

# **Appendix F**

---

## **Scoping Report**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



METRO

GOLD

LINE

FOOTHILL  
EXTENSION

## Summary Scoping Report


### Azusa to Montclair Project EIS/EIR

March 2011

*Prepared for:*

**Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension  
Construction Authority**  
406 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202  
Monrovia, CA 91016-3633





## Summary Scoping Report Azusa to Montclair Project EIS/EIR

This Summary Scoping Report provides information specific to the scoping process that was conducted for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension from Azusa to Montclair project in January 2011. The appendices to this report are available on the Authority's website:  
<http://www.foothillextension.org>.

Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR provides an overview of the comprehensive outreach effort conducted for the Draft EIR. This effort included outreach during the scoping process, as well as additional efforts following scoping that helped refine the project to what is now described in the Draft EIR.

Please note: At the time of scoping, the environmental process was envisioned to meet both the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and result in a joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (joint EIR/EIS) document. Subsequently, it was determined that the NEPA process would be deferred until a future time. The Draft EIR is therefore no longer a joint document and is pursuant to CEQA only.

---

## Table of Contents

|            |                                                           |             |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>1.0</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>                                  | <b>1</b>    |
| 1.1        | DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT.....                  | 2           |
| 1.1.1      | PROJECT ALTERNATIVES.....                                 | 2           |
| 1.2        | PROCESS OF SCOPING .....                                  | 4           |
| 1.3        | NOTIFICATION OF EIS/EIR SCOPING.....                      | 6           |
| 1.4        | SCOPING ACTIVITIES .....                                  | 6           |
| <b>2.0</b> | <b>PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT DURING SCOPING .....</b> | <b>9</b>    |
| 2.1        | Summary of Noticed Scoping Meetings .....                 | 11          |
| 2.2        | Briefings to Interested Parties .....                     | 11          |
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>PUBLIC AND AGENCY SCOPING COMMENTS .....</b>           | <b>12</b>   |
| 3.1        | SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS .....                          | 12          |
| 3.2        | SUMMARY OF AGENCY COMMENTS .....                          | 16          |
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>NEXT STEPS IN THE EIS/EIR PROCESS.....</b>             | <b>44</b>   |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>PREPARERS.....</b>                                     | <b>5-45</b> |

## List of Appendices

|   |                                                                              |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A | Notice of Preparation (CEQA)                                                 |
| B | Notice of Intent (NEPA)                                                      |
| C | Scoping Meeting Announcements                                                |
| D | Scoping Meeting Distribution List                                            |
| E | Newspaper Notices/Articles                                                   |
| F | Scoping Meeting Attendance Lists                                             |
| G | Scoping Meeting Handout Materials                                            |
| H | Scoping Comment Cards                                                        |
| I | Written Public Scoping Comments                                              |
| J | Written Agency Scoping Comments                                              |
| K | Record of Verbal Comments from Scoping Meetings (Court Reporter Transcripts) |
| L | Scoping Meeting Photographs                                                  |
| M | Scoping Meeting Display Boards                                               |
| N | Power Point Presentation                                                     |

---

## **List of Figures**

|                                                                                 |   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Figure 1 Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Azusa to Montclair Study Area ..... | 5 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|

## **List of Tables**

|                                                                        |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1-A: Scoping Meeting Dates, Locations and Times .....            | 7  |
| Table 1-B Number of Scoping Meeting Attendees – Meeting Location ..... | 7  |
| Table 2 – Summary of Public Comments by Residence of Commenter .....   | 15 |
| Table 3: Summary of Agency Comments - Alignment .....                  | 17 |
| Table 4: Summary of Agency Comments – Environmental Planning .....     | 19 |
| Table 5: Summary of Agency Comments – Traffic and Connectivity .....   | 35 |
| Table 6: Summary of Agency Comments – Project Funding .....            | 36 |
| Table 7: Summary of Agency Comments – Safety .....                     | 37 |
| Table 8: Summary of Agency Comments – Conservation .....               | 39 |
| Table 9: Summary of Agency Comments – Land Use .....                   | 41 |
| Table 10: Summary of Agency Comments – General .....                   | 43 |

---

## Abbreviations / Acronyms

|             |                                                          |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| AA.....     | Alternatives Analysis                                    |
| CEQA .....  | California Environmental Quality Act                     |
| CFR .....   | Code of Federal Regulations                              |
| EIR .....   | Environmental Impact Report                              |
| EIS .....   | Environmental Impact Statement                           |
| FAQ .....   | Frequently Asked Questions                               |
| FRA .....   | Federal Railroad Administration                          |
| FTA.....    | Federal Transit Administration                           |
| LACMTA..... | Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority |
| LPA.....    | Locally Preferred Alternative                            |
| LRT .....   | Light Rail Transit                                       |
| LRTP .....  | Long Range Transportation Plan                           |
| Metro ..... | Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority |
| mgd .....   | million gallons per day                                  |
| NEPA.....   | National Environmental Policy Act                        |
| NOA .....   | Notice of Availability                                   |
| NOC .....   | Notice of Completion                                     |
| NOD .....   | Notice of Determination                                  |
| NOI .....   | Notice of Intent                                         |
| NOP.....    | Notice of Preparation                                    |
| ppm .....   | parts per million                                        |
| ROD .....   | Record of Decision                                       |
| ROW.....    | Right of Way                                             |
| SCAG .....  | Southern California Association of Governments           |
| TSM.....    | Transportation Systems Management                        |



## **I.0 INTRODUCTION**

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Metro Gold Line (MGL) Foothill Extension Construction Authority (Construction Authority) have initiated a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) / Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Gold Line Foothill Extension Azusa to Montclair. The Draft EIS/EIR is being prepared with the FTA and the Construction Authority as Joint Lead Agencies under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Construction Authority as the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This report provides an overview of the written and verbal comments received during the scoping process for the EIS/EIR. The purpose of this report is to summarize agency and public comments, issues, and concerns raised during the scoping process. The report will be used to help the Construction Authority and the FTA to determine the appropriate scope for the EIS/EIR.

Appendices can be found on the Authority's website:

[http://www.foothillextension.org/construction\\_phases/azusa\\_to\\_montclair/](http://www.foothillextension.org/construction_phases/azusa_to_montclair/)

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation under CEQA that describes the project and starts the environmental review process under state procedures
- Appendix B: Notice of Intent under NEPA that describes the project and starts the environmental review process under federal procedures
- Appendix C: Copies of scoping meeting announcements that introduces the public to the project and provide details on the scoping meetings
- Appendix D: Scoping meeting distribution list that provides information on contacts invited to all scoping meetings
- Appendix E: Newspaper notices and advertisements used to alert the public to the availability of scoping meetings
- Appendix F: Scoping meeting attendance lists that show who signed in and attended scoping meetings
- Appendix G: Scoping meeting handout materials that include informational materials provided to scoping meeting attendees
- Appendices H, I, J, and K: Summary of public and agency comments made during the scoping phase
- Appendix L: Photographs taken at scoping meetings
- Appendix M: Scoping meeting display boards are digital copies of the exhibit boards presented at the scoping meetings for public review and discussion with the project team.
- Appendix N: Power Point of presentation made at the public scoping meetings.

---

## **I.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

The proposed project is an extension of the existing Metro Gold Line light rail transit line, from Azusa to Montclair, with proposed stations in Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont and Montclair. The proposed project will improve mobility in eastern Los Angeles County and western San Bernardino County by introducing high-frequency transit service options; enhance the regional transit network by interconnecting existing and planned rail and bus transit lines; provide an alternative mode of transportation for commuters who currently use the congested I-210 corridor; improve transit accessibility for residents and employees who live and/or work along the corridor; and encourage a mode shift to transit, reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

The proposed project is located in Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties encompassing seven adjoining cities that lie along I-210 and a railroad right-of-way, between the eastern boundary of Azusa on the west and Montclair on the east. The study area includes the cities of, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, and Claremont in Los Angeles County. In San Bernardino County, it includes the city of Montclair.

A Draft EIS/EIR for Gold Line Phase II Pasadena to Montclair Foothill Extension was issued in April 2004 ("2004 DEIS/EIR"). A Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register on May 7, 2004. Following the release of the 2004 DEIS/EIR, the public comment period, and input from the cities along the alignment, the Construction Authority Board approved a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) in August 2004 for the Pasadena to Azusa extension of the Gold Line Phase II Project. In March 2005, a Project Definition Report (PDR) was prepared to refine the station and parking lot locations, grade crossings, two rail grade separations, and traction power substation locations.

Following the PDR, the Construction Authority Board approved a Revised LPA in June 2005. Between March and August 2005, station options in Claremont were added. Subsequent to circulation of the 2004 DEIS/DEIR, the Construction Authority decided to fund the Pasadena to Azusa extension of the Gold Line Phase II Project without Federal funding and the environmental impact assessment for Phase II no longer proceeded as a joint NEPA/CEQA document but as a CEQA document. The Pasadena to Azusa Extension project of the Gold Line Phase II Pasadena to Montclair Extension was certified under CEQA by the Construction Authority and a FEIR was completed in February 2007. Because the Construction Authority decided to fund the Pasadena to Azusa extension of the Gold Line Phase II Project without Federal funding, the FTA subsequently withdrew the Gold Line Phase II DEIS on June 25, 2010.

