is far superior to compromising a neighborhood that's finally coming into its own after years of difficult growth. Build more beautiful, affordable housing on the property the City owns, or how about a park for the large group of youngsters who live on our street and in the neighborhood who have nowhere but the streets to play and recreate? G

H Please reconsider the placement of this M&O yard in Monrovia. The obvious and clear place for it is in Irwindale.

Sincerely,
Christina Cocumelli
Secretary, Las Terrazas HOA Board

Response to Christina Cocumelli

A) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

B) Although the commenter includes noise as a concern, the main point of this comment is the impact on property values. The purpose of an EIR is the determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. According to Section 15064 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines, economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as a significant effects on the environment. Therefore, while the comment does not raise any specific environmental issues, the concerns of the commenter will be considered in the overall evaluation of the Project by the Lead Agency.

Changes in property values would not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA (see significance criteria in Section 4.3.4.1 in the Supplemental EIR). However, it should be noted that comparison studies of the impact of 12 rail projects (including both heavy rail and light rail) throughout North America show that, in general, proximity to rail transit has a positive impact on property values. The increase in accessibility provided by new rail transit has been cited as a primary contributing factor in increasing property values (Roderick Diaz. Impacts of Rail Transit on Property Values. May 1999, APTA 1999 Rapid Transit Conference Proceedings Paper). While this study does not account for the effect of property values related to the proximity to maintenance facilities, it should be noted that the M&O Facility in Monrovia and the Monrovia LRT Station are within 0.5 miles of each other.

C) The M&O Facility is consistent with the policies and objectives stated in the City of Monrovia General Plan, which states that allowable land uses within the Station Square Transit Village Planning Area include “supporting [transit] parking facilities, a rider drop-off area, and other improvements supporting transit facilities.” All of the proposed facilities in Monrovia fit within this land use definition.

The proposed Monrovia location of the M&O Facility is located in an area already zoned as planned development (refer to Figure 4.2-2 and Section 4.2.2.2 of the Supplemental EIR).

The concern with property values is acknowledged. As noted in Response to Comment B above, changes in property values would not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA (see significance criteria in Section 4.3.4.1 in the Supplemental EIR). However, it should be noted that comparison studies of the impact of 12 rail projects (including both heavy rail and light rail) throughout North America show that, in

general, proximity to rail transit has a positive impact on property values. The increase in accessibility provided by new rail transit has been cited as a primary contributing factor in increasing property values (Roderick Diaz. Impacts of Rail Transit on Property Values. May 1999, APTA 1999 Rapid Transit Conference Proceedings Paper). While this study does not account for the effect of property values related to the proximity to maintenance facilities, it should be noted that the M&O Facility in Monrovia and the Monrovia LRT Station are within 0.5 miles of each other.

D) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues, but it is noted.

As the Gold Line Foothill Extension Project identified the need for a M&O Facility, available sites were identified, and each city was given the opportunity to accept or reject placing the facility in their boundaries. The City of Monrovia accepted. As a point of clarification, the City of Santa Monica recently accepted an M&O Facility.

E) Under future conditions, noise levels calculated for the M&O Facility using the Traffic Noise Model would range from 60.5 dBA Leq to 74.5 dBA Leq at nearby sensitive receptors. Given that the noise levels associated with the M&O Facility are estimated to be 56 dBA Leq and noise levels associated with traffic are anticipated to be 60.5 dBA Leq to 74.5 dBA Leq, it is in fact unlikely that noise from the operations of the M&O Facility (56 dBA Leq at nearest sensitive receptor) would be audible in relation to the noise levels associated with the future traffic.

The commenter is correct that operations at the M&O Facility would occur on a 24-hour basis. Per Section 4.4.1.3 of the Supplemental EIR, "Maintenance would occur on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis in three shifts. A swing shift time period, from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., would be the highest period of activity for maintenance operations." As such, noise levels from maintenance and operations would peak between 10 p.m. and 2 p.m. However, noise levels during this time would not exceed the 56 dBA Leq level as discussed above. According to Table 4.12-8 of the Supplemental EIR, existing nighttime noise levels at the corner of California Avenue and Duarte Road adjacent to the proposed M&O Facility were measured at 64.5 dBA Leq. Therefore, operational noise from the M&O Facility would not exceed existing ambient noise levels, and traffic noise would still be the dominant noise source in the Project area during nighttime hours after Project implementation.

F) As described in the Supplemental EIR, construction and operation of the M&O Facility in Irwindale (Alternative 2) has the potential to result in greater environmental impacts

relative to biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and geology and soils as compared to the proposed M&O Facility in Monrovia. As a result, the Construction Authority has determined that the M&O Facility in Monrovia is the environmentally superior alternative.

G) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

H) Refer to Response to Comment F above. This comment does not raise any additional environmental- or Project-related issues.

Margaux Vogel

From: Lisa Levy Buch
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 1:44 PM
To: Margaux Vogel
Subject: SEIR Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: bartd44@aol.com [mailto:bartd44@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 10:41 AM
To: Lisa Levy Buch; ssizemore@ci.monrovia.ca.us
Subject: That whistle is unbelievably loud

Dear Lisa

A I want to thank you, the Extension Authority and the City leaders for the opportunity to visit the Lawndale M & O yard last Saturday and to discuss the plans for the Monrovia yard. While the general operating noise level within the maintenance buildings and carwash of the M &O is not so much of a concern, the daily required testing of the gong and emergency whistle, which by the way is EXTREMELY LOUD, and the required whistling both when entering and exiting the carwash or any building ALL DAY, ALL NIGHT, EVERYDAY 24/7 365 is going to be significant and well above the 65 db quoted for the car wash in the EIR. We all witnessed the actual level during our tour at Lawndale and trust me, we will all be noticing it in the quiet of the night. That kind of noise is simply NOT Acceptable in a bedroom community like Monrovia. Even the residents in the upper end of town are going to hear these whistle tests. Feel free to confirm my assessment with Chris and Larry, I think they were impressed by the whistle. B

C While the yard plans are similar and Lawndale does have a very nice condo complex adjacent to the yard, there are some significant differences between it and Monrovia. In Lawndale the condos were built after the yard was up and running and they knew they were buying into the mist of a heavy industrial area with a huge Edison Substation on one side and a M & O on the other and no decent view in any direction. Here in Monrovia it is being added to the an established neighborhood after significant redevelopement with 30 plus new homes built and sold on Monrovista resulting in a vast improvement of the area. Hopefully more to come. The M & O with its labyrinth of tracks and overhead power lines will not be enhancing the views from the neighborhood. D

E Many of my neighbors, myself included are concerned about the effect of the project on the property values and marketability of our homes. During the next 3 + years I believe the impact on potential buyers will cause them to shy away from the entire portion of Monrovia due to the uncertainly of the impact on the area. Once they experience the daily whistle testing there will no longer be any uncertainly and it will definitely effect many blocks surrounding the site and effecting values for a major portion of the city. F

G I know that when we purchased our home in August 2009 this project would have been a huge consideration had had it been properly disclosed by the builder and realtors. For all future sales, disclosure to any new potential buyers will be required and they will definitely factor it in to their decisions to buy and prices offered, especially prior to completion, since the final product and its effect on the neighborhood is a total unknown. This will ultimately effect the Property Tax base in this end of town when we all demand a reduced assessed value due to the impact on home prices.

