**Comment 98-58**

This condition does not change the impact assessments reported in the EIS/EIR.

**Comment 98-59**

The provision of safety programs would be the responsibility of LACMTA, to be implemented prior to the commencement of LRT operations. Although the ROD may include this provision, there is no need to develop and implement such a program prior to issuance of the ROD.
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Comment 98-60
The entire right of way will be fenced appropriately.

Comment 98-61
The locally preferred alternative was adopted and is not the TSM Alternative.

Comment 98-62
Costs for mitigation, which includes outreach efforts related to specific impacts (e.g., noise) are included in project costs.

Comment 98-63
Because the rail alignment is on an embankment adjoining the school, access to the right of way would be prevented by providing fencing along the lower edge of the rail right of way. The provision of fencing is a project element, not a mitigation measure. The precise location of soundwalls along the slope of the embankment has not yet been determined.

Comment 98-64
Please see revised Chapter 3-11.3 for a discussion of noise mitigation. The areas in which soundwalls would be provided have been determined by engineering station number and are reported in the Final EIS/EIR. The final locations of soundwalls within the right of way are subject to refinement during Final Design.
RESPONSE TO LETTER 98

Comment 98-65

The entire right of way, including areas next to schools, will be fenced appropriately to prevent unauthorized access. See Comment 98-59 regarding school safety programs. The potential for derailment of a rail vehicle adjacent to a school cannot be predicted, and under both CEQA and NEPA such an issue would be speculative and thus does not require discussion. The Foothill Extension would be designed to meet LACMTA, state, and federal standards for the safe operations of LRT and freight rail.

Comment 98-66

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the SHPO concurred that there would be no adverse impacts to the historic Colorado Street Bridge, which is the only bridge determined historic in the Foothill Extension project.

Comment 98-67

A mitigation measure to require design of parking garages undertaken by the Construction Authority within the APE of historic depots to be done in accordance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer has been added.

COMMENT 98-68

See Comment 98-67.
### RESPONSE TO LETTER 98

**Comment 98-69**

The referenced mitigation measures are defined in Section 3-5.2.6(a), Regulatory Compliance.

**Comment 98-70**

The regulatory compliance measures are federal and state standards.

**Comment 98-71**

Specific power sources will be identified during Final Design. Table ES-4 is part of the Executive Summary; detailed discussion of energy issues is provided in Chapter 3-6.

**Comment 98-72**

The Maintenance and Operations Facility would be designed to meet Green or Energy Star building standards where required by LACMTA Design Criteria or applicable codes.

**Comment 98-73**

The Energy analysis reports the information required, but has been updated to reflect a forecast year of 2025.

**Comment 98-74**

See response 98-73.

**Comment 98-75**

The No Build projects are listed in Chapter 2-2.1.1. There are no substantial construction efforts within the study corridor; most are service improvements or changes to the traffic management system.

**Comment 98-76**

For the Draft EIS/EIR, the Potential Design Solutions can be considered as potential mitigation measures for conceptual level design. The Final EIS/EIR reports mitigation measures associated with more advanced design development.
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Rescue from Comments
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Comment 98-77
See Comment 97-76.

Comment 98-78
The results of Phase 2 hazardous materials investigations are reported in the Final EIS/EIR in revised Chapter 3-9.

Comment 98-79
This statement needs no further justification; the premise for the conclusion is clearly stated: compliance with federal and state regulatory compliance and permits.

Comment 98-80
See revised Chapter 3-9.

Comment 98-81
This statement is correct as stated, in that the No-Build Alternative includes numerous construction projects, as outlined in Chapter 2.

Comment 98-82
This statement needs no further justification; the premise for the conclusion is clearly stated: compliance with federal and state regulatory compliance and permits.

Comment 98-83
The Final EIS/EIR reports mitigation measures associated with more advanced design development.

Comment 98-84
As stated in Section 3-9.3, Potential Mitigation, there are no impacts, and therefore there is no mitigation.
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Comment 98-85

Mitigation for the acquisition of property is defined in Chapter 3-1.2.6, Regulatory Compliance. All property acquisitions would be governed by the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policies Act. A cross-reference has been added in the land use discussion.