To avoid confusion expressed about the terminology used in the Draft EIS/EIR (e.g. Phase I; Phase II, Segments 1 and 2), the Proposed Project described by this Coordination Plan and the attached Notice of Intent (NOI) (Appendix A), which was previously named Gold Line Phase II Segment 2, is now referred to as the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Azusa to Montclair Project ('Azusa to Montclair Extension').

### **I.1.1 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

The three alternatives being evaluated include the No Build Alternative, TSM, and the Build Alternative.

---

**No Build Alternative:** The No Build Alternative includes all highway and transit projects and operations that the region and Metro expect to be in place in 2035. The No Build Alternative would not require construction of ancillary facilities other than those included in the projects comprising the alternative. The No Build Alternative is Metro's 2009 LRTP adopted in October 2009. This 2009 LRTP includes a balance of vehicle and transit improvements, including an expanded bus and rail network. Projects within the 2009 LRTP that are relevant to the corridor are stated below.

- Transit projects include countywide (Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties) bus service improvements; commuter rail (Metrolink) improvements; and light rail and heavy rail transit improvements.
- Freeway improvements include projects on freeways such as the extension of freeway Route 30/I-210 from Foothill Boulevard to I-15 (now completed) and the continuing extension of I-15 to I-215 in the future.
- Smart street projects include improvements such as synchronized traffic signals, on-street parking removal, frontage road and grade separation construction, and key intersection improvements to improve traffic flow.
- Arterial improvement projects include improvements to existing roadways.

**Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative:** The EIS/EIR will evaluate transportation and environmental effects of modest improvements in the highway and transit systems beyond those in the No Build Alternative. The TSM Alternative would include low-cost improvements to the No Build Alternative to reduce delay and enhance mobility. The TSM Alternative would emphasize transportation system upgrades, such as intersection improvements, minor road widening, traffic engineering actions, bus route restructuring, shortened bus headways, expanded use of articulated buses, reserved bus lanes, expanded park-and-ride facilities, express and limited-stop service, signalization improvements, and timed-transfer operations.

**Build Alternative:** The Build Alternative utilizes the existing Metro/Construction Authority and San Bernardino Associated Governments rights of way through the San Gabriel Valley for an LRT extension of the existing Gold Line. The Build Alternative would extend the Metro Gold Line LRT system from the eastern boundary of Azusa to the Montclair TransCenter (approximately 12.6 miles) located in Montclair, bordering the city of Upland. The same LRT technology and the same types of system components would be used as the existing Metro Gold Line. The Build Alternative would include six new stations, one in each of the cities along the corridor: Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont and Montclair. Potential station locations have been defined in consultation with the corridor cities. Parking facilities would be provided at each new station.

Eight traction power substations (TPSSs) would be constructed along the route in order to provide electrical power to the line. Where possible, TPSS sites would be located near a station. TPSS sites would be located within existing rail right of way or within properties to be acquired for stations or parking. The Build Alternative would include two LRT tracks throughout, and one freight track between the eastern boundary of Azusa

---

and Pomona. In Pomona, the single freight track would then join up with the double Metrolink tracks and continue through to Montclair and beyond.

An overview of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Azusa to Montclair Study Area is shown in Figure 1.

## **I.2 PROCESS OF SCOPING**

“Scoping” is one of the first steps in the environmental review process that assists with determining the focus and content of an EIS/EIR. Scoping is also intended to inform and educate the public and public agencies about the project, the potential range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, the overall schedule for the environmental review process, mitigation measures to be analyzed in the EIS/EIR, and is a means of providing input to the Construction Authority and the FTA.

Scoping also provides opportunities for the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties to express their concerns about the project. Scoping is not conducted to resolve differences concerning the merits of a project or to anticipate the ultimate decision on a proposal. The intent of the scoping process is to involve the agencies and the public in defining the major issues to be analyzed in the EIS/EIR.

The objectives of the Azusa to Montclair Project EIS/EIR scoping process include:

- Informing the agencies and interested members of the public about the proposed Azusa to Montclair project, including NEPA and CEQA requirements.
- Identifying concerns and issues regarding environmental topics.
- Identifying concerns and issues regarding alignments and potential station locations to be analyzed in the EIS/EIR.
- Identifying mitigation measures or approaches to avoid or minimize impacts; these measures and approaches may be examined further in the EIS/EIR.
- Informing and engaging public, agency and other interested parties in communities along the Azusa to Montclair corridor.
- Developing a mailing list to provide interested parties an opportunity to review the EIS/EIR.



---

Details related to the scoping process and the input gathered during the scoping period are documented in this report.

Scoping is a specific activity within the EIS/EIR process, but public involvement activities continue throughout the entire EIS/EIR process. These activities encourage ongoing input and the recognition of public and agency issues and concerns related to the EIS/EIR throughout the environmental analysis process.

During the scoping process, agencies and interested members of the public presented questions and identified concerns related to the Azusa to Montclair Project. Comments provided during the scoping process will assist the Construction Authority and FTA in their review and evaluation of alternatives, station and parking locations.

### **I.3 NOTIFICATION OF EIS/EIR SCOPING**

In December 2010, the Authority issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and the FTA issued a Notice of Intent (NOI) for an EIS/EIR for the Foothill Extension Azusa to Montclair Project (the NOP is included in Appendix A and the NOI in Appendix B). Recipients included the State Clearinghouse, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, elected officials, agencies and planning/community development directors (along the project corridor and in Sacramento).

Publication of the NOP/NOI initiated the state environmental review process under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the federal environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), respectively. The NOP and NOI described the purpose and need of the project, the project limits, alternatives for consideration, noted the importance of agency input, highlighted potential environmental impacts, and identified a key contact person for additional information regarding the project, as well as the dates and locations of the scoping meetings. The documents also indicated the end of the public comment period for the Azusa to Montclair Project EIS/EIR as February 2, 2011.

### **I.4 SCOPING ACTIVITIES**

The scoping meetings for the Azusa to Montclair Project EIS/EIR were conducted in January 2011. There were four noticed public scoping meetings and one interagency scoping meeting held in the Azusa to Montclair project corridor (Table 1-A, page 7). The four public scoping meetings drew 229 participants; the interagency scoping meeting 18 participants (Table 1-B, page 7).

The public scoping meetings were held from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Each session included an open house followed by a presentation. An interagency scoping meeting was held in Glendora at 2:00 to 4:00 pm (Table 1-A, page 7).

Materials provided during the scoping meetings included exhibits and handouts distributed at the meetings and specific documents (noted below) distributed through the Construction Authority's website ([www.foothillextension.org](http://www.foothillextension.org)). A full list of scoping related documents are included in the report's Appendices A through N (see the list on Page ii).

These materials included the following:

- Scoping Meeting Handout Materials: agenda/meeting guide, fact sheet, comment sheets – posted to Construction Authority website (Appendix G)

- Power Point Presentation – posted on Construction Authority website (Appendix N)
- Scoping Meeting Announcement (Appendix C)
- 10 Information Boards, 6 City-Station Aerial Maps, and 6 Station Area Concepts – posted on Construction Authority website (Appendix M)
- Media Advisory (Appendix E)

**Table I-A: Scoping Meeting Dates, Locations and Times**

| <b>Date</b>                 | <b>City</b> | <b>Location/Address</b>                                 | <b>Meeting Times</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Wednesday, January 12, 2011 | Pomona      | Ganesha Community Center, 1575 North White Avenue       | 6:00-8:00 p.m.       |
| Thursday, January 13, 2011* | Glendora    | Glendora Teen and Family Center, 241 West Dawson Street | 2:00-4:00 p.m.       |
| Thursday, January 13, 2011  | Glendora    | Glendora Teen and Family Center, 241 West Dawson Street | 6:00-8:00 p.m.       |
| Wednesday, January 19, 2011 | Claremont   | Elementary School, 120 West Green Street                | 6:00-8:00 p.m.       |
| Thursday, January 20, 2011  | San Dimas   | Ekstrand Elementary School, 400 North Walnut Avenue     | 6:00-8:00 p.m.       |

\* Interagency scoping meeting.

**Table I-B Number of Scoping Meeting Attendees – Meeting Location**

| <b>Meeting Location</b>                    | <b>Federal</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>Local/City</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Individual</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Pomona                                     | 1              | 1            | 7                 | 16                  | 20                | 45           |
| Glendora – Interagency Meeting (afternoon) | 1              | 3            | 9                 | 5                   | 1                 | 19           |
| Glendora – Public Meeting (evening)        | 0              | 1            | 5                 | 19                  | 40                | 65           |
| Claremont                                  | 0              | 0            | 13                | 9                   | 49                | 71           |
| San Dimas                                  | 1              | 1            | 5                 | 10                  | 34                | 51           |
| Total                                      | 3              | 6            | 39                | 59                  | 144               | 251          |

---

Attendees were asked to register at the meetings and were provided with an information packet, which included an agenda/meeting guide, fact sheet and comment sheet. Registration table staff provided directions on the meeting format to orient attendees, and asked that they remember to document comments on the forms provided. A court reporter was also available at each meeting to document verbal testimony provided by interested attendees (Appendix L).