Please reevaluate the wisdom of locating the M & O yard in Monrovia. Irwindale must be a better location, at least in our opinion. H

Bart DuFresne
President, Las Terrazas HOA
405 Monrovista Av

1

Response to Bart DuFresne

A) This comment does not raise any additional environmental- or Project-related issues.

B) The City of Monrovia Noise Ordinance includes an exemption for "activities of the federal, state, or local jurisdiction while performing governmental duties." Because it is required for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) compliance, the train noise testing would be included under this exemption. Therefore, noise increases associated with train noise testing at the M&O Facility would be considered "exempt." Additionally, according to Table 4.12-8 of the Supplemental EIR, existing noise levels at the corner of California and Duarte adjacent to the proposed M&O Facility were measured at 68.2 dBA Leq. The City of Monrovia Noise Ordinance allows an increase of up to 10 dBA above existing measured ambient noise levels for 5 minutes per hour and 20 dBA above existing measured ambient noise levels for no more than one minute per hour. The noise associated with the standard horn (i.e., quacker) is expected to be 77dBA, and noise associated with the emergency horn is expected to be 87dBA. Both horns would sound for approximately one second within the facility's yard and only during the period of the morning when outbound trains are leaving the yard. The maximum number of train headway leaving the yard would be at 10 minute intervals in each direction. Even if the noise duration was for a longer period, it would be extremely unlikely that the noise from either horn would exceed the established levels. Therefore, the noise associated with each horn would not exceed the maximum permitted increases in noise levels as defined in the City of Monrovia Noise ordinance.

C) The M&O Facility is consistent with the policies and objectives stated in the City of Monrovia General Plan, which states that allowable land uses within the Station Square Transit Village Planning Area include “supporting [transit] parking facilities, a rider drop-off area, and other improvements supporting transit facilities.” All of the proposed facilities in Monrovia fit within this land use definition.

The proposed Monrovia location of the M&O facility is located in an area already zoned as planned development (refer to Figure 4.2-2 and Section 4.2.2.2 of the Supplemental EIR).

D) The concerns about potential visual impacts of the new M&O Facility in Monrovia on the community are noted. The design of the M&O Facility in Monrovia would adhere to the latest Metro Design Criteria Section 11: Yards and Shops and Section 4: Guideway and Trackwork as well as the City of Monrovia’s General Plan and Update. Text in Section 3.1 of the Supplemental EIR has been added to state, "All applicable Metro Design

criteria will be adhered to for the design of each Project refinement." The overall site would be completely enclosed by security fencing and retaining walls with landscaping on the outside perimeter of the fence. As noted in Section 4.1.4.2 of the Supplemental EIR, the fencing, wall, landscaping, and flat geography would limit views of the M&O Facility in Monrovia on the surrounding community and thus reduce "the visual impact of the proposed elements." Furthermore, the application of Mitigation Measures V-1 from the 2007 Final EIR and V-3 from the Supplemental EIR (Section 4.1.5) will further enhance the visual quality of the M&O Facility within the surrounding neighborhood.

E) The purpose of an EIR is the determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. According to Section 15064 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines, economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as a significant effects on the environment. Therefore, while the comment does not raise any specific environmental issues, the concerns of the commenter will be considered in the overall evaluation of the Project by the Lead Agency.

Changes in property values would not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA (see significance criteria in Section 4.3.4.1 in the Supplemental EIR). However, it should be noted that comparison studies of the impact of 12 rail projects (including both heavy rail and light rail) throughout North America show that, in general, proximity to rail transit has a positive impact on property values. The increase in accessibility provided by new rail transit has been cited as a primary contributing factor in increasing property values (Roderick Diaz. Impacts of Rail Transit on Property Values. May 1999, APTA 1999 Rapid Transit Conference Proceedings Paper). While this study does not account for the effect of property values related to the proximity to maintenance facilities, it should be noted that the M&O Facility in Monrovia and the Monrovia LRT Station are within 0.5 miles of each other.

F) Refer to Response to Comment B above.

G) Refer to Response to Comment E above. This comment does not raise any additional environmental- or Project-related issues.

H) As described in the Supplemental EIR, construction and operation of the M&O Facility in Irwindale (Alternative 2) has the potential to result in greater environmental impacts relative to biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and geology and soils as compared to the proposed M&O Facility in Monrovia. As a result, the Construction Authority has determined that the M&O Facility in Monrovia is the environmentally superior alternative.

Margaux Vogel

From: Lisa Levy Buch
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 1:46 PM
To: Margaux Vogel
Subject: SEIR Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Greg Shin [mailto:gregshin@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 10:59 AM
To: Lisa Levy Buch; ssizemore@ci.monrovia.ca.us
Subject: M & O Yard

Hello,

A I am a homeowner in the Las Terrazas housing community. I would like to voice my displeasure in the proposed yard north of our housing community. Please do not build it in monrovia. We are trying to make the area up and coming for future new home builds. Please build the new yard in irwindale.

Greg Shin
417 Monrovista Ave
unit B
Monrovia, CA 91016

1

Response to Greg Shin

A) As described in the Supplemental EIR, construction and operation of the M&O Facility in Irwindale (Alternative 2) has the potential to result in greater environmental impacts relative to biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and geology and soils as compared to the proposed M&O Facility in Monrovia. As a result, the Construction Authority has determined that the M&O Facility in Monrovia is the environmentally superior alternative.

Margaux Vogel

From: Lisa Levy Buch
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 1:46 PM
To: Margaux Vogel
Subject: SEIR Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Jeff Liou [mailto:jeffliou@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 11:56 AM
To: Lisa Levy Buch; ssizemore@ci.monrovia.ca.us
Subject: M&O Yard

Dear Lisa and Steve,

A My name is Jeff Liou. I'm a resident on Monrovista. You've been receiving some e-mails from our neighbors in Las Terrazas Homes recently.

B My wife and I are not sure that we fully share their particular concerns - chiefly, property value. Within reason and on principle, we do not have a strictly economic calculus that drives our decision making and evaluations. If however, there were reason to believe that home values would be severely impacted, this would become an issue of fairness on behalf of those for whom this would become an undue burden.

C In the presentations and materials that we've considered, we have, heretofore, considered the M&O yard to be better than what is currently there. Additionally, we were under the impression that the M&O yard was somehow a deal breaker for the entire Gold Line Extension project. Now that construction is under way further up the line, we see that the M&O yard's placement is not a deal breaker.

D At our HOA meeting, it was mentioned that a different site for the yard would (though it would incur significant additional expenses) still be possible. It does raise questions for me regarding the motivation to have the M&O yard here as opposed to elsewhere. It would be uncharitable of me to think, without your clarifying reassurance, that the motivation is the city's fallow land holdings on the north side of Duarte road.