Comment 98-86

The location of parking in San Dimas has changed since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, the issue of acquisition and relocation would remain; see Comment 98-85.

Comment 98-87

The summary statement is built upon the preceding discussions of long-term impacts in each city, all of which concluded that there would be no long-term impacts because the cities have already accounted for the Foothill Extension and previously created or modified their individual land use plans.

Comment 98-88

Given that the proposed project is likely to be constructed under a Design-Build contract, the potential range of equipment to be used is too broad to support a typical construction period impact assessment. Instead, specific property line noise limits will be established to give the contractor flexibility and to help ensure that adjacent sensitive receptors are not exposed to excessive construction noise levels.
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3-10 Land Use

Page 3-10-47 Please identify mitigation measures for the two potentially significant impacts of providing parking facilities at an Arroyo station.

Page 3-10-48 Please identify mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of providing parking facilities at a San Dimas station.

Page 3-10-50 Please justify the statement that there would be no long-term land use impacts in Phase II, Segment 1 or 2 cities under the Triple Track Full Build LRT Alternative.

3-11 Noise and Vibration

General In Section 3-11-2.1, please include an assessment methodology for construction (short-term) noise and vibration impacts.

Page 3-11-15 Under subsection “a,” please provide complete references for the Manuel Padron & Associates plan and the prediction model specified in the FTA guidance manual (e.g., Sound 2000, TNM).

Page 3-11-16 The “Noise Impact Assessment Methodology” section states that: “The projections are based on noise measurements made on the Pasadena Gold Line Phase I light rail system in 2002.” However, the sentence following this statement reads: “The noise projections assume that the whistles generate a noise level of 76 dBA at 50 feet from the track for a five second period...” While there are measurements available (please provide who performed the measurements), please clarify why the maximum level of the whistle sound and the duration are assumed.

Pages 3-11-17 to 3-11-22 Section 3-11.2.2, Impact Criteria. Please provide the criteria based on which a significant construction noise impact would be concluded.

Pages 3-11-24 to 3-11-29 Section 3-11.2.4, Long-Term Impacts. The impacts analyses for all alternatives are provided for Categories 2 and 3 (referred to the FTA definitions in its noise impact criteria guidelines). One would conclude that there is no Category 1 land use along the entire project corridor; however, this is not clearly stated anywhere in this section. Please include an appropriate explanation.

Page 3-11-26 Under the first paragraph it is stated that: “...would increase by substantially less than 1 dBA, which is...” Please clarify how substantial an amount can be the range between 0 and 1 dBA.

RESPONSE TO LETTER 98

Comment 98-89

The Manuel Padron & Associates plan is the proposed operating plan for the Foothill Extension and is a Technical Appendix, in Volume X of the Final EIS/EIR. There is no specific model; rather, the FTA guidance manual specifies a prediction methodology.

Comment 98-90

Predicted train noise levels for the Foothill Extension are based on measurements taken of P2000 light rail vehicle (LRV) operating on Phase I of the Metro Gold Line in South Pasadena. Measurements were performed by ATS Consulting, LLC, the noise and vibration consultant for the Final EIS/EIR. The analysis assumes that the on-vehicle audible warning device (“whistle”) will generate a sound level of 85 dBA at 100 feet in front of the LRV. This assumption is consistent with both the California Public Utilities Commission General Order 143-B and previous measurements of the P2000 LRV performed by ATS Consulting, LLC at Metro’s Gold Line maintenance facility.

It was also assumed that the audible warning device would sound continuously starting either 300 feet or five seconds in advance of the crossing. This assumption generates a worst-case estimate since the audible device would likely not sound continuously but rather in a pattern. The maximum sound level of the horn (Lmax), the total time that the horn would sound at each crossing per passby, and the total number of train passbys were used to predict the Ldn from the audible device. This Ldn was then added to the Ldn for the LRV (i.e., wheel/rail noise) to determine the total noise level from light rail transit operations.

