend that the Authority carefully design every train track / road grade crossing for maximum safety and minimal negative impact on overall mobility. Frequent stopping cross traffic to wait for the train will increase local pollution. Likewise, running Light Rail trains very slowly through some neighborhoods will reduce ridership, which will also reduce air quality. Avoid at-grade rail crossings of busy streets to improve safety and flow rate of both cars and trains. Crossing gates & signals should be designed, using best allowable FRA practices employed by other cities, to maximize safety and improve train speed. Grade crossing horns should be designed, located, and pointed to minimize negative impact on surrounding residential neighborhoods, while still meeting minimum FRA safety requirements.

For the locally preferred alternative, we prefer dedicating the entire existing right of way to passenger rail service solely, rather than trying to safely share Light Rail and freight together along the same right of way. The additional costs, safety issues, right of way takes, and environmental impacts of building 3 parallel tracks does not seem justified.

We support the overall Foothill extension project and building a new Gold line maintenance yard, as well. In the final EIR, please include any negative projected impacts on wildlife in the Santa Fe Dam Recreational Area due to the proposed adjacent maintenance yard in Irwindale (next to the Miller Beer plant). Please summarize any proposed mitigations.

The Sierra Club also supports building the proposed Exposition Light Rail from downtown LA to Santa Monica beach as soon as possible. To improve regional mobility, the Gold line should be connected to the Blue Line and Expo Lines via the proposed "Downtown Connector" under downtown LA.

To attract maximum potential ridership to reduce air pollution and to provide efficient passenger service, the Gold Line Foothill extension should be built all the way from Pasadena to Montclair and opened in phases as soon as possible. The Gold line should be extended east to link directly with MetroLink, in La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair. To provide convenient quick Light Rail to commuter rail transfer for thousands of east -< west commuters each work day.

We urge elected leaders and the Authority to approve the environmental analysis and seek rapid full funding to build this train project.

Thank you and good luck,

Daniel Walker
Co-Chair Sierra Club
Angeleno Chapter Transportation Committee

COMMENT 95-8

All grade crossings would be designed to meet CPUC standards. The proposed LRT trains would generally 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 impacts associated with traffic intersections were evaluated and mitigated. The horns and whistles that are heard at grade crossings are the result of safety regulations required by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). They have developed guidelines for pedestrian, passenger, employee and automobile safety in relation to rail traffic. Please see revised Chapter 3-3, Safety and Security, and revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for clarification regarding the regulations.

COMMENT 95-9

Biological impacts and mitigation measures have been studied for the Santa Fe Dam Recreation Area and can be found in revised Chapter 3-3, Biological Resources.
We recommend that the Authority carefully design every train track / road grade crossing for maximum safety and minimal negative impact on overall mobility. Frequent stopping for pedestrian crossings is not recommended. Likewise, running Light Rail trains very slowly through some neighborhoods will reduce ridership, which will also reduce air quality. Avoid at-grade rail crossings of busy streets to improve safety and flow rates of both trains and traffic. Crossing gates and signals should be designed, using best allowable PTC practices employed by other cities, to maximize safety and improve train speed. Grade crossing boxes should be designed, located, and painted to minimize negative impact on surrounding residential neighborhoods, while still meeting minimum PTC safety requirements.

For the locally preferred alternative, we prefer dedicating the entire existing right of way to passenger rail service solely, rather than trying to safely share Light Rail and freight together along the same right of way. The additional costs, safety issues, right of way takes, and environmental impacts of building 3 parallel tracks does not seem justified.

We support the overall Foothill extension project and building a new Gold line maintenance yard, as well. In the final EIR, please include any negative projected impacts on wildlife in the Santa Fe Dam Recreational Area due to the proposed adjacent maintenance yard in Irwindale (next to the Miller Bear plant). Please summarize any proposed mitigations.

The Sierra Club also supports building the proposed Exposition Light Rail from downtown LA to Santa Monica beach as soon as possible. To improve regional mobility, the Gold Line should be connected to the Blue Line and Expo lines via the proposed “Downtown Connector” under downtown LA.

To attract maximum potential ridership to reduce air pollution and to promote efficient consumption of energy, the Gold Line Foothill extension should be built all the way from Pasadena to Montclair and opened in phases as soon as possible. The Gold Line should be extended east to link directly with Metrolink, in La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair, to provide convenient quick Light Rail to commuter rail transfer for thousands of east-west commuters each work day.

We urge elected leaders and the Authority to approve the environmental analysis and seek rapid full funding to build this train project.