So, can you clarify a few things:

1. Why here as opposed to elsewhere?
2. Are you absolutely certain (certain enough to be quoted publicly) that the noise pollution (e.g. washing, and esp. horn testing) will not affect our neighbors whose homes back up to Duarte Rd? E
3. Have you made public statements about potential, or required zoning changes? If so, what were those statements? What would change? F
4. What do you say about the impact of the yard on home values? G

Openly,

Jeff Liou
401 Monrovista Ave, Unit A

1

Response to Jeff Liou

A) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

B) The purpose of an EIR is the determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. According to Section 15064 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines, economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as a significant effects on the environment. Therefore, while the comment does not raise any specific environmental issues, the concerns of the commenter will be considered in the overall evaluation of the Project by the Lead Agency.

Changes in property values would not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA (see significance criteria in Section 4.3.4.1 in the Supplemental EIR). However, it should be noted that comparison studies of the impact of 12 rail projects (including both heavy rail and light rail) throughout North America show that, in general, proximity to rail transit has a positive impact on property values. The increase in accessibility provided by new rail transit has been cited as a primary contributing factor in increasing property values (Roderick Diaz. Impacts of Rail Transit on Property Values. May 1999, APTA 1999 Rapid Transit Conference Proceedings Paper). While this study does not account for the effect of property values related to the proximity to maintenance facilities, it should be noted that the M&O Facility in Monrovia and the Monrovia LRT Station are within 0.5 miles of each other.

C) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

D) The need for the Project is due to “the existing Metro Gold Line Division 21 Midway Yard is at capacity and cannot handle the additional railcars needed to operate the Gold Line Foothill Extension, a new rail operation and maintenance facility is being considered in this SEIR.” This text has been added to Section 2.1.1 of the Supplemental EIR. As described in the Supplemental EIR, construction and operation of the M&O Facility in Irwindale (Alternative 2) has the potential to result in greater environmental impacts relative to biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and geology and soils as compared to the proposed M&O Facility in Monrovia. As a result, the Construction Authority has determined that the M&O Facility in Monrovia is the environmentally superior alternative.

E) Per Section 15151 of the CEQA Guidelines, "An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental

consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible...The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure." Noise levels associated with the operation of the M&O Facility were assessed in the Supplemental EIR based on noise measurements taken from a comparable Maintenance and Operations Facility at 33rd Street and Aviation Boulevard in Manhattan Beach (Los Angeles County). These are the actual noise levels measurements taken at a maintenance facility including rail car entry and exit from the yard and all relevant equipment. These measurements accurately reflect future noise levels that would be associated with the proposed M&O Facility.

The City of Monrovia Noise Ordinance includes an exemption for "activities of the federal, state, or local jurisdiction while performing governmental duties." Because it is required for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) compliance, the train noise testing would be included under this exemption. Therefore, noise increases associated with train noise testing at the M&O Facility would be considered "exempt." Additionally, according to Table 4.12-8 of the Supplemental EIR, existing noise levels at the corner of California and Duarte adjacent to the proposed M&O Facility were measured at 68.2 dBA Leq. The City of Monrovia Noise Ordinance allows an increase of up to 10 dBA above existing measured ambient noise levels for 5 minutes per hour and 20 dBA above existing measured ambient noise levels for no more than one minute per hour. The noise associated with the standard horn (i.e., quacker) is expected to be 77dBA, and noise associated with the emergency horn is expected to be 87dBA. Both horns would sound for approximately one second within the facility's yard and only during the period of the morning when outbound trains are leaving the yard. The maximum number of train headway leaving the yard would be at 10 minute intervals in each direction. Even if the noise duration was for a longer period, it would be extremely unlikely that the noise from either horn would exceed the established levels. Therefore, the noise associated with each horn would not exceed the maximum permitted increases in noise levels as defined in the City of Monrovia Noise ordinance.

F) The M&O Facility is consistent with the policies and objectives stated in the City of Monrovia General Plan, which states that allowable land uses within the Station Square Transit Village Planning Area include “supporting [transit] parking facilities, a rider drop-off area, and other improvements supporting transit facilities.” All of the proposed facilities in Monrovia fit within this land use definition.

The proposed Monrovia location of the M&O Facility is located in an area already zoned as planned development (refer to Figure 4.2-2 and Section 4.2.2.2 of the Supplemental EIR).

G) Refer to Response to Comment B above. This comment does not raise any additional environmental- or Project-related issues.

Margaux Vogel

From: Lisa Levy Buch
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 1:41 PM
To: Margaux Vogel
Subject: SEIR Comment

From: Rob and Jordan Boldt [mailto:boldtfam@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 07, 2010 6:05 PM
To: Lisa Levy Buch; ssizemore@ci.monrovia.ca.us
Subject: concerns regarding the metro operation and maintenance facility

To Whom It May Concern,

A I appreciate the effort that the city of Monrovia has made to inform the Monrovia residents of the plans for the Maintenance and Operation Yard for the Metro. However, as a resident of Las Terrazas, I have gone to some of the city meetings, and I still strongly object to its placement (as do all of my neighbors that I have spoken with).

B First, I am very worried about the way in which this facility will have a negative impact on the property value of my home. When I bought my house at the beginning of 2009, it was my understanding that Monrovia is seeking to improve this residential area, and choosing to replace the current buildings and empty lots with the M&O yard does not seem like a good improvement. If I were seeking to buy a home now, knowing the proposed plans, this facility would definitely deter me away from this area. Perhaps a better option would be a park, considering that there are none at the moment located south of the freeway in Monrovia. I realize that the proposed metro area includes green spaces; however, a large area where children can play that compares to the other parks north of the freeway is much needed. The space could also be used for more small businesses (what Monrovia is known for) or residential facilities. C

D My second large concern is the noise of the facility and the crossing guards that will be going off at the corner of Duarte and California when the trains come and go from the facility. At the last informational meeting, I raised this concern and was told that the noise from the maintenance facility would be drowned out by the freeway. However, I can barely hear the freeway from outside my house, but I can definitely hear the railroad crossing when I am inside with all windows and doors shut. Furthermore, the noise will be occurring in the middle of the night, when noise from the freeway and surrounding businesses is almost null. I would hope that you would perform another sound test in the middle of the night to see how this facility would impact the current noise levels at that time. E

F I'm not arguing that alternative transportation and/or the maintenance of that transportation is a bad idea; I'm simply stating that this is not the best area for the M&O yard. I realize that the facility would cost more to

place in Irwindale; however, in the long run, this seems like the best option considering it is already an industrial zone. The extra initial cost that it would take to build the yard in Irwindale would very likely be comparable to the millions of dollars that Monrovia residents would collectively lose in the property values of their homes. G

H Please reconsider the placement of this M&O yard in Monrovia. I feel like this is not the best step in the development of our community, and the surrounding citizens are not being given the consideration that they deserve given that this will have a huge impact on their lives.

Thanks so much for your time,

Jordan Boldt

Monrovia Homeowner/Resident

Response to Jordan Boldt

A) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues. However, the opposition is noted and will be considered by the Authority Board.