The meetings began with a 30 minute power point presentation provided to the attendees. The Construction Authority staff and Consultant Team representatives welcomed attendees, presented an overview of the project, and responded to questions posed by meeting participants. An open house session followed, where Authority, staff and consultants were available to respond to questions and discuss informational materials being distributed or shown on display boards around the room. The displays covered pertinent topics such as environmental issues, engineering plan drawings, system maps, aerial maps of project corridor cities, and how to comment during scoping.

Written and officially documented verbal comments (transcribed by a court reporter) are included and summarized in this report (see Section 3.4). Written comments, which were provided by mail and e-mail, are also included. During scoping, 133 communications in the form of comment letters, comment cards, emails, and oral testimony were received during the comment period. These included:

- 30 written comments received at the five scoping meetings,
- 38 e-mails received with comments
- 10 comment letters received by mailed or fax
- 55 oral testimonies or questions that were transcribed during the meeting by a court reporter.

Copies of the comment cards, letters, verbal comments and e-mails are provided in Appendix I (public comments), Appendix J (agency comments), Appendix K (organization comments) and Appendix L (verbal comments).

---

## 2.0 PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT DURING SCOPING

Notice of scoping meetings was mailed to a comprehensive list of various federal, state and local agencies, elected officials, community members, businesses, environmental leaders/organizations and other interested parties between December 2010 and January 2011.

Scoping activities included public outreach measures, the identification of key concerns, development of key messages to address issues, media outreach activities, and proactive information sharing efforts as described below:

- 15,277 public meeting notices were sent on January 5, 2011 to:
  - o 2,384 Property Owners
  - o 4,069 Occupants
  - o 8,824 Stakeholders
- The email-only version of the public meeting notice and reminders was sent to 3,460 individuals and stakeholders on the following dates:
  - o January 3, 2011
  - o January 10, 2011
  - o January 18, 2011
- Legal notices published in the following newspapers:
  - o San Gabriel Valley Tribune – January 3, 2011
  - o Inland Valley Daily Bulletin – January 3, 2011
- Display ads were placed in 4 market/daily, community and ethnic papers within the project corridor publicizing the upcoming scoping meetings. These papers included:
  - o Inland Empire Weekly – Thursday, January 6, 2011
  - o Inland Valley Daily Bulletin – Friday, January 7, 2011
  - o Claremont Courier – Saturday, January 8, 2011
  - o San Gabriel Valley Tribune – Sunday, January 9, 2011
- Social media activity included:
  - o I Will Ride blog posts (also distributed via email to subscribers) – December/January
  - o Facebook posts, including meetings added as “events” on project page – December/January
  - o Twitter posts – December/January
  - o Construction Authority Website – Created copy describing environmental process and listed scoping meeting dates/locations, posted on Website in January.
- Organizational Outreach included calls and correspondence to approximately 75 community, civic and business groups.

- 
- Newspapers and Media Outlets that published articles or bulletins about the scoping meetings included:
    - o Azusa Tomorrow
    - o Azusa Chamber of Commerce Newsletter
    - o Azusa Community News
    - o Claremont Courier
    - o Claremont Now
    - o Curbed LA
    - o Frontier News
    - o Glendora Community News
    - o Glendora Patch blog
    - o Glendora Report
    - o InsideSoCal.com
    - o LA Streetsblog
    - o LaVerne Community News
    - o Laternan Development Center Newsletter
    - o Neon Tommy blog
    - o San Dimas Chamber Newsletter
    - o San Dimas Community News
    - o San Gabriel Valley Tribune
  - Briefings to Stakeholders were conducted with the following area community, civic and business groups:
    - o Toastmasters/Claremont chapter – December 3, 2011
    - o Citrus College Interclub Council – December 7, 2011
    - o La Verne Senior Advisory Committee – January 19, 2011
    - o Glendora Kiwanis – February 10, 2011
    - o Montclair Chamber – February 10, 2011
  - City Planning Directors/Community Development Directors were asked to place additional copies of the notice in high-traffic public locations to inform citizens about upcoming scoping meetings.
  - Information was also provided on the Construction Authority's website at:  
[www.foothillextension.org](http://www.foothillextension.org).

---

## **2.1 Summary of Noticed Scoping Meetings**

The scoping meetings were designed to provide the public and public agencies with the opportunity to receive project information, provide access to key project staff to facilitate an interactive dialogue, and respond to inquiries.

A number of overall themes related to the Project were raised at the public and interagency scoping meetings. The themes are reflected in the topics listed in Section 3.0 of this report and, although emphasis on each topic varied, the topics generally were consistent from meeting to meeting, with the exception of geographic-specific details related to individual communities (neighborhoods, grade crossings, station locations, parking, intersections). Key EIR/EIR themes addressed at the scoping meetings ranged from analyzing potential environmental effects of a project to examining station concept plans for platforms and parking locations.

## **2.2 Briefings to Interested Parties**

Briefings with city officials were conducted prior to the initiation of scoping activities. This setting provided early opportunities to provide information about the project, to meet with project managers and team staff, to share concerns and to be better prepared to participate in the environmental review process. Below is a list of city briefings that occurred during the pre-scoping phase of the project:

- City of Glendora: November 30, 2010
- San Dimas: December 2, 2010
- La Verne: November 29, 2010
- Pomona: November 29, 2010
- Claremont: November 30, 2010
- Montclair: December 2, 2010

---

## 3.0 PUBLIC AND AGENCY SCOPING COMMENTS

Between December 28, 2010 and February 2, 2010, written public comments were received from 132 commenters, including 48 letters and e-mails and 29 comment forms. In addition, 55 people made verbal comments at the public scoping meetings.

### 3.1 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Table 2 highlights approximately how many comments were made by topic area for each of the corridor cities.

Positive comments relating to the project's goals and purpose constituted the largest group of comments received (14.5%). Of these types of comments, many expressed a desire to see the project completed sooner than is proposed.

The second largest pool of comments and questions concerned noise, soundwalls, vibration, and disruptions from train lights (11.8%). Increased noise is a concern, although it should be noted that many comments referred to the noise of existing, non-project traffic (e.g., Metrolink and BNSF). Comments on soundwalls were divided between requests to see soundwalls installed for noise mitigation and concerns that soundwalls would obscure views or require property acquisition.

The third largest group of comments was about grade crossings (8.1%). Most of the comments about grade crossings related to the project's impacts on traffic circulation on or near the streets where grade crossings are proposed. Other comments focused on grade crossing safety and possible impacts to emergency response times.

An equal number of comments were received concerning bicycle/pedestrian access and visual/aesthetic impacts and historic preservation (each group constituted 7.7% of all comments counted). Comments expressed a desire to have adequate bike facilities and accommodations at each station (including bikeways leading to the stations, lockers at the stations). Several comments also wanted to see a bikeway constructed alongside the Gold Line right of way. Comments on pedestrian access issues mostly focused on the provisions of walk access to each station either from a station's surrounding neighborhood, or from the adjacent parking garage. Several comments referenced the need for pedestrian bridges across busy streets (Arrow Highway in particular).

There were also comments relating to Visual/aesthetic impacts caused by catenary wires and poles. Several comments (mostly from Claremont residents) asked that the grade be lowered or entrenched to reduce the visual impact created by wires and poles. At the Claremont Scoping Meetings, there were also concerns expressed about the impact on the historic depot adjacent to the proposed Gold Line station. Some comments indicated a desire to use the depot for operations, others requested that access to the depot be preserved, and most expressed a concern that the alignment as proposed was too close to the structure.

The facilitation of transfers to/from Metrolink at shared stations and the coordination of schedules and fares with both Metrolink and bus operators serving the stations constituted the next largest pool of comments (6.7%).

Other concerns included station siting and design, operational questions (primarily concerning hours of operation, schedules, and fares), alignment design, and acquisition

---

requirements. Sixteen comments in favor of extending the project to Ontario airport were received, and 2 were received opposed to such an extension.

Relatively few comments were received concerning funding, traffic/circulation, parking, air quality, and economic impacts. Only four comments (1.3%) expressed general opposition to the project.

This section characterizes the comments received from residents of each city.

### **Glendora**

Of the 43 comments received from Glendora residents, 7 comments expressed general support for the project, 7 comments raised concerns or asked questions about station siting. These were divided between those who favored the current location and those who preferred a site closer to the Marketplace. Grade crossings and their traffic impacts generated 6 comments, many of which focused on Grand and Foothill. Noise and soundwalls were also a concern from 5 residents who lived adjacent to the tracks. Finally, of the 16 comments received in support of extending the project to Ontario airport, 5 came from Glendora residents.