Thank you and good luck,

Daniel Walker
Co-Chair Sierra Club

Angeleno Chapter Transportation Committee

Comment 95-10

Support for a regional transit system is acknowledged. Potential connection of the Gold Line to other rail lines via the proposed downtown (or Alameda Street) connector is beyond the scope of this project, but are being studied by LACMTA.

Comment 95-11

The proposed project is assumed to be built in two stages. The first stage, from Pasadena to Azusa is planned for opening in 2009, with the second stage from Azusa to Montclair in operation by 2014. Connections to Metrolink service would occur in Pomona, Claremont and Montclair.
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Comment 96-1
Your support for the proposed project is acknowledged.

Comment 96-2
Energy use is examined in revised Chapter 3-6, Energy. Potential use of solar energy was not studied. The analysis conducted indicated no need for new electrical generating plants in order to supply the forecasted electrical demand.

Comment 96-3
Water use issues are discussed in revised Chapter 3-18, Water Quality, and landscaping and station design are explained in revised Chapter 2, Alternatives. In general, stations would not have lawn areas, only landscaped bedding areas.

Comment 96-4
The potential for relocating the deodar cedars located along the rail right of way in the La Verne will be explored.
Since the Draft EIS/EIR was released, alternative layout options for the Claremont station were developed and studied to determine whether LRT, Metrolink, and freight service could be accommodated within the existing rail right of way. After consultation with Metrolink and MTA operations staff, these options proved not to be feasible. It has been confirmed that the Claremont station needs to provide for two LRT tracks on the north side of the Construction Authority-owned right of way with a center platform station, with two Metrolink/freight track and two side platforms on the south side. This layout was developed in consultation with the City of Claremont, MTA, and Metrolink staff. The station layout would require approximately 30 feet of additional right of way on the south, between Indian Hill and College Avenue. Please see revised Chapter 2 Alternatives for more information.

Comment 97-2

The revised station concept defined in Comment 97-1 results in there being 4 tracks within the right of way, and a need to expand to the south. However, the expansion would not close Santa Fe, so access to facilities adjacent to Santa Fe Street would remain as they are under current conditions.

Comment 97-3

Property acquisitions would be governed by the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended (Uniform Act), which mandates that certain relocation services and payments be made available to eligible residents, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by construction and operation of transit-related projects.
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Comment 97-4
Please see Comment 97-3.

Comment 97-5
Expansion of the right of way to the south will require the removal of trees along the current south edge of the rail right of way. The Construction Authority will consult with qualified arborists to determine if trees can be relocated. If deemed feasible, the Construction Authority will cause the trees to be relocated to a location approved by the City of Claremont. If the trees cannot be relocated, their loss will be mitigated in accordance with the City of Claremont’s Tree Ordinance.

Comment 97-6
The estimated cost of construction is based on FTA and LACMTA policies and practices. The potential savings for alternatives methods is not included in the EIS/EIR.
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Comment 97-7
Please Comment 97-1.

Comment 97-8
No need for a construction easement at Spring Street Center has been identified.

Comment 97-9
Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a complete description of how noise impacts were assessed and where mitigation is required. The chapter also describes the type of mitigation required in order to reduce impacts to meet or be less than the FTA-established threshold for commercial properties.

Comment 97-10
Parking for the Claremont LRT station would be provided at the existing Metrolink station.
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Comment 98-1
The roles and responsibilities of various agencies under CEQA are discussed in the Executive Summary, section ES-15.

Comment 98-2
Please see revised Chapter 5 for an update on the financial plan for the proposed project.

Comment 98-3
All design is being developed in accordance with LACMTA design criteria. A grade separation analysis was completed on the 43 grade crossings using Metro Grade Crossing Analysis Policy. The Milestone 2 Detailed Analysis was completed on the 13 grade crossings identified as “At Grade Operation Possible.” The Grade Crossing Preliminary Hazard Analysis was completed for all grade crossings along the alignment and resulted in intersection and crossing improvements to improve safety and to allow optimal operation of the crossings and streets. Please see revised Chapter 3-15, Traffic and Transportation for more information.
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Comment 98-4

The EIS/EIR reports the noise impact associated with the proposed light rail project. Where noise levels are forecasted to exceed the impact criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration, mitigation will be provided. Since the approval of CPUC to minimize noise from warning devices (to levels lower than used in the impact analysis) cannot be assured by the publication date of the Final EIS/EIR, the impact analysis and mitigation reflects the standard noise levels of warning devices. The Construction Authority, in cooperation with LACMTA and corridor cities, would seek approval for minimization before construction is initiated. Please see revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for more information.