B) The purpose of an EIR is the determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. According to Section 15064 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines, economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as a significant effects on the environment. Therefore, while the comment does not raise any specific environmental issues, the concerns of the commenter will be considered in the overall evaluation of the Project by the Lead Agency.

Changes in property values would not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA (see significance criteria in Section 4.3.4.1 in the Supplemental EIR). However, it should be noted that comparison studies of the impact of 12 rail projects (including both heavy rail and light rail) throughout North America show that, in general, proximity to rail transit has a positive impact on property values. The increase in accessibility provided by new rail transit has been cited as a primary contributing factor in increasing property values (Roderick Diaz. Impacts of Rail Transit on Property Values. May 1999, APTA 1999 Rapid Transit Conference Proceedings Paper). While this study does not account for the effect of property values related to the proximity to maintenance facilities, it should be noted that the M&O Facility in Monrovia and the Monrovia LRT Station are within 0.5 miles of each other.

C) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

D) The noise associated with the crossing devices was already analyzed in the 2007 Final EIR and impacts were adequately addressed. Per Section 4.2.3 of the Supplemental EIR, existing noise levels adjacent to the freeway were measured at up to 71.8 dBA Leq at the nearest sensitive receptor at California Avenue and Evergreen Avenue. This noise level is largely the result of freeway and other traffic noise. Although noise levels decrease as distance increases from the noise source, 24-hour noise measurements were taken at California Avenue and Duarte Road and the existing noise levels were measured at 68.2 dBA Leq, more than 300 feet south of the freeway. Therefore, freeway and traffic noise is the dominant noise source in the proposed M&O Facility area.

Under future conditions, noise levels calculated for the M&O Facility using the Traffic Noise Model would range from 60.5 dBA Leq to 74.5 dBA Leq at nearby sensitive receptors. Given that the noise levels from the Rail Car Repair Facility would be

approximately 56 dBA Leq or less at the nearest sensitive receptor and that noise levels associated with traffic are anticipated to be 60.5 dBA Leq to 74.5 dBA Leq, it is in fact unlikely that noise from the facility would be audible in relation to the noise levels associated with the future traffic. Noise associated with actual operations of the of the railroad was addressed in the 2007 Final EIR and impacts and mitigation measures to address the effects associated with these operations were included.

E) Under future conditions, noise levels calculated for the M&O Facility using the Traffic Noise Model would range from 60.5 dBA Leq to 74.5 dBA Leq at nearby sensitive receptors. Given that the noise levels associated with the M&O Facility are estimated to be 56 dBA Leq and noise levels associated with traffic are anticipated to be 60.5 dBA Leq to 74.5 dBA Leq, it is in fact unlikely that noise from the operations of the M&O Facility (56 dBA Leq at nearest sensitive receptor) would be audible in relation to the noise levels associated with the future traffic.

The commenter is correct that operations at the M&O Facility would occur on a 24-hour basis. Per Section 4.4.1.3 of the Supplemental EIR, "Maintenance would occur on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis in three shifts. A swing shift time period, from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., would be the highest period of activity for maintenance operations." As such, noise levels from maintenance and operations would peak between 10 p.m. and 2 p.m. However, noise levels during this time would not exceed the 56 dBA Leq level as discussed above. According to Table 4.12-8 of the Supplemental EIR, existing nighttime noise levels at the corner of California Avenue and Duarte Road adjacent to the proposed M&O Facility were measured at 64.5 dBA Leq. Therefore, operational noise from the M&O Facility would not exceed existing ambient noise levels, and traffic noise would still be the dominant noise source in the Project area during nighttime hours after Project implementation. Based on these conclusions, additional analysis is not necessary.

F) As described in the Supplemental EIR, construction and operation of the M&O Facility in Irwindale (Alternative 2) has the potential to result in greater environmental impacts relative to biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and geology and soils as compared to the proposed M&O Facility in Monrovia. As a result, the Construction Authority has determined that the M&O Facility in Monrovia is the environmentally superior alternative.

G) Refer to Response to Comment B above. This comment does not raise any additional environmental- or Project-related issues.

H) This comment does not raise any additional environmental- or Project-related issues.

Margaux Vogel

From: Lisa Levy Buch
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 3:42 PM
To: Margaux Vogel
Subject: SEIR Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: snpark79@aol.com [mailto:snpark79@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 2:58 PM
To: Lisa Levy Buch; ssizemore@ci.monrovia.ca.us
Subject: M&O

To Whom it may concern,

A I am a new home owner of the Las Terrazas and I am writing this letter to **oppose** the project for the M&O for the Metro. When we first were being introduced to the home in the beginning of 2010, we were told that the new Metro would bring new businesses and more jobs to the people of Monrovia. When my husband and I heard this, we thought it would be a great investment and a great place to live to start our family. We were not told of any talks for a M&O yard for the Metro, only told of the Goldline being built.

B We did attend the last meeting and found out that the jobs for the M&O were already taken by the union workers and therefore no jobs were open to the Monrovians. I was very disappointed to hear that. I rather have that spot be used to Monrovia's own business and to help development Monrovia to become a better neigborhood.

C My husband and I are a new young couple and wanting to have family soon. We are strongly against having the M&O yard being built so close to our home. I believe many of the City Hall members and Monrovians who are wanting this is no where near living on this side of the proposed plan. This is really unfair to the families that do live near the area where the proposed plan will be built.

D For these reasons I am opposing.
1. It will bring the home value down for us.

E 2. Does not beautify our area in this part of the Monrovia.

3. It will look more like an industrious work area rather than being a "family oriented" area (like how we were told before we bought our home here).
4. We were never told of the M&O yard being built when we were in the process of shopping for a home in Monrovia. Even on the MOnrovia website, it only talked about the new Goldline, buildings, and shops that would be built to beautify and help development Monrovia. We feel very betrayed for not getting the entire story. It would have made a big difference for us because if there was talks of the M&O before we bought out home, we would have most likely found a more family friendly area instead of Monrovia. F

G 5. In the mornings, there is already traffic starting early as 6am around Duarte and Myrtle, and with the M&O, it would make it worse for our commuters. There is also a school so close on Duarte that it would cause much more headache for many parents dropping off their kids.

H 6. The noise level is also an issue. There is no guarantee that it would stay quiet always. The meeting said the M&O is most active at night. We sleep at night and I don't want the noise to be an issue. We already have noise sometimes during the day from the other warehouses, we don't need anymore.

I I hope you would please consider our voices and why we are so concerned. If they were to build the M&O closer to the north, near the mountains homes, I am sure more people would oppose. It's not fair that the M&O has to be built close to

1

our home and that we have to suffer for the sake of Monrovia making money and it doesn't even provide jobs for the Morovia's citizens. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Nancy Park
Las Terrazas home owner

Response to Nancy Park

A) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

B) The majority of the positions at the new facility will fall under one of several Metro-Union Collective Bargaining Agreements. It is true that the existing Metro union employees will have the right of first refusal for the new positions created at the new M&O Facility in Monrovia. However, there are no guarantees that all positions will be filled by existing personnel. For those who do elect to transfer to the new facility, openings will be created in their former work locations that will need to be backfilled, so employment opportunities will be available.