### **San Dimas**

A total of 24 comments were recorded from San Dimas residents, 7 of which expressed general support for the project. Comments about noise, soundwalls, lights, and vibration constituted the single biggest concern for San Dimas residents (4 comments). Residents living by the tracks asked about noise both from trains and from grade crossings. Property acquisition ranked as the second largest concern (3 comments).

### **La Verne**

Twelve comments were received from La Verne residents. Four comments expressed an interest in seeing bicycle and pedestrian accommodations at each station site. If the station is separated from the parking garage by Arrow Highway, several commenters noted that traffic on Arrow Highway makes this street very busy for pedestrians to cross. Three comments were received in general support of the project, and three comments concerned the coordination of train service with bus service at the station.

### **Pomona**

A total of 17 comments were received from Pomona residents. Most of these concerned bicycle and pedestrian access (4 comments); a bikeway along the railroad right of way was of particular interest. Other categories of concern to Pomona residents were station siting, and project funding/cost.

### **Claremont**

A total of 145 comments (or 49% of the total recorded) were received from Claremont residents whose top concerns were noise, vibration, and soundwalls (22 comments) and visual impacts, aesthetics, and historic preservation (22 comments). Most of these comments focused on the historic depot at Claremont, and several commenters expressed concern about the proximity of the Gold Line's alignment to the structure and potential impacts the aesthetic character of the existing structure. A large number of comments (19) expressed general support for the project. The next largest group (11

---

comments) asked about bicycle and pedestrian access. Claremont residents made up the majority of commenters expressing support for the Ontario extension. Of the 16 total comments in support of the extension, 9 are from Claremont residents.

### **Montclair**

Four residents were recorded as having attended the scoping meetings, however no comments were received from Montclair residents.

**Table 2 – Summary of Public Comments by Residence of Commenter**

|                                                                     | Glendora | San Dimas | La Verne | Pomona | Claremont | Montclair | Agency/<br>Other/<br>Unknown | Total | Total % |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|-------|---------|
| General support                                                     | 7        | 7         | 3        | 2      | 19        | 0         | 5                            | 43    | 14.5%   |
| Noise/vibration/lights/soundwalls                                   | 5        | 4         | 0        | 0      | 22        | 0         | 4                            | 35    | 11.8%   |
| Grade crossings                                                     | 6        | 2         | 0        | 1      | 10        | 0         | 5                            | 24    | 8.1%    |
| Bicycle/pedestrian access & facilities                              | 1        | 0         | 4        | 4      | 11        | 0         | 3                            | 23    | 7.7%    |
| Visual/sight lines/aesthetics/historic preservation                 | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0      | 22        | 0         | 1                            | 23    | 7.7%    |
| Metrolink/bus coordination/interfacing                              | 0        | 1         | 3        | 0      | 8         | 0         | 8                            | 20    | 6.7%    |
| Station siting/design/safety                                        | 7        | 0         | 0        | 2      | 6         | 0         | 4                            | 19    | 6.4%    |
| Operational questions (hours, fares, ridership, freight operations) | 2        | 1         | 1        | 1      | 9         | 0         | 4                            | 18    | 6.1%    |
| Ontario extension                                                   | 5        | 0         | 0        | 0      | 10        | 0         | 3                            | 18    | 6.1%    |
| Alignment design                                                    | 2        | 0         | 0        | 1      | 8         | 0         | 5                            | 16    | 5.4%    |
| Property acquisition/value                                          | 3        | 3         | 0        | 1      | 5         | 0         | 1                            | 13    | 4.4%    |
| Other                                                               | 2        | 2         | 0        | 1      | 2         | 0         | 4                            | 11    | 3.7%    |
| Funding/Cost                                                        | 3        | 2         | 0        | 2      | 1         | 0         | 0                            | 8     | 2.7%    |
| Traffic/circulation/public safety access                            | 0        | 1         | 0        | 0      | 5         | 0         | 1                            | 7     | 2.4%    |
| Parking                                                             | 0        | 1         | 0        | 1      | 1         | 0         | 3                            | 6     | 2.0%    |
| Pollution/Air quality impacts                                       | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0      | 4         | 0         | 1                            | 5     | 1.7%    |
| Economic/Jobs                                                       | 0        | 0         | 1        | 1      | 1         | 0         | 1                            | 4     | 1.3%    |
| General opposition                                                  | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0      | 1         | 0         | 3                            | 4     | 1.3%    |

Note: These numbers count comments and not commenters, many of whom made multiple comments in their letters, forms, e-mails, and testimonies.

---

## 3.2 SUMMARY OF AGENCY COMMENTS

Written comments were received from 13 agencies: 2 federal; 3 state, 3 regional, 4 cities, and one public utility. These agency comments are summarized in Tables 3 through 10 under the following categories:

- Alignment
- Environmental Planning
- Connectivity
- Project Funding
- Safety
- Conservation
- Land Use
- General

**Table 3: Summary of Agency Comments - Alignment**

| <b>Date Comment Submitted or Received</b> | <b>Commenter</b>                                                     | <b>Summary of Comments</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/25/2011                                 | State of California Public Utilities Commission, Rosa Munoz          | While we understand the cost of grade separating a highway-rail at-grade crossing makes for a perceived detriment to your project, the CPUC normally does not take cost into its consideration of the practicability of grade separating a crossing.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 2/2/2011                                  | City of Glendora, Dianne Walter                                      | City's Public Works Street Yard access off of Loraine Avenue is located on the railroad right of way. Discussion with Authority staff indicate that the Loraine access will not be impacted. The City respectfully requests confirmation from the Authority that the Loraine access to the Street Yard will be maintained as part of the Phase 2B project.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 1/28/2011                                 | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris                                     | Requests the authority conduct a detailed grade crossing analysis that evaluates the feasibility of a grade separation in order to mitigate traffic concerns. The intersection of Bonita Ave/Cataract Ave will be experiencing almost 40 to 50 seconds delays of closure every 5 minutes when considering the estimated train frequency of 12 trains per hour in both directions. In addition to signal stoppage delays, the intersection would most likely result in all automobile operations being stopped during the LRT crossing every 5 minutes. This delay or closure would significantly impact traffic operations and adversely impact traffic in the heart of downtown San Dimas.                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 1/28/2011                                 | County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Stephen R. Maguin | Proposed project may impact existing and/or proposed Districts' trunk sewers over which it will be constructed. Existing and proposed sewers are located directly on and/or cross directly beneath the proposed project alignment. The Districts cannot issue a detailed response to or permit construction of the proposed project until project plans specifications that incorporate Districts' sewer lines are submitted. In order to prepare plans, submit a map of the proposed project alignment, then the Districts will provide the plans for all Districts' facilities that will be impacted by the proposed project. Then, when revised plans incorporate the sewers have been prepared, please submit copies of the same for review and comment.                                                                                                                                                       |
| 1/31/2011                                 | Southern California Edison, Ben Wong                                 | The project as described has the potential to impact SCE's existing transmission, distribution and communication facilities as well as SCE's easements and land rights. In order to provide a more thorough review of the project's potential impact to SCE facilities and land rights, SCE will require more detailed project information for the proposed LRT alignment and all supporting infrastructure, appurtenant facilities, and for the six proposed transit transitions, including location maps and surveyed drawings illustrating all LRT structure elevations and profiles. Where LRT elements cross existing SCE transmission, distribution, or telecommunication facilities, surveyed drawings must include SCE structure locations and profiles. In addition, the location and highest elevation of the LRT's electric power system crossing under each of SCE's lines would need to be indicated. |

---

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                            | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/31/2011                          | Southern California Edison, Ben Wong | For all LRT alignments and electric power elements adjacent to our overhead lines, we will require power line conductor elevations, plans and profiles, grading and drainage plans, and transmission line access information.             |
| 1/31/2011                          | Southern California Edison, Ben Wong | For each line crossing need to look in detail at transmission line access, conductor heights, grading and drainage, and proximity to towers.                                                                                              |
| 1/31/2011                          | Southern California Edison, Ben Wong | Without this detailed information, SCE can only provide general comments on how the proposed project potentially impacts SCE facilities and land rights, and what SCE would like the DEIS is indicated below (see comments P-10 to P-13). |