Comment 98-5

All issues and topics required for analysis of environmental impacts have been included in the Final EIS/EIR. Please see revised Chapters 1 through 8.
COMMENT LETTER 98

CONSOLIDATED COMMENTS OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY ON THE DEIS/DEIR FOR THE GOLD LINE PHASE II PROJECT

VOLUME ONE

Abstract

Page i The third paragraph states that the Authority Board of Directors will consider all comments prior to adoption of the Locally Preferred Alternative. As such, MTA will continue to review the DEIS/DEIR and may submit additional comments. 98-6

Page iii The Table indicates that the Technical Reports for the DEIS/DEIR are only available at the Construction Authority. We request extra sets of the Technical Documents. 98-7

Executive Summary

General The funding assumed in this report is speculative and does not reflect the commitment of actual programmed funds by MTA. MTA’s plans and programs do not currently designate the magnitude of funding or annual availability that is depicted in this environmental impact report. 98-8

General The assumption of funding from Senate Bill 314 of the State of California requires voter approval prior to any actual funding being available. This should be noted in the financial tables. 98-9

General The document should explain that under statute, the Authority cannot transfer any obligations to MTA that will affect MTA’s'facebook revenues. 98-10

General The document should acknowledge that MTA has no plans to acquire light rail vehicles for this project. 98-11

General Fails to explain, identify, or clarify role of MTA to review, approve or reject various elements of the Project. 98-12

Page ES-1 The document needs to state who will build and who will operate the LRT and clarify MTA’s role in the operation of the LRT once it is built. 98-13

Page ES-1 The Background section should explain and identify the nature of the relationship between MTA and the Authority. There is no discussion or explanation of the Property Trust Agreement, the role as Trustee, the nature of other agreements, or the role of MTA to review, approve or reject various elements of the Project. The document should explain ownership of ROW in Trust and MTA’s roles as third party/settlor. 98-14
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Comment 98-6


Comment 98-7

Additional sets of technical documents were provided.

Comment 98-8

Please see revised Chapter 5, Financial Analysis, for an updated description of funding for the proposed project.

Comment 98-9

See comment 98-8.

Comment 98-10

See comment 98-8.

Comment 98-11

See comment 98-8.

Comment 98-12

See comment 98-8.

Comment 98-13

This issue has been clarified in the revised Executive Summary.

Comment 98-14

This issue has been clarified in the revised Executive Summary.
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Comment 98-15

Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, the project has undergone further refinement. Pomona will have one station, near Garey Avenue. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives, for more information.

Comment 98-16

The Purpose and Need statement was developed to respond to transportation issues in the corridor with an eye toward FTA’s independent utility parameter, rather than connectivity.

Comment 98-17

Section ES-3.2, number 2 has been edited to include the connection to the Metro Gold Line in the western end of the corridor.

Comment 98-18

Please see revised Chapter 5, Financial Analysis, for an updated discussion of cost effectiveness.

Comment 98-19

Page ES-10 does include a discussion of HOV facilities as part of the Alternative Analysis phase.

Comment 98-20

The comment is not appropriate for inclusion in the discussion set forth in the EIS/EIR.
Comment 98-21
As stated in the Executive Summary, Section 4.1 Development of Alternatives, the BRT alternative was analyzed, but did not meet the project goals and objectives, and therefore was not carried forth into the EIR/EIS analysis.

Comment 98-22
The comment is not appropriate for inclusion in the discussion set forth in the EIS/EIR.

Comment 98-23
Refer to the revised Executive Summary. Parking facilities built with project funds will be managed by LACMTA, once transferred to LACMTA.

Comment 98-24
The Final EIS/EIR has been edited in several places to indicate that no additional rail right of way is needed for implementation of the project.
Comment 98-25

The graphic appropriately indicates there is more than one station option at some locations.

Comment 98-26

Station designs were based on standard safety criteria and LACMTA standards. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives, for a detailed description of station design, and Chapter 3-13, Safety and Security for a full safety analysis.

Comment 98-27

There are no existing rail station platforms, other than the Sierra Madre Villa Station, that would be used for LRT service.

Comment 98-28

Waivers will not be necessary based on updated designs developed for the Final EIS/EIR. Safety issues are discussed in Chapter 3-13, Safety and Security.