Comment 98-91

Please see revised Chapter 3-11 discussion of construction period noise and proposed mitigation.
Comment 98-92

A statement to the effect that there are no Category 1 land-uses along the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension corridor has been added to Section 3-11.2.4.b of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment 98-93

The text has been revised to delete the word “substantially.” Any increase of less than 1 dBA would not be perceptible.
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Comment 98-94
This comment does not relate to any wording on the cited page. The text in the Draft EIS/EIR stated the conditions that would create noise impacts.

Comment 98-95
On March 17, 2005, the Construction Authority adopted a policy to comply with local noise requirements during the construction period.

Comment 98-96
This section has been edited with the suggested change.

Comment 98-97
Impacts predictions and proposed mitigation are based on August 2005 conceptual level designs that are subject to further refinement during Final Design. During Final Design, data that affect the impact prediction process may change, such as the precise locations and grade of rails, switch locations, and the placement of grade crossing warning devices. If it is determined that crossovers cannot be relocated due to operational constraints, then moveable point frogs will be installed to eliminate the flangeway gap and mitigate the noise and vibration impact caused by the crossover. Accordingly, it is important to note that the calculation of impacts and specific mitigation measures reported in the Final EIS/EIR will be subject to further refinement.
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Comment 98-98

See Comment 98-43. Note that there are no speed reductions proposed as mitigation measures in the Final EIS/EIR. The existing audible devices on the P2000 LRV are directional due to their mounting location. This directionality has been incorporated into the noise analysis. However, a “directional” horn is not proposed.

Comment 98-99

Existing privacy walls were generally not factored into the impact analysis. However, if the existing walls meet the specifications for the proposed sound walls in terms of height above the top-of-rail, length, and material density, then mitigation may not be required. The effectiveness of these walls will be assessed as part of Final Design.

Comment 98-100

The structural feasibility of raising the existing privacy walls will be considered during Final Design. See Comment 98-99.

Comment 98-101

See revised Chapter 3-11.3 for the locations of proposed mitigation measures. Locations of remainder impacts are also described.

Comment 98-102

See revised Chapter 3-12, Railroad Operations, which indicates that MTA has sole rights to amend existing operating agreements.

Comment 98-103

Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, the LRT Alternative has been amended to eliminate potential conflicts between LRT and freight operations.

Comment 98-104

There is no statement that the Purchase and Sale Agreement is under the control of the Construction Authority.
The additional references have been added, but do not change to overview of operating conditions provided in the EIS/EIR.

The clarification has been added.

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Build Alternatives were modified to provide two rail grade separations so that LRT and freight operations occur on separate tracks. Accordingly, there is no impact to freight operations from the LRT operations.

See Comment 98-107. Future electrification of the freight line is a possibility, regardless of current BNSF policy.

The bullet states a condition of the Purchase and Sale Agreement. Subsequent state legislation creating the Construction Authority transferred the obligation for LRT construction to the Construction Authority.

The bullet states a condition of the Purchase and Sale Agreement and need not be edited.

See Comment 98-107. BNSF can discontinue service to individual customers at will. STB approval is required only if service over the entire subdivision line were to be requested.
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Comment 98-112
See Comment 98-111.

Comment 98-113
See Comment 98-107.

Comment 98-114
See Comment 98-107

Comment 98-115
See Comment 98-107.

Comment 98-116
See Comment 98-107.

Comment 98-117
See Comment 98-107.

Comment 98-118
See Comment 98-107.

Comment 98-119
See Comment 98-107.

Comment 98-120
See Comment 98-107.

Activities in Irwindale include more than storage of cars; the word “function” is appropriate.
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Comment 98-121
See Comment 98-107. The Double Track option has been eliminated.

Comment 98-122
See Comment 98-121.