Typically, personnel who transfer to a new facility are doing so to move their work location closer to their residence. There is no reason to expect any difference with the opening of this facility. As such, it is reasonable to expect a good number of the employees to be residents of the San Gabriel Valley. At this time, the facility is expected to open in 2014. Contact Metro Human Resources regarding information as to when they may start the hiring process.

C) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

D) The purpose of an EIR is the determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. According to Section 15064 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines, economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as a significant effects on the environment. Therefore, while the comment does not raise any specific environmental issues, the concerns of the commenter will be considered in the overall evaluation of the Project by the Lead Agency.

Changes in property values would not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA (see significance criteria in Section 4.3.4.1 in the Supplemental EIR). However, it should be noted that comparison studies of the impact of 12 rail projects (including both heavy rail and light rail) throughout North America show that, in general, proximity to rail transit has a positive impact on property values. The increase in accessibility provided by new rail transit has been cited as a primary contributing factor in increasing property values (Roderick Diaz. Impacts of Rail Transit on Property Values. May 1999, APTA 1999 Rapid Transit Conference Proceedings Paper). While this study does not account for the effect of property values related to the proximity to maintenance facilities, it should be noted that the M&O Facility in Monrovia and the Monrovia LRT Station are within 0.5 miles of each other.

E) As noted in Section 3.4.1.1 of the Supplemental EIR, "After construction, landscaping and a small park-like area would be developed on the northwest corner of the site to enhance the visual aesthetics of the M&O Facility and surrounding neighborhood." Furthermore, the design of the M&O Facility in Monrovia would adhere to the latest Metro Design Criteria Section 11: Yards and Shops and Section 4: Guideway and Trackwork as well as the City of Monrovia's General Plan and Update. Text in Section 3.1 of the Supplemental EIR has been added to state, "All applicable Metro Design criteria will be adhered to for the design of each Project refinement." The overall site would be completely enclosed by security fencing and retaining walls with landscaping on the outside perimeter of the fence. As noted in Section 4.1.4.2 of the Supplemental EIR, the fencing, wall, landscaping, and flat geography would limit views of the M&O Facility in Monrovia on the surrounding community and thus reduce "the visual impact of the proposed elements." Furthermore, the application of Mitigation Measures V-1 from the 2007 Final EIR and V-3 from the Supplemental EIR (Section 4.1.5) will further enhance the visual quality of the M&O Facility within the surrounding neighborhood.

F) The M&O Facility is consistent with the policies and objectives stated in the City of Monrovia General Plan, which states that allowable land uses within the Station Square Transit Village Planning Area include "supporting [transit] parking facilities, a rider drop-off area, and other improvements supporting transit facilities." All of the proposed facilities in Monrovia fit within this land use definition.

The proposed Monrovia location of the M&O Facility is located in an area already zoned as planned development (refer to Figure 4.2-2 and Section 4.2.2.2 of the Supplemental EIR).

G) The intersection referenced (Duarte Road and Myrtle Avenue) was not defined by study scoping and, therefore, not a studied roadway segment for this Supplemental EIR. However, according to Section 4.4.4.2 of the Supplemental EIR, AM and PM peak period traffic volume-to-capacity (v/c) for the intersection of California Avenue/Duarte Road (east of the referenced intersection as one drives towards the proposed M&O Facility) did not significantly increase based on "Future 2012 with Project" projections compared with "Future 2012 No Project" conditions (see Table 4-4.4 in Section 4.4.4.2). A significant impact was noted for the intersection of California Avenue/Evergreen Avenue (northeast of the referenced intersection), but with the implementation of Mitigation Measure T-7 (Section 4.4.5 of the Supplemental EIR), these traffic impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Concerning the comment regarding increased traffic around local schools, area traffic volumes were defined in Section 4.4.3 of the Supplemental EIR by "new traffic counts conducted in April 2010 and June 2010." Therefore, traffic volume would account for local school peak traffic periods.

H) Under future conditions, noise levels calculated for the M&O Facility using the Traffic Noise Model would range from 60.5 dBA Leq to 74.5 dBA Leq at nearby sensitive receptors. Given that the noise levels associated with the M&O Facility are estimated to be 56 dBA Leq and noise levels associated with traffic are anticipated to be 60.5 dBA Leq to 74.5 dBA Leq, it is in fact unlikely that noise from the operations of the M&O Facility (56 dBA Leq at nearest sensitive receptor) would be audible in relation to the noise levels associated with the future traffic.

The commenter is correct that operations at the M&O Facility would occur on a 24-hour basis. Per Section 4.4.1.3 of the Supplemental EIR, "Maintenance would occur on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis in three shifts. A swing shift time period, from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., would be the highest period of activity for maintenance operations." As such, noise levels from maintenance and operations would peak between 10 p.m. and 2 p.m. However, noise levels during this time would not exceed the 56 dBA Leq level as discussed above. According to Table 4.12-8 of the Supplemental EIR, existing nighttime noise levels at the corner of California Avenue and Duarte Road adjacent to the proposed M&O Facility were measured at 64.5 dBA Leq. Therefore, operational noise from the M&O Facility would not exceed existing ambient noise levels, and traffic noise would still be the dominant noise source in the Project area during nighttime hours after Project implementation.

I) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

Margaux Vogel

From: Lisa Levy Buch
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 3:43 PM
To: Margaux Vogel
Subject: SEIR Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Sharon Koh [mailto:sharonkoh718@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2010 3:13 PM
To: Lisa Levy Buch
Subject: Monrovia proposed M&O site

Dear Ms. Buch,

A Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns as a homeowner and resident on Monrovista Avenue. I am enthusiastic about public transportation as offered by the Metro Gold Line, but I object specifically to the M&O site being so near to our homes. I had the opportunity to attend the public hearing held on October 27th, and I have a few objections to the proposed Monrovia M&O site(s).

B My first objection is that this M&O site would be detrimental to the development of Monrovia.

C The use of Monrovia land for an M&O site is a short term solution to a long term problem. At the hearing, the explanation offered seemed to be, "Monrovia cannot afford to fix our own intersections (California and Duarte, Mountain and the 210 freeway, Mountain and Duarte were all listed as examples) so let's allow MTA to have their M&O site here because they promised to pay for our development." Once the M&O site is up and running (and even if/when the streets are widened as promised), there will no longer be additional revenue generated for the city. Instead, there will be decreased property prices and potential residents looking to live where they will not be subject to the the noise, security and pollution issues of a 24/7 M&O site. D

E Please consider letting Monrovia use the land for small businesses (that Monrovia is known for) or even a large business (like Lowe's) that will generate tax revenue (and healthy consumer competition) for the city and jobs for its residents. In the long run, this revenue could be used for development such as the street widening that was mentioned several times at the public hearing. An M&O site would need to hire people that have very specific skills, so it cannot be guaranteed that the site will only employ Monrovia residents. Therefore, the site does not necessarily create jobs for our city. While retail and other businesses also cannot guarantee us that they will employ Monrovia

1

residents exclusively, the number of jobs created at a skill level that is more readily available here with retail stores is certainly a greater number than an M&O site would bring.