**Table 4: Summary of Agency Comments – Environmental Planning**

| <b>Date Comment Submitted or Received</b> | <b>Commenter</b>                   | <b>Summary of Comments</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6/21/2004                                 | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf        | Review of 2004 DEIS/EIR: insufficient information to thoroughly assess environmental impacts that should be avoided to fully protect the environment. Concerns are based on the scope of analysis, potential impacts to air, water, and biological resources, hazardous materials management, and socioeconomic impacts of removing freight service.                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 6/21/2004                                 | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf        | Describe the design and location of the proposed relocation of the 6,000-foot siding area required on the BNSF line and disclose the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that the relocation will have on environmental resources.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 6/21/2004                                 | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf        | Consistent with CEQ's guidance, present all reasonable mitigation and pollution prevention features in the Final EIS. Evaluate the feasibility of mitigation to avoid, reduce or compensate for adverse environmental impacts from construction and operation.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2/2/2011                                  | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson     | Please see comments for the 2004 DEIS regarding scope of analysis, air quality, water resources, biological resources, hazardous materials and hazardous waste, and impacts of freight delivery restrictions, please address if relevant. When released for public review mail one hard copy and one disc copy of the Draft EIS to address listed, mail code CED-2.                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 1/27/2011                                 | Caltrans, District 7, Ron Kosinski | Potential concerns are hazardous waste sites, noise and vibration impacts, right-of-way requirements and potential modifications to our bridge structures.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2/4/2011                                  | City of Arcadia, Philip Wray       | Impacts on the operational capabilities of the stations and parking structures in the Phase 2A segment should be given serious consideration when developing the Phase 2B project scope. How will Phase 2B project address impacts on Phase 2A facilities? As part of the Phase 2B project, will a new ridership forecast be done? If the new forecast is significantly different from the one that was done as part of Phase 2A project, some mechanisms need to be put in place to remedy any impact on the Phase 2A segment (station, parking, etc). |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                        | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | The DEIS should explore and objectively evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives, including No Action Alternative, and briefly discuss the reasons for eliminating from future evaluation (40 CFR 1502.14). EPA recommends the DEIS include summary of screening methodology used to determine the Range of Alternatives for inclusion in the DEIS. The methodology summary should include information about what criteria and measures were used at each screening level and how integrated in a comprehensive evaluation. The DEIS should include a description of alternatives considered but withdrawn and a summary of why eliminated. |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | The DEIS should also identify opportunities for the alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts while fulfilling the project purpose. This may include alignment shifts, buffers, localized design modifications, changes in construction practices, or spanned crossings of sensitive biological resources                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 1/28/2011                          | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris | EIS/EIR intends to utilize the 2008 SCAG Growth Forecast, the City of San Dimas considers these forecasts as being unrealistic for this City. SCAG has acknowledged this and the current drafts of the 2012 Growth Forecast reflect housing, population and jobs projections more consistent with the built-out conditions in the City. The updated projections are substantially lower than those in the 2008 Forecast. The EIR/EIS should take these differences into consideration.                                                                                                                                                         |
| 6/21/2004                          | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf      | Discuss the feasibility and impacts of limiting all freight operations between the hours of 2:00am and 4:00am, including how light rail maintenance between 2:00am and 4:00am would be compatible with freight delivery utilizing the same tracks. Describe the long-term socioeconomic impacts of permanently removing the ability for freight to be delivered on the BNSF line between the Sierra Madre Station and the city of La Verne.                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | Identify whether the proposed alternatives may disproportionately and adversely affect low-income or minority populations and provide appropriate mitigation measures for any adverse impacts. Assessment of the project's impacts should reflect consultation with affected populations and mitigation measures should be considered where feasible to avoid, mitigate, minimize, rectify, or eliminate impacts associated with a proposed project (See 40 CFR 1508.20). Mitigation measures identified in the DEIS should reflect the needs and preferences of the affected low-income and minority populations to the extent practicable.   |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | Document process used for community involvement and communication, including all measures to specifically outreach to potential environmental justice communities. Include an analysis of results achieved by reaching out to these populations. EPA has developed a model plan for public participation that may assist Caltrans in this effort: <i>The Model Plan for Public Participation</i> , EPA OECA, Feb 2000, is available at: <a href="http://www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/publications/nejac/model-public-part-plan.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/publications/nejac/model-public-part-plan.pdf</a>        |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                                        | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson                   | In the DEIS, discuss possible impacts to community cohesion the project may cause, and include mitigation measures for those impacts.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 1/31/2011                          | City of La Verne, Bob Russi                      | Closure of A, D and E Street and Fulton Road would cause diversion through residential areas to Wheeler Avenue and White Avenue, which is unacceptable from a neighborhood preservation perspective and unnecessary environmental impacts.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 1/31/2011                          | City of La Verne, Bob Russi                      | Downtown viability - Downtown commercial area and the University of La Verne are primary traffic generators affected by the proposed closures, they rely on Arrow Hwy for east-west access for students/patrons and D St provides primary connection to this major route for both entities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 1/26/2011                          | Metro Water District of Southern CA, John Shamma | The following Metropolitan facilities are within the proposed project area:<br>Orange County Feeder is a 42-inch diameter precast concrete pipeline runs in a northerly to southerly direction along Wheeler Ave. The project would intersect the Feeder at Wheeler Ave.<br>Middle Feeder is a 72-inch diameter steel pipeline that runs in a south-westerly to easterly direction along Bonita Avenue. The project would intersect at Bonita Avenue.<br>Upper Feeder is 140-inch diameter precast concrete pipeline that runs in a north-westerly to south-easterly direction between Fulton Rd and North Garey Ave. The project would intersect at North Garey Ave.<br>Yorba Linda Feeder is a 102-inch diameter steel pipeline that runs in a northerly to southerly direction along A St. The project would intersect at A St.<br>We are concerned with potential impacts to these facilities associated with future excavation, construction, utilities or any redevelopment that may occur as a result of proposed activity under the proposed Project. |
| 1/26/2011                          | Metro Water District of Southern CA, John Shamma | Metropolitan must be allowed to maintain its rights-of-way and requires unobstructed access to our facilities and properties at all times in order to repair and maintain system.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 1/26/2011                          | Metro Water District of Southern CA, John Shamma | In order to avoid potential conflicts with Metropolitan's rights-of-way, we require that any design plans for any activity in the area of Metropolitan's pipelines or facilities be submitted for our review and written approval. Approval of the project where it could impact Metropolitan's property should be contingent on approval of design plans for the Project. Detailed prints of drawings of Metropolitan's pipelines and rights-of-way may be obtained by calling Metropolitan's Substructure Info Line (213) 217-6564. To assist in preparing plans that are compatible with Metropolitan's facilities, easements, and properties, we have enclosed a copy of the " <i>Guidelines for Developments in the Area of Facilities, Fee Properties, and/or</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                                         | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                    |                                                   | <i>Easements of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California</i> " (see Attachment B). Please note that all submitted designs or plans must clearly identify Metropolitan's facilities and rights-of-way.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2/2/2011                           | Los Angeles County Fire Department, Debra Aguirre | The Build Alternative that will be analyzed traverses four cities protected by the LACFD. While all light rail transit routes have the potential to impact fire stations operations and emergency response times to some extent, three of the six proposed light rail stations are in extremely close proximity to three Los Angeles County fire stations (Stations 64, 101, 186), representing a greater threat to emergency response times for these stations. The Fire Department will work with Metro to make appropriate adjustments due to temporary construction delays and/or road closures.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2/2/2011                           | Los Angeles County Fire Department, Debra Aguirre | Some potential issues that will need to be addressed as the project is further developed include: consideration of where the Light Rail Transit stations will be located so as to not increase, or at least minimize, the traffic in the vicinity of existing fire stations, coordination with the Fire Department for any grade crossing construction so that emergency response is not impacted during construction, and any unforeseen issues that may impede the Fire Department's emergency services operations.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 2/2/2011                           | City of Glendora, Dianne Walter                   | In 2005, the City was notified that the Gold Line Authority was considering eliminating crossings at several streets in Glendora including Pasadena Ave, Glenwood Ave, and Elwood Ave. The City notified the Authority at that time that closure of these streets at the railroad right of way would cause significant emergency access problems for the City. Recently, Authority staff indicated that the closure issue had been reduced to consideration either Glenwood Ave or Elwood Ave. The City would like to continue discussions regarding the advisability of closing either Glenwood Avenue or Elwood Avenue at the railroad crossing and the impact on providing emergency services to the area.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 2/2/2011                           | City of Glendora, Dianne Walter                   | Authority staff indicated there will be two or three transformer substations located in Glendora to service the light rail system, which is still under review. Please provide detailed information on the locations for City review and comment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 1/31/2011                          | City of La Verne, Bob Russi                       | With the City Public Safety headquarters located on 3rd St (between C and D St), both A St and D St are primary routes for response to emergencies in the area south of the railroad tracks. E St is also a primary route for emergency service to Fairplex, Brackett Field and the large industrial complex south of Arrow Hwy. Emergency Services - City Public Safety headquarters located on 3rd St between C and D Streets, both A St and D St are primary routes for response to emergencies in the area south of the railroad tracks. E St is also a primary route for emergency services to Fairplex, Brackett Field and the industrial complex south of Arrow Highway. Closure of any of these streets could severely affect response times. Fire Dept estimates that closure of A St would increase response times to areas south of Arrow Hwy by approx 1 min, and closure of D and E St would increase response times up to 3 min and compromise the |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                            | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                    |                                      | safety of first responders due to rerouting through numerous intersections. The difference of even 1-3 minutes is particularly critical for medical aid response to heart attacks, strokes, drowning, etc. and eliminates alternative routes if at-grade crossings were blocked.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry          | Study should evaluate the impact to police, fire, and ambulance response times at proposed crossings. There is a fire station at Bonita Ave about 1/4 mile east of Garey Ave. Response times of emergency vehicles from the fire station would be affected by blockages of Garey Ave resulting from at-grade crossing.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 1/31/2011                          | Southern California Edison, Ben Wong | Please note: significant costs associated with modifying and/or relocating 220 and 500 kilovolt transmission lines. Costs could be as much as \$1million or more per SCE transmission structure that is required to be modified or moved. The cost associated with lower voltage lines may also be quite significant.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 1/31/2011                          | Southern California Edison, Ben Wong | If the project as proposed requires undergrounding facilities of sub-transmission lines, the cost and timeframes associated with undergrounding facilities are significantly larger and prohibitive over moving or modifying overhead lines at these same voltages.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 1/31/2011                          | Southern California Edison, Ben Wong | SCE prefers not to relocate transmission lines and instead would like to work with the Construction Authority to determine feasible LRT project design alternatives and/or alterations to existing SCE transmission lines that allows SCE's facilities to operate in place.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 1/31/2011                          | Southern California Edison, Ben Wong | Be advised if 500kV tower heights are required to be increased to accommodate LRT alignments and line crossings, the following project issues/concerns may exist: technical feasibility of increasing tower heights at some or all locations; all SCE lines must adhere to CPUC General Order 95 minimum requirements for vertical clearances from ground and other structures, which may impact LRT alignments; alterations to transmission, distribution and communication facilities may impact SCE's transmission line access roads and/or may require the access roads to be relocated; increasing SCE structure heights may increase environmental impacts to visual resources and air traffic circulation; SCE prefers to maintain existing and future transmission lines in place with design adaptations, provided it is technically feasible and all operations and maintenance requirements can be met. |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                                                                 | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/31/2011                          | Southern California Edison, Ben Wong                                      | Please include in the DEIS discussion and figures the location of any SCE facilities or land rights relative to the proposed alignments, structures, equipment, facilities, train stations, temporary construction areas, construction activity, etc., associated with the proposed project. Please also address any environmental impacts associated with raising, relocating, or modifying any existing SCE transmission lines.                          |
| 1/18/2011                          | Department of Transportation District 7, Regional Planning, Dianna Watson | We would like to remind you that any transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will require a Caltrans transportation permit. We recommend that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods                                                                                                                                               |
| 2/2/2011                           | Metro, Shahrzad Amiri                                                     | During the scoping meetings, the Construction Authority indicated that the EIR/EIS would analyze 10 minute peak headways. To be consistent, Metro requests that the EIR/EIS analyze Phase 2B operations using Metro's Rail Fleet Management Plan, dated 6/5/09. The proposed peak service headway is 6 min with three car trains in FY 2017 and beyond. Additionally, in anticipation of future enhanced service, please consider analyzing 5 min headways |
| 2/2/2011                           | City of Glendora, Dianne Walter                                           | Concerns regarding traffic impacts at important intersection crossings in the City. Particular concerns are the intersections of Foothill and Grand Ave, Vermont Ave, Glendora Ave, and Lone Hill Ave. Please provide detailed traffic impact analysis for all at-grade crossings with particular attention to the listed intersections for City review and comment.                                                                                       |
| 1/31/2011                          | City of La Verne, Bob Russi                                               | The City strongly opposes closing several at-grade crossings along the Gold Line Corridor in La Verne. A, D, and E Streets in La Verne and Fulton Road at the La Verne/Pomona border should all remain open and continue to be through streets.                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 1/31/2011                          | City of La Verne, Bob Russi                                               | Closure of either D or E Street would cause a diversion to the other that would cause a near-capacity condition on the street that is left open.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 1/31/2011                          | City of La Verne, Bob Russi                                               | To potentially close E Street and Arrow Highway would serve as a barricade to the Gold Line Station and preclude parking for any La Verne residents traveling from north of the station.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 1/31/2011                          | City of La Verne, Bob Russi                                               | Fulton Road (shared by both La Verne and Pomona) is a designated truck route, closure would force trucks to travel through residential areas to reach areas in east La Verne and west Pomona and interfere with access to the Garey Avenue Metrolink Station                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry                                               | The FEIR did not state how many trains/day currently block crossings in Pomona. The FEIR should describe the maximum vehicle queue length caused by these blockages including the average duration of the blockages and estimated number of affected vehicles/day.                                                                                                                                                                                         |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                   | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | Impacts of the potential elimination of Fulton Road ingress/egress at the existing/future Metrolink parking lot need to be addressed                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | Impacts to Garey Ave as a result of the potential Fulton Road cul-de-sacs need analysis and mitigation or a revised proposal. The local preferred alternative is to consider a grade separation at the Garey Avenue crossing.                                                                    |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | The potential Fulton Road closure and cul-de-sacs need police, fire, and City of La Verne's review with any comments being addressed                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | The SCAG travel demand model should be used to adjust existing counts for future traffic scenarios based on growth rates from each city.                                                                                                                                                         |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | The FEIR traffic volume forecast does not appear to have considered the cumulative projects to determine an accurate traffic forecast.                                                                                                                                                           |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | It is not clear that the study considered increases in BNSF freight traffic and Metrolink service in the evaluation of build-out intersection delay analysis. The new traffic analysis should address this issue clearly.                                                                        |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | The new study should provide expected queue length and delays for traffic stopped at all crossings.                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | The new study should consider and analyze potential traffic diversion to other arterials as a result of an at-grade crossing blockage. Diverted traffic from Garey Ave could potentially trigger impacts at Fulton Road/Arrow Hwy and Towne Ave/Arrow Hwy.                                       |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | Proposed Pomona Light Rail Station is about 1/2 mile from the Pomona Fairplex. Currently, Metrolink operates special train service to this station during the LA County Fair. Discussion about the traffic impact to and from the Fairplex and a future Pomona Gold Line station is recommended. |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | Current study does not consider potential traffic impacts of shuttles that would likely be used to link the Gold Line Station near Garey Ave to various activity centers.                                                                                                                        |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | Impacts to Garey Ave, Bonita Ave, Towne Ave, and Santa Fe St need further analysis and potential modifications to proposed improvements.                                                                                                                                                         |