Page 3-12-06 Section 3-12.4.1 should acknowledge need for MTA approval.
Page 3-12-06 Section 3-12.4.2 should acknowledge the need for MTA's approval and the fact that limited freight delivery hours may result in added costs to companies and require payment from the Authority for losses.
Page 3-12-06 Section 3-12.4.3 should be augmented to address cost factors involved before and after mitigation for double track. Further, it should address BCRRA comments regarding 4-track areas, including added costs/impacts/mitigations.
Page 3-12-06 The Draft EIS/EIR must recognize that to enable BNSF's current and future operations to continue on a freight operation only single track the following measures would be necessary:
- Construction of a new track with proper clearances with new bridges and appurtenances.
- Turnouts, crossings in LRT tracks and interlocking authorized by FRA and CPUC that would enable freight operations across the LRT track to serve industries.
- Replacement of 6000 foot-long siding now existing at Irwindale to another location within the BNSF network.
- CPUC order and FRA agreement would be necessary before construction.
Page 3-12-06 The first bullet should be rewritten to read: "Turnouts, crossing in LRT tracks and interlockings authorized by FRA and CPUC that would enable freight operations across the LRT track to serve industries."
Page 3-12-06 The third bullet should be rewritten to read: "A constrained operating schedule under which freight service would occur during non-revenue hours which would have to be negotiated with BNSF since it would be a drastic change from existing agreements."
Page 3-12-06 The second line of the final paragraph must read: "Fourth would be negotiated and settled by agreement with BNSF prior to construction."
Page 3-12-06 In Section 3.12.1-5, in the fourth line of first paragraph, replace: "storage of cars" for "function of transfer cars."
Page 3-12-06 In Section 3.12.1-5, in the first line of second paragraph, replace: "Turnouts and track crossings" for "switches."
Page 3-12-06 In Section 3.12.1-5, in the fifth line of the second paragraph, substitute "storage of cars for "function of transfer cars."
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Comment 98-123
A grade separation analysis was completed on the 43 grade crossings using Metro Grade Crossing Analysis Policy.

Comment 98-124
The text has been revised to indicate compliance with LACMTA policies and design standards.

Comment 98-125
MTA safety standards are being utilized for all design.

Comment 98-126
Although the comment does not change the meaning of the information presented in the EIS/EIR, the requested edits have been made.

Comment 98-127
The suggested change is incorrect.

Comment 98-128
Although the comment does not change the meaning of the information presented in the EIS/EIR, the requested edits have been made.

Comment 98-129
The comment does not change the meaning of the information presented in the EIS/EIR; no edit to the EIS/EIR has been made.

Comment 98-130
The description of LACMTA safety efforts is clearly stated to apply to all transit types, including buses. No edit to the EIS/EIR has been made.
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Comment 98-131
The requested edits have been made.

Comment 98-132
Although no specific reasons for the deletion are given, some edits to the EIS/EIR have been made to delete commentary.

Comment 98-133
See Comment 98-132.
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Comment 98-134
See Comment 98-132.

Comment 98-135
An impact assessment of police protection is provided under the discussion of Community Facilities and Services, Chapter 3-4. The impact thresholds stated are not defined under CEQA, and are not those selected by the Construction Authority, as the CEQA Lead Agency, to assess safety issues.

Comment 98-136
See Comment 98-135.

Comment 98-137
See Comment 98-135.

Comment 98-138
The impact threshold stated is not defined under CEQA, and is not one selected by the Construction Authority, as the CEQA Lead Agency, to assess safety issues.

Comment 98-139
An impact assessment of emergency response is provided under the discussion of Community Facilities and Services, Chapter 3-4.
### Commentary Letter 98

**Response to Letter 98**

**Comment 98-140**

No significant adverse impacts were identified, only potential adverse impacts. The EIS/EIR states that these potential adverse impacts would be reduced by regulatory compliance and the safety and operational standards of federal agencies, state agencies, and LACMTA.

**Comment 98-141**

See revised Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements, for a listing of all required acquisitions, including those needed for intersection modifications. Right of way needs are also shown on drawings in Volume 4.