F From the October public hearing, my understanding is that the City of Irwindale has already objected to the locating to of this site in their city, and that is why MTA had to look to Monrovia for additional proposed sites. Yet, the proposed Irwindale alternative site next to the Miller Brewing facility is much less residential than the Monrovia proposed sites.

G My second objection is that the proposed site in Monrovia is less expensive to MTA than the proposed Irwindale site. This would be convenient for MTA but for not the residents of Monrovia.

H I asked the question at the public hearing of whether it is cheaper for GLCA to promise Monrovia widened and improved streets than it is for GLCA to fill the land in Irwindale before they can build an M&O site on it. I received the affirmative answer - yes, it is less expensive for GLCA to promise Monrovia development than it is for GLCA to make the land in Irwindale usable for an M&O site. Therefore, it makes sense that GLCA is pushing for a Monrovia site. It would be more cost effective for them to have it here. But, I am appealing to my city representatives to please keep the interests of Monrovia residents foremost. What is cost effective for GLCA is going to cost us in property prices and consequently property taxes for the city.

I Finally, I share my neighbors' concerns that situating the M&O site here will affect our residential neighborhood on many levels. As many of my neighbors have pointed out, security and noise (e.g the daily testing of the emergency whistle) are major concerns for those of us who are living across the street from this proposed site.

J Please consider the location of this M&O site as if it were being proposed for across the street from your home - as it is for my neighbors and me. I think that this would make it clear that the (less residential) Irwindale site is preferable.

Sincerely,

Sharon Koh

401D Monrovista Avenue

Response to Sharon Koh

A) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

B) The M&O Facility is consistent with the policies and objectives stated in the City of Monrovia General Plan, which states that allowable land uses within the Station Square Transit Village Planning Area include "supporting [transit] parking facilities, a rider drop-off area, and other improvements supporting transit facilities." All of the proposed facilities in Monrovia fit within this land use definition.

The proposed Monrovia location of the M&O Facility is located in an area already zoned as planned development (refer to Figure 4.2-2 and Section 4.2.2.2 of the Supplemental EIR).

C) The City of Monrovia Circulation Element identifies roadway improvements necessary to improve the flow of traffic. Every development is reviewed to ensure there is no adverse impact to the existing circulation system. Mitigation measures, if any, can be imposed on new development. The analysis for the construction and operation of the M&O Facility utilized City of Monrovia standards for traffic impacts.

D) Although the commenter includes noise, security, and pollution as a concern, the main point of this comment is the impact on property values.

The purpose of an EIR is the determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. According Section to 15064 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines, economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as a significant effects on the environment. Therefore, while the comment does not raise any specific environmental issues, the concerns of the commenter will be considered in the overall evaluation of the Project by the Lead Agency.

Changes in property values would not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA (see significance criteria in Section 4.3.4.1 in the Supplemental EIR). However, it should be noted that comparison studies of the impact of 12 rail projects (including both heavy rail and light rail) throughout North America show that, in general, proximity to rail transit has a positive impact on property values. The increase in accessibility provided by new rail transit has been cited as a primary contributing factor in increasing property values (Roderick Diaz. Impacts of Rail Transit on Property Values. May 1999, APTA 1999 Rapid Transit Conference Proceedings Paper). While this study does not account for the effect of property values related to the proximity to maintenance

facilities, it should be noted that the M&O Facility in Monrovia and the Monrovia LRT Station are within 0.5 miles of each other.

E) Furthermore and as noted above, the M&O Facility is consistent with the policies and objectives stated in the City of Monrovia General Plan, which states that allowable land uses within the Station Square Transit Village Planning Area include "supporting [transit] parking facilities, a rider drop-off area, and other improvements supporting transit facilities." All of the proposed facilities in Monrovia fit within this land use definition.

The proposed Monrovia location of the M&O Facility is located in an area already zoned as planned development (refer to Figure 4.2-2 and Section 4.2.2.2 of the Supplemental EIR).

F) As described in the Supplemental EIR, construction and operation of the M&O Facility in Irwindale (Alternative 2) has the potential to result in greater environmental impacts relative to biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and geology and soils as compared to the proposed M&O Facility in Monrovia. As a result, the Construction Authority has determined that the M&O Facility in Monrovia is the environmentally superior alternative.

G) This comment does not raise any additional environmental- or Project-related issues.

H) Following completion of the environmental document, the decision-making agency must balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. Therefore, the concerns of the commenter will be considered in the overall evaluation of the Project.

I) The City of Monrovia Noise Ordinance includes an exemption for "activities of the federal, state, or local jurisdiction while performing governmental duties." Because it is required for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) compliance, the train noise testing would be included under this exemption. Therefore, noise increases associated with train noise testing at the M&O Facility would be considered "exempt." Additionally, according to Table 4.12-8 of the Supplemental EIR, existing noise levels at the corner of California and Duarte adjacent to the proposed M&O Facility were measured at 68.2 dBA Leq. The City of Monrovia Noise Ordinance allows an increase of up to 10 dBA above existing measured ambient noise levels for 5 minutes per hour and 20 dBA above existing measured ambient noise levels for no more than one minute per hour. The noise associated with the standard horn (i.e., quacker) is expected to be 77dBA, and noise

associated with the emergency horn is expected to be 87dBA. Both horns would sound for approximately one second within the facility's yard and only during the period of the morning when outbound trains are leaving the yard. The maximum number of train headway leaving the yard would be at 10 minute intervals in each direction. Even if the noise duration was for a longer period, it would be extremely unlikely that the noise from either horn would exceed the established levels. Therefore, the noise associated with each horn would not exceed the maximum permitted increases in noise levels as defined in the City of Monrovia Noise ordinance.

J) This comment does not raise any additional environmental- or Project-related issues.

028

Margaux Vogel

From: Lisa Levy Buch
Sent: Thursday, December 09, 2010 3:26 PM
To: Margaux Vogel
Subject: SEIR Comment - City of Arcadia Colorado Blvd. Railroad Bridge

Phil Wray is with the city of Arcadia. He has provided the comment below for response in the SEIR. Please forward to the team.

Thanks.

From: Philip Wray [mailto:pwray@ci.arcadia.ca.us]
Sent: Thursday, December 09, 2010 3:18 PM
To: Denis Cournoyer; Lisa Levy Buch
Cc: Linda Hui; Tanya Patsaouras; Chris Burner; Jason Kruckeberg
Subject: RE: Colorado Blvd. Railroad Bridge

Denis and Lisa,

A As a result of our discussion this morning, we think it is important to bring up the issue of the sound wall on the Colorado Bridge. Per Denis' e-mail below, we are concerned with the sound wall being constructed only on the northeast side of the bridge. There is a residential neighborhood just south and west of the bridge that the City commented in the original EIR on the need to protect with a sound wall. The EIR determined that the neighborhood was not impacted by the original project scope. However, now that you are proposing a change in the scope to remove the old bridge and add a sound wall to the northeast side of the new bridge, we request that you reconsider the potential noise impact to the neighborhood to the south. We believe that a sound wall should be included on the southwest side of the bridge to contain the noise.