## METRO GOLD LINE FOOTHILL EXTENSION

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                        | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/28/2011                          | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris | Since the rail line at Bonita Avenue/Cataract Avenue crosses the intersection in a diagonal entry from the northwest corner and crossing to the southwest corner, considering the (approximately 300 foot) long diagonal rail crossing and its intersection geometry. It is the City's belief this intersection will be experiencing almost 40 to 50 seconds delays of closure every 5 minutes when considering the estimated train frequency of 12 trains per hour in both directions. Therefore in addition to signal stoppage delays, the intersection would most likely result in all automobile operations being stopped during the Light Rail Transit (LRT) crossing every 5 minutes. This delay or closure would significantly impact traffic operations and adversely impact traffic in the heart of downtown San Dimas. |
| 2/2/2011                           | City of Glendora, Dianne Walter  | City concerns regarding aesthetic impacts of a narrow, tall, utilitarian structure on surrounding views and properties within the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone adjacent to the subject station property for the parking structure proposed along the south side of the proposed station with access possibly from Vermont and Glendora Avenues. Please provide detailed site plans, floor plans, elevations and traffic analysis for the proposed parking including any plans for expanding parking to meet future demand pursuant to the MOU for City review and comment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 2/2/2011                           | City of Glendora, Dianne Walter  | The Gold Line commuter line will require an additional bridge across Route 66. It is unclear from documents provided whether the existing bridge for the freight line will also need to be rebuilt. Route 66 Bridge is not considered a historic structure, but it does provide an opportunity for the City to provide historic identification of the community as "Pride of the Foothills." Please provide detailed plans and elevations of the new bridge and modifications to the existing bridge if proposed for City review and comment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry      | Project impacts to visual resources by obstructing views along the portion near Towne Ave where elevated grade separation is being proposed should be addressed. Local alternative is to consider a below grade rail separation at this location.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry      | Poles for power, communications, and similar installations need to be painted in green, brown, or a similar City approved color to minimize visual impact.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry      | Proposed landscaping in City approved palette (drought-tolerant, native, etc.) should be illustrated. Walls and screening should be incorporated.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 1/28/2011                          | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris | Conduct a study of aesthetics and a visual impact plan for the Bonita Ave/Cataract Ave intersection and other LRT crossing intersections in the City                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 1/28/2011                          | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris | The equipment and the necessary housing of a power traction system to operate the LRT has the potential of creating negative aesthetic impacts throughout the City, but especially the City's Frontier Village area. In addition, the poles and the overhead wiring system, along the entire length of the rail right-of-way will have an adverse impact to the community.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                                                          | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/28/2011                          | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris                                   | The feasibility of relocating the existing abandoned spur/siding line located at the southwest corner of Bonita Avenue and Cataract Avenue                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 2/1/2011                           | Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Louise Dunford Brodnitz | In order to ensure compliance with Section 106 of the <i>National Historic Preservation Act</i> , the ACHP encourages your agency to initiate the Section 106 process by notifying, at your earliest convenience, the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and/or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), Indian tribes, and other consulting parties pursuant to our regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800). Through early consultation your agency will be able to determine the appropriate strategy to ensure Section 106 compliance for this undertaking.                                                                                                                          |
| 2/1/2011                           | Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Louise Dunford Brodnitz | The agency should continue consultation with the appropriate SHPO/THPO, Indian tribes, and other consulting parties to identify and evaluate historic properties and to assess any potential adverse effects on those historic properties. If your agency determines through consultation with the consulting parties that the undertaking will adversely affect historic properties, or that the development of a Programmatic Agreement is necessary, the agency must notify the ACHP and provide the documentation detailed at 36 CFR 800.11(e). In the event that this undertaking is covered under the terms of an existing Programmatic Agreement, you should follow the process set forth in the applicable Programmatic Agreement. |
| 6/21/2004                          | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf                                        | Identify all jurisdictional waters of the US that are directly or indirectly affected by the project. Disclose the total number of acres of impacts to jurisdictional waters of the US due to the proposed project, including any jurisdictional waters not identified as blue-line streams on USGS maps. Update the listings of channels/drainages included within each city area to include jurisdictional waters that are not identified as blue-line streams on the USGS maps referenced. Include a reference to a jurisdictional determination that has been completed by the Army Corps of Engineers. Describe potential mitigation, including on-site restoration, for any impacts to waters where it is feasible.                  |
| 6/21/2004                          | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf                                        | Describe the proposed methods for avoiding and minimizing impacts to the San Gabriel River and other streams and channels that will be crossed by the build alternatives. Correct the reference to the CDFG Streambed Alteration Agreements by identifying what additional requirements FTA will be committing to regarding necessary permits from CDFG for projects requiring streambed alterations.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson                                     | The DEIS should identify if the project will involve discharge of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional wetlands and waterways. This requires authorization by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Federal Guidelines at 40 CFR Part 230 promulgated under CWA Section 404 (b) (1) provide substantive environmental criteria that must be met to permit such discharges into waters of the US. These criteria require a permitted discharge to: (1) be at least environmentally damaging and                                                                                                                                                                                                |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                                                                 | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                    |                                                                           | practicable alternative (LEDPA); (2) avoid causing or contributing to a violation of a State water quality standard; (3) avoid jeopardizing a federally listed species or adversely modifying designated critical habitat for a federally listed species; (4) avoid causing or contributing to significant degradation of the waters of the US; and (5) mitigate for unavoidable impacts to waters. A fully integrated DEIS that adequately addresses these criteria would facilitate the CWA Section 404 permit review process.                                                                                     |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson                                            | To demonstrate compliance with CWA Guidelines, the DEIS should identify measures and modifications to avoid and minimize impacts to water resources. Temporary and permanent impacts to waters of the US for each alternative studies should be quantified; for example, acres of waters impacted, etc. For each alternative, the DEIS should report these numbers in table form for each impacted water and wetland feature.                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson                                            | On April 10, 2008, EPA and the Corps issued revised regulations, "Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources; Final Rule" (Mitigation Rule) (40 CFR 230), governing compensatory mitigation for authorized impacts to wetlands, streams, and other waters of the US under Section 404 of the CWA. These regulations are designed to improve the effectiveness of compensatory mitigation to replace lost aquatic resource functions and area and include a mitigation hierarchy with an inherent preference for mitigation banks and in-lieu fee programs before the use of an on-site mitigation site. |
|                                    |                                                                           | If it is determined that waters of the US will be impacted, include discussion in the DEIS to reflect current regulations. The link to the final Mitigation Rule, which went into effect on June 9, 2008, can be found at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/EPA-WATER/2008/April/Day-10/w6918a.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/EPA-WATER/2008/April/Day-10/w6918a.pdf</a> . Ensure that all mitigation proposed for waters of the US is in compliance with the Mitigation Rule.                                                                                                                                                    |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson                                            | Discuss mitigation for temporary and unavoidable indirect impacts. Temporary impact mitigation should consider additional compensatory mitigation for temporal loss of functions as well as establishing numeric criteria and monitoring of the temporary impact site to ensure that aquatic functions are fully restored. Indirect impact mitigation should consider opportunities to reduce any potential effects from shading and to compensate for possible wetland habitat fragmentation.                                                                                                                       |
| 1/18/2011                          | Department of Transportation District 7, Regional Planning, Dianna Watson | Based on our evaluation of the information received, this project should receive encroachment permit review by Caltrans. We recommend that your agency, at its earliest convenience, submit six complete sets of plans including two sets of all engineering documents including drainage plans to the Caltrans Permits Office for review                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 1/18/2011                          | Department of Transportation District 7, Regional Planning, Dianna Watson | Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful of your need to discharge clean run-off water                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                                                                 | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/18/2011                          | Department of Transportation District 7, Regional Planning, Dianna Watson | An Encroachment Permit from the Department of Transportation may be needed for this project. Any encroachment into, on or over State right-of-way needs a Department Encroachment Permit. Please prepare and submit engineering plans including drainage plans, for our review so we can determine whether an encroachment exists.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 1/28/2011                          | County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Stephen R. Maguin      | The proposed development is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of Districts Nos. 21 and 22.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 1/28/2011                          | County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Stephen R. Maguin      | Wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plan located adjacent to the City of Industry, which has a design capacity of 100 million gallons per day and currently processes an average flow of 76.3 mgd, or the Pomona WRP, which has a design capacity of 15 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 8.6 mgd.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 1/28/2011                          | County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Stephen R. Maguin      | In order to estimate the volume of wastewater the project will generate, a copy of the Districts' average wastewater generation factors is available online. Go to <a href="http://www.lacsd.org">www.lacsd.org</a> , information center, will serve program, obtain will serve letter, and click on the appropriate link on page 2.