The revised Chapter 3-15.6 (Impact Results with Mitigation) describes the resulting functions of intersections following proposed mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>98-134</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rather than the statement about the existing rail operations by MTA, a detailed statement of what the Authority intends to do to build a safe system would be appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>98-135</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The document should include a safety and security discussion under “Public Services – Police Protection.” The purpose of this section should be to describe existing and future safety and security services for passengers and the surrounding community, and to identify and quantify any potentially significant safety and security impacts associated with the development of the project. The CEQA thresholds would be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cause or create the potential for substantial adverse safety conditions, including: station accidents, boarding and disembarking accidents, right-of-way accidents, collisions, fires, and major structural failures; or substantially limit the delivery of community safety services, such as police, fire, or emergency services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cause or create the potential for substantial adverse fire/life safety conditions, including: vehicle fires, trainway electrical fires, station and facility fires, and smoke and toxic fume-generating fires;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cause or create the potential for substantial adverse security conditions, including: incidents, offenses, and crimes; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Substantially interfere with implementation of an emergency evacuation plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>98-140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The construction-period mitigation measures should specify the specific practices that would be the mitigation measures for the significant adverse impacts identified in the impact discussion. This same comment applies for “Long-Term Mitigation Measures.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3-15.1 Traffic and Transportation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>98-141</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is stated that “some right-of-way” may need to be acquired for the following street intersections:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Myrtle Avenue and Evergreen Avenue (210 EB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Myrtle Avenue and Duarte Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Irwindale Avenue and Foothill Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Irwindale Avenue and E 1-210 Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Irwindale Avenue and W First Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More information needs to be provided regarding the widths of these acquisitions, and the analysis of such potential land acquisitions should be conducted. If these acquisitions were analyzed in Section 3.3, “Acquisition and Displacement,” it was not apparent. CEQA Guidelines Section 15123.4.
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Comment 98-142
All mitigation measures would be the responsibility of the Construction Authority. Justification for the conclusion of less than adverse/less than significance is stated within the same sentence: "structures are typically 10 feet off of curb lines and thus would not likely be affected."

Comment 98-143
There is no page 3-15-138 in the Draft EIS/EIR. The discussion on page 3-15.119 adequately describes the construction period mitigation measures to support the conclusion.

Comment 98-144
See revised Chapter 3-16.

Comment 98-145
See Comment 98-144.

Comment 98-146
The suggested measure is included in a typical Work Site Traffic Management Plan.

Comment 98-147
See revised Chapter 3-17, Visual.

Comment 98-148
See revised Chapter 3-17, Visual.
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Comment 98-149

The Draft EIS/EIR states that the project would be designed in accordance with all required permits, including those of the LARWRCB. A Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) will be prepared during Final Design.

Comment 98-150

Modifications to the Build alternatives have eliminated potential impacts to riparian habitat. See revised Chapter 3-3.

Comment 98-151

The text has been edited to indicate that the existing rail alignment is within both Pasadena and Arcadia.

Comment 98-152

See revised Chapter 3-18.

Comment 98-153

No revised LACMTA Design Criteria have been issued. The Construction Authority has already conducted a station art and design program with the corridor cities, including selection of artists for each station. The Construction Authority shall continue to manage station design, including the inclusion of art, in conformance with the current LACMTA Design Criteria.

Comment 98-154

See Response 98-153.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment 98-155</th>
<th>Please see revised Chapter 5, Financial Analysis, for an updated discussion of project funding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment 98-156</td>
<td>See Response 98-144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment 98-157</td>
<td>A Scoping Report was provided on August 1, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment 98-158</td>
<td>The requested Scoping Report was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment 98-159</td>
<td>The requested information was provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comment 98-160
The requested clarification has been added.

Comment 98-161
Design has advanced only to the advanced conceptual level (August 2005). Note that the potential shared use of a track for LRT and BNSF has been eliminated. See drawings in Volume IV of the Final EIS/EIR. The requested details are appropriate for when the project is in the Final Design phase.

Comment 98-162
See Comment 98-161.

Comment 98-163
See Comment 98-161.

Comment 98-164
The note has been removed. See Comment 98-51.

Comment 98-165
The requested edit has been made.

Comment 98-166
Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the project was amended to allow LRT and freight to operate independently within the rail right of way.
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Comment 98-167
All design is being developed in accordance with CPUC General Orders.