Thanks for your consideration.

Phil Wray

Response to City of Arcadia

A) Per section 4.12.4.2 of the Supplemental EIR, “The Monrovia and Irwindale Parking Structure and the San Gabriel and Colorado River Bridges are not located in close proximity to sensitive receptors, nor do they involve uses likely to generate excessive noise. Therefore, operation of these uses would not be expected to generate noise levels in excess of local or state standards, and, therefore, the impact is considered less than significant." Noise impacts of light rail train (LRT) operations was already analyzed in the 2007 Final EIR. Although soundwalls were proposed to the north of Colorado Boulevard in the 2007 Final EIR, no significant impacts were identified at the actual Colorado bridge location and no soundwalls were proposed. The nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 100 feet from the Colorado Bridge, and noise levels associated with operation of the Colorado Bridge would likely be inaudible at this distance. Therefore, because operational noise impacts would be less than significant, no mitigation measures are proposed.

October 27, 2010 Public Hearing

Comments and Responses

IN THE MATTER OF:

Metro Gold Line Maintenance & Operation Facility/Foothill Extension Improvements Project Public Hearing.

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

Arcadia, California

Wednesday, October 27, 2010

REPORTED BY: Michelle Quinones
CSR No. 9985

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

IN THE MATTER OF:

Metro Gold Line Maintenance & Operation Facility/Foothill Extension Improvements Project Public Hearing.

Transcript of Public Hearing, taken before Michelle Quinones, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, with principal office in the County of Orange, commencing at 5:30 p.m., Wednesday, October 27, 2010, at The City of Arcadia City Hall, 240 West Huntington Boulevard, Arcadia, California.

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

APPEARANCES:

HEARING OFFICER:

Habib F. Balain, CEO
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

I N D E X

HEARING COMMENCED	PAGE
HABIB BALAIN	5
PUBLIC COMMENT	
MAYOR MARY ANN LUTZ	11
MAYOR PAULA KELLY	12
JOEL COVARRUBIAS	13
YOLANDA GUTIERREZ	13

E X H I B I T S

(NONE)

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

Arcadia, California, Wednesday, October 27, 2010

5:30 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.

MR. BALAIN: My name is Habib Balain. And I am the CEO for the Construction Authority. And I will be the Hearing Officer tonight to review the draft SEIR and its findings and give you an opportunity -- the public an opportunity to make comments.

Just briefly, with regard to the format of tonight's proceedings, we started at 5 o'clock this evening, and we had an open house. We will now begin at 5:30 and go for about five, ten minutes with a presentation, overview presentation, and then we will move into the public hearing process.

And I'll just remind every one we're limiting comments to two minutes.

We will also have an opportunity for those who do not want to offer public comment to present comments in writing or speak directly with the Court Reporter after the proceedings in the next room.

It's important for everyone to know that this is the opportunity to give us your questions. We will not be responding to your questions tonight, but we will do so in the environmental document.

We are asking each person who would like to

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

speak to fill out a speaker card. They are in the front of the auditorium. We would need that passed up in advance. We will then call each speaker up to speak for two minutes.

Again, if you want to fill out a comment sheet, you can do so or speak directly with the Court Reporter. This is the opportunity you have to post your comments. All comments must be received by November the 8th if they are gonna be answered as part of this process.

Most of you do know the history of the Authority. We were created by the legislature in 1999 by Congressman Adam Shift who carved out this project from Metro, allowing us to build from Union Station to Claremont.

We did Phase 1 of the project to begin the planning and engineering of Phase 2. We have all the rights and responsibilities that are afforded to a transit agency for construction. And then, as you know, we turn the project over to Metro to operate it permanently.

The Phase 2 system map, again talking about the entire length of the project and the phases. Phase 2A is what we're look at tonight and the supplemental information that we'd like to have approved.

With regard to CEQA, and what public agencies

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

are responsible for, is to identify and figure out ways to mitigate any impacts of the project, anything that has to do with resources of the project, be it by biological or visual or traffic. Any of those items are to be mitigated to the extent possible through this process.

This process is important because we are able to identify those significant impacts and proceed in a way to not adversely affect the community that we're trying to serve.

Most of you have followed this project since its passage in 2007 with regard to the final EIR, the approval of that in 2007.

Since then, we have identified five areas where there is some modifications that we needed to get cleared through a supplemental.

Those are the maintenance and operations facility, some relocation of parking in the cities of Monrovia and Irwindale, as well as realignment of Mountain Avenue and two bridge replacements that are critical to the project.

Before I go any further, I just wanted to mention the attendance of our chairman, our board member, Keith Hanks, who's from the City of Azusa. Keith Hanks is here, as well as Mayor Mary Ann Lutz from the City of Monrovia. Thank you and welcome for being here

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

tonight.

With regard to the maintenance facility site, we are looking at three different -- we're looking at two different locations. And the first has two options. Here's Option A, which is a larger site, which is about 28 acres. And it is bordered by Evergreen and Shamrock. And this is Option A. We have also looked at an alternative option, which is option B, which looks to make it slightly smaller. It's about 24 acres, and we do a work around of this site here. We roughly house the same number of vehicles with either site. The configuration is slightly different, but it's about 84 vehicles will be -- will be serviced on this site with this option.

And then the second alternative is the Irwindale option adjacent to Miller Brewery and the Pit, as well as the 210 Freeway on the north side. We have a configuration that runs along the outside of the Pit, with storage and maintenance facilities on this side the Pit itself.

We are looking at a Mountain Avenue realignment. Again, this is to improve the circulation through this intersection. It's a difficult intersection and this is an overall improvement that was discussed with the Cities of Monrovia and Duarte. I believe we have a good

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

solution here.

We also have the parking Option A for Irwindale, which is something that was not considered to be in this location the first go around. We were looking at a surface parking lot, which is our Option A, and then a structured parking here, the same location, but to use less of the land as our Option B. We will be studying both of those.

In addition to that, we have our Monrovia parking plan. This relates to the station itself, and to put a 338 car garage in this section of the land, which is adjacent to the station.

We have two bridge replacements. First is the North Colorado Boulevard Bridge replacement. Originally in its original configuration I think there was gonna be some rehab, and then it was determined that it best be replaced. And that's our plan right now.

And the second bridge replacement that we're talking about is the San Gabriel River Bridge. Again, this is an older bridge and it needed significant work and it was determined that it's best to replace it.

There are three categories that we look at in reviewing this project and potential impacts. First it's those issues that have no impact or less than significant impacts to the project. We had very little impact, as

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

you can see, in those three areas.

And then there's areas where there's less than significant impacts and we can provide mitigations. And you can see here what's covered.

And then there's the one area where there's significant unavoidable impacts, and that relates strictly to noise on the Mountain Avenue realignment, which is an existing condition. But that's the only one that cannot be mitigated.