Comment 98-29

The correct reference should be the LACMT, not CPUC. The Executive Summary has been edited.
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Comment 98-30
The two grade crossings in Arcadia were analyzed using the Metro Grade Crossing Policy. Both intersections fell into the category of “Possible At-Grade Operation.” Additionally, a Milestone 2 (M2) Analysis (from Metro policy) was conducted for these grade crossings. With appropriate mitigation measures, both intersections would remain operable. 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, Traffic and Transportation, for more information.

Comment 98-31
The baseball diamond shown on the aerial is a private facility not subject to Section 4(f). Since the Draft EIR/EIS was released the proposed project has undergone further refinement. The Irwindale station location has changed, and is now on the east side of North Irwindale Avenue. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives for more information.

Comment 98-32
The Azusa-Citrus Avenue Station is now proposed as a center platform station, located between Palm Avenue and Citrus Avenue. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives for more information.
Comment 98-33
This section has been edited to reflect the discussions between the Construction Authority and LACMTA about the location and layout of the Maintenance and Operations Facility.

Comment 98-34
Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the project was revised to allow for independent operation of freight service within the right of way by providing two railroad grade separations. BNSF concurrence for parallel operation is not required.

Comment 98-35
Table ES3 includes two main columns on the left side, Alternatives, and Project Phase. Under the two columns are three sub-columns. The table has been designed so that one would place an X in the appropriate column that is being discussed.

Comment 98-36
There are no wetland impacts identified in Chapter 3-2, Biology, so accordingly no wetland impacts were included in Table ES-3.

Comment 98-37
Any applicable regulations are listed within their respective assessment sections, not where they may be applicable on a secondary basis.

Comment 98-38
The applicable stormwater regulations are mentioned on page ES-111; page ES-122 states: “see above.”
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Comment 98-39
Table ES-4 referred to long-term impacts; noise mitigation is assumed to have occurred during the construction period so that there would not be a long-term noise impact. Further, Mitigation would be implemented during construction so that potential long-term impacts are eliminated or reduced to less than impact thresholds.

See Comment 98-4 regarding minimization of warning device noise.

Comment 98-40
The reference to quadrant gates in Pasadena has been deleted from impact discussion of that city. The discussion of quadrant gates has been edited throughout the document to delete the reference to problem intersections. However, it should be noted that the proposed project includes quadrant gates, or medians and dual gates, at all at-grade intersections as a standard design feature.

Comment 98-41
Section ES-7.2.1 is a summary of impacts to the City of Arcadia identified in Chapter 3. Since no safety impacts to schools, parks or churches were identified in the construction period, there is no discussion in the Executive Summary.

Comment 98-42
Voluntary compliance with local ordinances during the construction period is a policy of the Construction Authority. Since it is voluntary, it cannot be ensured or enforced.
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Comment 98-43
Speed reduction is appropriate to include in the menu of potential mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR.

Comment 98-44
Dual glazed windows are included within the term “sound insulation.”

Comment 98-45
The project configuration during the Draft EIS/EIR included no section 4(f) impacts to Irwindale, so it was not mentioned in this section. However, revisions to the Maintenance and Operation Facility layout for the Final EIS/EIR do not affect the Santa Fe Dam Recreation Area, so there are Section 4(f) impacts, as discussed in revised Chapter 7 and noted in the revised Section ES-7.5.

Comment 98-46
See revised Chapter 5

Comment 98-47
Section ES-9, Proposed Findings already states that the project is not inconsistent with Executive Orders. See Chapter 3-7, Executive Orders for a detailed discussion.
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Comment 98-48
All 43 at-grade crossings in the project study area were analyzed using the Metro Grade Crossing Policy, and none warranted closure. 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, Traffic and Transportation, for more information.

Comment 98-49
The requested edit has been made.

Comment 98-50
Since the Draft EIR/EIS was released, the proposed project has undergone further planning. The potential multimodal center station has been eliminated.

Comment 98-51
The Traction Power Load-Flow Analysis was forwarded to LACMTA for review during the engineering effort to support the Final EIS. This information was also included in the Project Definition Report, transmitted in March 2005.
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Comment 98-52
This discussion has been edited for clarification.

Comment 98-53
Phase 1-level investigations were performed and reported in the Draft EIS/EIR. Phase 2-level investigations are reported in the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment 98-54
Since the Draft EIR/EIS was released, the proposed project has undergone further changes. The City of Hope parking lot option at the Duarte station has been eliminated.

Comment 98-55
Please see revised Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements, for an update on business displacements. Due to project refinements, there are no acquisitions of institutional lands.

Comment 98-56
See revised Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements, for an update on acquisitions needed for the project.

Comment 98-57
The provision of safety programs is the responsibility of LACMTA.