Comment 98-168
See Comment 98-167.
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Comment 98-169
See Comment 98-167.

Comment 98-170
See Comment 98-167.

Comment 98-171
See Comment 98-167.

Comment 98-172
See Comment 98-167.

Drawing X-201, Sheet 1/13
Drawing Detail Section #5: Show guardrail or fence protection along outer edges of bridge structure adjacent to walkway.

Drawing X-203, Sheet 5/13
Drawing Detail section #20: U-shaped structures leading from the mainline to the maintenance facility require fire protection (MTA Fire/life safety design criteria 3.9.5).
Walkway lighting will be needed here also.

Drawing S-004
Bridge # Freeway Over crossing: A wet standpipe and walkway lighting are required on this structure (MTA Fire/life safety design criteria 3.10.4. and 3.10.5). Provide fall protection on outer edges of structure.

Drawing S-016 to S-032
San Gabriel River Crossing: A wet standpipe and walkway lighting are required on this structure (MTA fire/life safety design criteria 3.10.4. and 3.10.5).
Comment 99-1
The college’s support for the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative is acknowledged.
COMMENT LETTER 100

RESPONSE TO LETTER 100

Comment 100-1

The City of Hope’s support for the project is acknowledged. Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, changes in the proposed Duarte Station and parking have been made in response to comments submitted. Specifically, the proposed parking location shown 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. The City of Duarte affirmed in the February 22 action that the station location would remain at the same location as shown in the Draft EIS/EIR, which is across the street from the City of Hope campus. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives.
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Comment 100-2

During numerous meetings with the City of Duarte throughout the alternatives analysis and environmental process during the period 2000–2004, several station options were presented, evaluated, and narrowed down to the station location proposed in the Draft EIS/EIR. Options at Buena Vista Avenue and Mountain Avenue were discussed and sketch-level plans prepared, but the City and the Construction Authority agreed that the location near City of Hope would be the optimal location for a number of reasons; the key ones being ridership, freeway access, and limited impact on residential properties.

Comment 100-3

A discussion of the station location process was included in the Alternatives Analysis Report (AA) released in January 2003. The AA Report was one of the reference documents used to prepare the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, further consultation with the City of Duarte occurred subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR about station location. Detailed information about the city’s selection (affirmation) of the station site is included in the March 2005 Project Definition Report (PDR), which is an appendix to the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment 100-4

The Draft EIS/EIR does properly describe the project in that it defines a proposed station location. As stated previously, there was only one station location in the City of Duarte in the Draft EIS/EIR, the location of that station being defined based on numerous meetings with City staff during the environmental process. The purpose of a Draft EIS/EIR is not to pick a best option (or even to justify one); rather, it is to present the impacts related to overall transportation alternatives and of any location options for specific facilities.
Because the City of Duarte was able to identify their preferred station option prior to release of the Draft EIS/EIR, only one location was presented and analyzed in the report. With other cities that could not narrow down their station options prior to release of the Draft EIS/EIR, the impacts of each station option were presented objectively, with no discussion as to superiority.

Comment 100-5

This concern should be alleviated with the relocation of the parking facility to Business Center Drive, thus removing garage users from the City of Hope campus.

Comment 100-6

For City of Hope visitors and employees, a signalized crossing on Duarte Road would control access to the campus from the LRT station. Please see revised Chapter 3-13, Safety and Security. With regard to issues raised, please note the following:

re “security guards:” All LACMTA LRT vehicles and station areas are under the jurisdiction of Los Angeles County Sheriff.

re “lighting:” LACMTA provides station design criteria for all LRT projects within Los Angeles County. These design criteria include lighting specifications for the platform and station area. These criteria can be augmented if necessary to provide additional shielding so that light remains focused within the immediate vicinity of the station platforms.
re “traffic control and parking enforcement:” A detailed traffic circulation analysis reported in the EIS/EIR identified two intersections within the City of Duarte that will be subject to significant impacts by the implementation of the Gold Line LRT: Buena Vista Street / Three Ranch Road, and Highland Avenue / Central Avenue. Currently, these are stop sign-controlled intersections that are recommended in the EIS/EIR to be signalized in order to mitigate the impacts of the proposed project. On-street parking on Duarte Road is not currently monitored for enforcement by the City of Duarte, and they have stated that there are no plans to change this policy. Private property owners would be responsible for monitoring parking on their property, as is currently the policy.

re “maintenance:” The LACMTA will maintain the Gold Line Phase II stations and alignment following the completion of construction. The LACMTA currently operates and maintains three LRT lines (Blue, Gold, Green) and a subway (Red Line).