With regard to the time line, we have started this process in June, earlier this year. We did work on preparing technical studies through the summer. We have circulated since September 23rd the draft supplemental EIR. Our plan now is to have it considered by our Board sometime late this year and final certification to take place at that time so that we can initiate construction in the summer of 2001 and have the work completed in 2014.

Anyone wishing to make comments, if they are not gonna do so here or in the next room after this hearing, is encouraged to do so by sending them to Lisa Levy Buch. Any of your comments can be included as part of the record and you can get answers to your questions.

Just to remind you, please turn in your speaker cards. I don't know who's collecting them here, the

staff. And this is Lisa Levy Buch.

And why don't I ask all the Authority staff to just stand up so you can identify yourselves. If you're Authority staff or consultants, please stand up and wave so everyone knows who you are.

Thank you.

We will call you up and encourage you to take your two minutes. And I think we want to get the process started now.

So if we're ready to start, we can do so.

There is a Court Reporter here, and we will have also a timer going so we can double-check the time.

So at this moment in time, I have two cards for potential speakers. The the first one we will introduce is Mary Ann Lutz, Mayor Mary Ann Lutz. We'd like to call you to the podium.

MS. LUTZ: Good evening. Thank you so much for providing us this opportunity to comment on the supplemental environment impact report. The City of Monrovia appreciates very much the efforts that the Gold Line Construction Authority has done to produce such a comprehensive document, as well as providing the outreach to Monrovia's residents and property owners and businesses through this process.

A

The townhall meetings and the neighborhood

B

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

meetings that were held in Monrovia were extremely informational, but more importantly, they provided our community the opportunity to comment on the issues regarded to the maintenance and operation yard.

Our City staff is in the process right now of reviewing the draft, the environmental impact report, and will provide comments before November 8th in a written response. And based upon our initial review, it appears, though, that the draft has been prepared in a very -- in compliance with CEQA regulations, and we expect that it will provide the appropriate information on which the Monrovia City Council will be able to make an informed decision.

C

Thank you very much for your cooperation. Of course we're available for any questions.

D

MR. BALAIN: Thank you, Mayor.

The next Mayor which wishes to speak is Paula Kelly, from the City of Irwindale.

MS. KELLY: Thank you

I'm here to reiterate the City of Irwindale's City Council's opposition to location of the maintenance and operations facility in Irwindale. The City will also be submitting a comment letter on the SEIR.

E

Thank you.

MR. BALAIN: Thank you. Next speaker is Joel --

I'm gonna unfortunately not gonna be able to pronounce your name.

And how do you pronounce your last name?

MR. COVARRUBIAS: Covarrubias.

F I have been to many meetings this year, between Metro and, you know, Foothill. But in this case, I really have little comment then to say great job on everything and the project's looking really good.

G As a resident here -- I'm sorry. As a non-resident in this area, but as a worker in Monrovia, I'm sure everybody will appreciate getting off the street and off of -- out of the congestion and taking the train to work instead of bogging up the freeways.

Thank you very much.

MR. BALAIN: Thank you.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Good afternoon. My name is

H Yolanda Gutierrez. My property is on Mountain and Duarte Road.

I And my concern is the noise that I'm gonna get, traffic. The street realignment will probably go to my front yard. So I'm concerned, you know, that I'm gonna have to relocate. So I'm hoping I'm relocated still in Duarte.

J But because of -- it's gonna be like turning off my power, my water, everything while I'm there. So I'm

HAHN & BOWERSOCK 800-660-3187 FAX 714-662-1398
151 KALMUS DRIVE, SUITE L1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

hoping that that doesn't start until I'm relocated. If God willing, I can, you know, pay off my home and everything, because I am on social security.

I do have the noise. They told me when they went to check the noise thing, that it was at a level 6. It should be 60 something, and it was at 70 something, and they said by the time the process was going through and was done, it was gonna be uninhabitable, I couldn't live there. So I already know I have to be relocated.

Okay. Thank you for listening to me.

MR. BALAIN: Thank you for your comments.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Does anybody else want to speak?

MR. BALAIN: If there are no other speakers, I think we will end this portion of the hearing.

We will have the Court Reporter available in the next room until about 6:30, so you can make comments for the record at that time.

I thank you very much for attending, and we look forward to your comments.

(Whereupon, no further public comments were made.)

(Whereupon, the public hearing concluded at 7:00 p.m.)

K

L

Response to Public Hearing Comments

A) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

B) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

C) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

D) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

E) The comment is noted. As described in the Supplemental EIR, construction and operation of the M&O Facility in Irwindale (Alternative 2) has the potential to result in greater environmental impacts relative to biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and geology and soils as compared to the proposed M&O Facility in Monrovia. As a result, the Construction Authority has determined that the M&O Facility in Monrovia is the environmentally superior alternative. Following completion of the environmental document, the decision-making agency must balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. Therefore, the concerns of the commenter will be considered in the overall evaluation of the Project.

F) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

G) This comment does not raise any specific environmental- or Project-related issues.

H) It is assumed that the commenter is referring to noise impacts associated with traffic from the Mountain Avenue Realignment. As stated in the Supplemental EIR, "traffic noise impacts are anticipated with the Mountain Avenue Realignment." Further, as stated in the Section 4.12.5 of the Supplemental EIR, “noise barriers along Mountain Avenue and Duarte Road (at the receiver) would not be feasible due to the presence of driveways required for access points, rendering them ineffective for noise abatement.” Therefore, the Supplemental EIR concludes that the noise impacts of the Mountain Avenue Realignment would be significant and unavoidable.

I) The Construction Authority will coordinate with affected property owners. Following completion of environmental analysis on any future build projects, the acquisition and relocation assistance program would be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (49 code of Federal Regulations 24) and California Streets And Highways Code (Section 135). This Act identifies the process, procedures, and timeframe for right-of-way acquisition and

relocation of affected residents and/or businesses. Resources would be available to all affected property owners without discrimination. Private property owners would be compensated for their land at market value.

J) As stated above under Response to Comment J, following completion of environmental analysis on any future build projects, the acquisition and relocation assistance program would be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (49 code of Federal Regulations 24) and California Streets And Highways Code (Section 135). According to Section 205 (c) 3 of the Act, each relocation assistance advisory program shall assure that a person shall not be required to move from a dwelling unless the person has had a reasonable opportunity to relocate to a comparable replacement dwelling. The Act further identifies the process, procedures, and timeframe for right-of-way acquisition and relocation of affected residents and/or businesses.

K) According to the existing noise measurements included in the Supplemental EIR, daytime hourly noise levels measured adjacent to Mountain Avenue ranged from 67.2 dBA Leq to 71.1 dBA Leq. With implementation of the Mountain Avenue Realignment, the Supplemental EIR concludes that noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Specifically, the Project would result in impacts at Receiver 1 and Receiver 6, and the impacted receivers would be exposed to noise levels greater than 70 dBA in 2025. It should be noted that it is not always feasible to mitigate environmental impacts identified for a project to a less-than-significant level. When this occurs, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

L) Refer to Response to Comment I above.