Comment 100-7
Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, proposed parking on the City of Hope campus has been eliminated, which changes the traffic impacts reported in the Draft EIS/EIR. Parking 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 resulting impacts to traffic from this parking location are reported in revised Chapter 3-13, Safety and Security. For City of Hope visitors and employees, a signalized crossing on Duarte Road would control access to the campus from the LRT station.
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Comment 100-8

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIS, the proposed parking garage on the City of Hope campus was eliminated. The closest construction in the vicinity would now occur on the rail right of way, more than 250 feet from the nearest City of Hope facility. See revised Chapter 3-11, Noise and Vibration, for a discussion of construction period noise and vibration.

Comment 100-9

Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIS, the proposed parking garage on the City of Hope campus was eliminated. Relocating the parking facility to off-campus would significantly decrease anticipated construction and operational impacts to the City of Hope campus. Construction hours would be limited to daytime hours, and specific approval by the City of Duarte. Information on measures to limit air pollution impacts during construction are reported in revised Chapter 3-2.2 and 3-2.3. Noise mitigation measures during construction are described in revised Chapter 3-11.2 and 3-11.3. A Work Site Management Plan will be developed for each station and parking construction area with the assistance of the cities along the corridor.
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Comment 100-10

See Response to Comment 100-3.

Comment 100-11

The Draft EIS/EIR meets the requirements of both federal and state environmental laws. Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), where adverse effects are identified, mitigation options are to be identified in a draft environmental document. There is no requirement to develop “alternatives” for specific types of impacts. Under CEQA, alternatives are required only when impacts are identified as significant after the application of mitigation measures. The Final EIS/EIR identifies and describes impacts for all required environmental topics, and reports those that are adverse under NEPA and significant under CEQA, the mitigation measures that will be implemented to reduce effects/impacts, and any remaining significant CEQA impacts.
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RESPONSE TO LETTER 100

Comment 100-10

See Response to Comment 100-3.

Comment 100-11

The Draft EIS/EIR meets the requirements of both federal and state environmental laws. Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), where adverse effects are identified, mitigation options are to be identified in a draft environmental document. There is no requirement to develop “alternatives” for specific types of impacts. Under CEQA, alternatives are required only when impacts are identified as significant after the application of mitigation measures. The Final EIS/EIR identifies and describes impacts for all required environmental topics, and reports those that are adverse under NEPA and significant under CEQA, the mitigation measures that will be implemented to reduce effects/impacts, and any remaining significant CEQA impacts.
The long-term parking impacts were analyzed and reported in the Draft EIS/EIR for 2025. These parking estimates, and the 2025 forecast in the Final EIS/EIR, are based on projected ridership for the Foothill Extension. It should be noted that the Duarte station is planned for a maximum of 250 spaces (PDR, page 4-13) and would be located west of the Irwindale station, which would have 700 parking spaces. The Irwindale site has good transit connections and excellent freeway access. Many patrons within the Duarte / Irwindale area are expected to use the Irwindale station because of these attributes. To the west, the existing Sierra Madre Villa Station, with nearly 1,000 parking spaces and excellent freeway access, will attract riders as well. We do not anticipate that additional parking facilities within the City of Duarte would be necessary based on the ridership forecasts. By locating the parking facilities off-campus, the City of Hope “reserve parking” will be less attractive to LRT patrons. Clear signage by both the Authority and the City of Hope would discourage improper parking.
Comment 101-1

The proposed project has undergone an Alternative Analysis phase in which various rail technologies, including DMU, were considered. That phase is documented in the revised Chapter 2, Project Description.

Comment 101-2

Your support for freight operations and the Triple Track Alternative of the proposed project is acknowledged. Subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR, the triple track option was selected for the area east of Irwindale. The proposed project has also been redefined to eliminate restrictions on the hours of operation of freight. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives.

Comment 101-3

Your support for the Garey Avenue option is acknowledged. Subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed project has undergone further refinement. In that process, the Gary Avenue station site was selected by the City of Pomona. Please see revised Chapter 2, Alternatives for more information.
The demand for parking was developed to respond to the forecasted ridership at each station. The ridership forecast considers the distance from which riders at each station along the line would be likely to drive in order to use the LRT service. For potential Rancho Cucamonga patrons, there are four LRT stations (La Verne, Pomona, Claremont and Montclair) that are considerably closer than the San Dimas Station. The City of San Dimas has selected a site west of Eucla Avenue, north of Bonita Avenue (PDR, page 4-30) to serve the city; no station at I-210 will be considered. The Eucla 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 a detailed description of stations elements, including near-term and long-term parking. Please see revised Chapter 3-15, Traffic and Transportation for an analysis of traffic and parking conditions around the stations. Parking policies at an LRT station will be determined by LACMTA. The LACMTA does provide for paid and non-paid parking at rail station locations. On-street parking is under the jurisdiction of each city in which a station would be located.

Comment 101-5

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). No station is planned for the Lone Hill area.
COMMENT LETTER 101

RESPONSE TO LETTER 101

Comment 101-6 Your support for the public outreach program is acknowledged.

Comment 101-7

Volumes 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR were available for public review at local libraries and city halls during the public comment period, as well as at the public meetings. At each public meeting, information on adjoining cities was provided.
Comment 102-1

The project alignment follows the existing railroad alignment, which transitions from the middle of I-210 near your residence. 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.
RESPONSE TO LETTER 103

Comment 103-1

The project alignment follows the existing railroad alignment, which transitions from the middle of I-210 near your residence. 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 104-1

The project alignment follows the existing railroad alignment, which transitions from the middle of I-210 near your residence. 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.
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Comment 105-1

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 alignment in the Claremont area has been determined to continue due eastward via the San Bernardino Metrolink alignment. The potential use of the Pacific Electric right of way that would have affected Claremont College properties has been eliminated from consideration.
COMMENT LETTER 105

RESPONSE TO LETTER 105

this serious oversight in the EIR document. Further, it is unclear whether OCR will be affected in any way by proposed property acquisitions since neither your maps nor narrative reference our property -- it simply does not exist according to the EIR. I request that OCR be contacted regarding the goldline's plan and that this omission be corrected with appropriate mitigation in the final EIR.
RESPONSE TO LETTER 106

Comment 106-1

It is recognized that you are adjacent to the rail right of way. In general, noise from an electrically powered LRT system is low, with noise impacts typically occurring only where trains run very near homes and/or where there are grade crossings and warning devices must be sounded. 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. 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.

The focus of environmental analysis under CEQA and NEPA is on the proposed project’s effect on physical changes (CEQA) and/or any economic or social effect that may cause a physical change (NEPA). Causal relationships between the proposed project and property values have not been established. Therefore, property value analysis as a result of the presence of the proposed project is not discussed in the EIR/EIS. Similarly, quality of life issues are not evaluated under CEQA and NEPA. However, the commenter’s opinion will be considered by the Lead Agencies in deciding whether, and under what conditions, to approve the proposed project.

Comment 106-2

The rail right of way is of sufficient width to accommodate 2 LRT and 2 Metrolink/freight tracks and there is no need to expand to the south. However, trees along the right of way line may need to be trimmed to provide sufficient safety clearance along the rail alignment. Please see revised Chapter 3-3, Biological Resources for how nesting birds would be protected.
Comment 106-3

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 alignment in the Claremont area has been determined to continue due eastward via the San Bernardino Metrolink alignment. The potential use of the Pacific Electric right of way has been eliminated from consideration.