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 1/28/2011                          | County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Stephen R. Maguin      | The Districts are authorized by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee for the privilege of connecting (directly or indirectly) to the Districts' Sewerage System or increasing the strength or quantity of wastewater attributed to a particular parcel or operation already connected. Payment of a connection fee will be required before a permit to connect to the sewer is issued. For a copy of the Connection Fee Information Sheet, go to <a href="http://www.lacsd.org">www.lacsd.org</a> , information center, will serve program, obtain will serve letter, and click on the appropriate link on page 2. For more specific information regarding the connection fee application procedure and fees, please contact the Connection Fee Counter at extension 2727.                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 1/28/2011                          | County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Stephen R. Maguin      | In order for the Districts to conform to the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act, the design capacities of the Districts' wastewater treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments. All expansions of Districts' facilities must be sized and service phased in a manner that will be consistent with the SCAG regional growth forecast for the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. The available capacity of the Districts' treatment facilities will, therefore, be limited to levels associated with the approved growth identified by SCAG. As such, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of wastewater service, but is to advise you that the Districts intend to provide this service up to the levels that are legally permitted and to inform you of the currently existing capacity and any proposed expansion of the Districts' facilities. |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                        | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                    | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris | EIR should address/analyze the impact created on existing undersized and aging storm drains and culvert system crossing the proposed project                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 6/21/2004                          | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf      | Address potential impacts due to the use of hazardous materials in construction and operation, and the expected types and volumes of hazardous materials, specifically associated with the Maintenance and Operations Facility. Evaluate alternate processes potentially using a smaller volume of hazardous materials and/or less toxic materials, especially as project mitigation and identify expected storage, disposal, and management plans. Address the proposed methods to control and remediate any spill or discharge of hazardous materials into the environment. Address the applicability of Federal hazardous waste requirements and also California's requirements that are approved by EPA under RCRA.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 6/21/2004                          | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf      | Correct Section 3-2 to disclose that the project area is designated as severe nonattainment for federal 8-hour ozone standard.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 6/21/2004                          | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf      | Address whether the project is included in a conforming plan and transportation improvement program.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 6/21/2004                          | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf      | Analyze the air quality impacts from transferring current and future rail freight service to truck-delivered freight operations and disclose the estimated increase in pollutants.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | The proposed project is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) implements local air quality regulations in the SCAB to carry out Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements, as authorized by the EPA. The current SCAB nonattainment designations under the CAA are as follows: 8-hour ozone - severe nonattainment; particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less (PM10) - serious nonattainment; and particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less (PM2.5) - nonattainment. The SCAB has the worst 8-hour ozone and PM2.5 problems in the nation and attainment of these NAAQS will require massive reductions from mobile sources, given the rapid growth in this emissions category and the long lifespan of diesel engines. Because of the air basin's nonattainment status, it is important to reduce emissions of ozone precursors, mobile source air toxics (MSAT) and particulate matter from this project to the maximum extent. |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | The DEIS should include detailed discussion of ambient air conditions (i.e. baseline or existing conditions), the area's attainment or nonattainment status for all NAAQS, and potential air quality impacts (including cumulative and indirect impacts) from the construction and operation of the project for each fully evaluated alternative. Include estimate of all criteria pollutant emissions and diesel particulate matter (DPM). The EPS also recommends the DEIS disclose the available information about the health risks associated with construction and truck emissions and how the proposed project will affect current                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                      | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                    |                                | emission levels.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson | The DEIS should describe any applicable local, state, or federal requirements. Describe applicable requirements for Federal Actions that require FTA or FHWA funding or approval and are subject to the Transportation Conformity requirements in 40 CFR part 93, subpart A and for Federal Actions that are not subject to the General Conformity requirements in 40 CFR part 93, subpart B.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson | The DEIS should ensure that the emissions from both the construction and the operational phases of the project conform to the approved State Implementation Plan and do not cause or contribute to violations of the NAAQS. To meet transportation conformity requirements, the DEIS should demonstrate that the project is included in a conforming transportation plan and transportation improvement program.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson | The responsible agency should include a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan in the DEIS and adopt this plan in the Record of Decision (ROD). In addition to all applicable local, state or federal requirements, EPA recommends that the specific mitigation measures be included in the Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan in order to reduce impacts associated with emissions of particulate matter and other toxics from construction-related activities (see Attachment A).                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson | Identify all commitments to reduce construction emissions and update the air quality analysis to reflect additional air quality improvements that would result from adopting specific air quality measures.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson | Identify where implementation of mitigation measures is rejected based on economic infeasibility.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson | Prepare an inventory of all equipment prior to construction and identify the suitability of add-on emission controls for each piece of equipment before groundbreaking. (Suitability of control devices is based on: whether there is reduced normal availability of the construction equipment due to increased downtime and/or power output, whether there may be significant damage caused to the construction equipment engine, or whether there may be a significant risk to nearby workers or the public.) Meet CARB diesel fuel requirement for off-road and on-highway (i.e., 15 ppm), and where appropriate use alternative fuel sources such as natural gas and electric power. |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                        | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | Identify sensitive receptors in the project area, such as children, elderly, and infirm, and specify the means by which you will minimize impacts to these populations. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | EPA strongly recommends that the DEIS identify the cumulative contributions to and cumulative savings of greenhouse gas emissions that will result from implementation of the project.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | EPA also recommends the DEIS discuss how the project may support the principles of the Partnership for Sustainable Communities and development of the regional SCS.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | We recommend that the DEIS discuss potential impacts of climate change on the project. For example, discuss design features that will allow the proposed infrastructure to withstand an increase in extreme precipitation events, and drought tolerant landscaping should be used to prepare for water shortages. We suggest the DEIS discuss adaptation to climate change in context, be describing how the project meets the intent of statewide and national sustainability initiatives and goals to develop sustainable communities.                                                                                         |
| 2/2/2011                           | City of Glendora, Dianne Walter  | Noise impacts from the commuter rail line have been an on-going concern for the citizens of Glendora. Notes provided by Authority staff after a scoping meeting held with the City on 1/13/2011 indicate that the project would provide 15,575 feet of sound walls in Glendora. Please provide detailed maps showing the locations of these sound walls along with elevation view for City review and comment. Horn soundings and crossing gate bells may also create noise impacts for adjacent residents and businesses. Please provide more detail on mitigation planned to reduce these impacts for City review and comment. |
| 1/31/2011                          | City of La Verne, Bob Russi      | City requests noise studies to investigate noise from the alarm systems at the Gold Line at-grade crossings. This extension travels along residential areas and noise disturbance should be minimized to these residential areas.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 2/1/2011                           | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry      | Further analysis of noise considerations and mitigation measures is needed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 1/28/2011                          | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris | Noise and vibration will be significant issues. All feasible mitigation measures should be addressed including mitigation measures that consider landscaping within the railroad right-of-way                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                                  | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6/21/2004                          | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf                | Disclose the potential impacts from bridge retrofits on the species that utilize the San Gabriel River wildlife corridor. Include a more thorough description of how impacts to wildlife utilizing the wildlife corridor can be minimized.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 6/21/2004                          | US EPA Region IX, Lisa Hanf                | Disclose the historic loss of alluvial fan coastal sage scrub and riparian scrub habitat as well as the total remaining habitat. Identify the percentage of remaining habitat lost due to the proposed action. Identify any mitigation measures to minimize the loss of habitat.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 1/31/2011                          | US Fish and Wildlife Service, Karen Goebel | Our main concern regarding the proposed project is the potential for impacts to federally listed species and sensitive habitat types in the eastern half of the SR-60 Light Rail Transit Alternative. Please be aware we have data records for federally endangered least Bell's vireo and Nevin's barberry, federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher, and Federal candidate for listing Brand's phacelia in this area.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 1/31/2011                          | US Fish and Wildlife Service, Karen Goebel | In addition we are concerned regarding the location of the proposed future park and ride facilities at the stations along this route and request the environmental impact of these facilities be defined and considered within the EIR as interrelated and interdependent actions.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 1/31/2011                          | US Fish and Wildlife Service, Karen Goebel | To facilitate evaluation of the proposed project from the standpoint of fish and wildlife protection, we recommend the EIS include a description of proposed project and the environment in the vicinity of the project from local and regional perspectives, including all practicable alternatives that avoid and/or reduce project impacts to federally listed and other sensitive species and habitat types. Specific acreages and descriptions of the types of wetlands, riparian, and other sensitive habitats that may be affected by the project alternatives should be included, as well as aerial photographs, maps, and tables that summarize information. Please also include detailed information on the number and distribution of all Federal candidate, proposed, and listed species: State-listed species; and locally sensitive species that may be affected within the footprint or near proposed project alternatives. The EIS should address the entire footprint of all project alternatives, including borrow and fill sites, construction staging areas, and fuel modification zones, as well as impacts from future right-of-way maintenance and areas that may be restored to offset project impacts. |
| 1/27/2011                          | Caltrans, District 7, Ron Kosinski         | As this project moves forward please be aware, the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is also looking at alternatives in this region for the LA to San Diego segment. We highly recommend coordinating with that agency.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |

| Date<br>Comment<br>Submitted<br>or Received | Commenter                                                   | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/25/2011                                   | State of California Public Utilities Commission, Rosa Munoz | It is imperative that the CPUC be involved with the details of this project from its inception in order to be informed and to be of greater assistance in the future. The CPUC will need to provide applicable regulatory oversight for all phases of the project. This will require early consultation with Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority staff but contracted consultants in order to provide early consultation on all proposed design and engineering of proposed improvements on the corridor. This will also assist with the review of the environmental document and final CEQA approval of the project by the CPUC, since we are a responsible agency under CEQA section 15381 with regard to this project and in complying with any and all General Order requirements as they apply to the Phase 2B. |
| 2/1/2011                                    | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry                                 | Considering the projected frequency of rail traffic at the proposed crossings, the City of Pomona would strongly recommend a joint agreement between Metrolink, Gold Line, and the applicable Freight Operators to establish acceptable train daily minimum and maximum separation at crossings, thereby limiting the long-term impact to the community                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

**Table 5: Summary of Agency Comments – Traffic and Connectivity**

| <b>Date Comment Submitted or Received</b> | <b>Commenter</b>                 | <b>Summary of Comments</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/2/2011                                  | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson   | The DEIS should explore the extent to which proposed alternatives will integrate with existing transportation facilities. The document should discuss how the project will impact existing bus and rail transit, surface vehicle traffic, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths due to construction and operation. Measures to minimize impacts to bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths should be addressed in DEIS. |
| 2/2/2011                                  | Metro, Shahrzad Amiri            | Bike Amenities - We suggest focus on accommodating bicyclists at transit stations. For example, please consider bike rooms at stations, as appropriate. This is consistent with MTA's existing policies, as well as those currently under development.                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2/2/2011                                  | City of Glendora, Dianne Walter  | We have had some discussion with Gold Line Authority staff to remind them that the City will require pedestrian access through the property north of the Station from Glendora Avenue which provides a direct link to bus stop service on Glendora Avenue and pedestrian access north to the Downtown Village area. Please ensure that the station location and pedestrian access can accommodate this goal.    |
| 2/1/2011                                  | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry      | Access: ingress, egress, and movement on site appears overly restrictive for this area                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2/1/2011                                  | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry      | Preliminary design of the Pomona Station location does not appear to accommodate pedestrians within the track. Also the platform location does not appear to provide free and unobstructed accessibility. The local alternative is to construct a station/platform on the north side of the outside rail.                                                                                                       |
| 2/1/2011                                  | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry      | Bus and similar transit connectivity (on-site bus access and turn-around) is needed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 1/28/2011                                 | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris | Mitigation should consider the viability of expanding bus services, bikeways, pedestrian and vehicular areas at the station and other parts of the City                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 1/31/2011                                 | City of La Verne, Bob Russi      | There should be additional studies undertaken to investigate which signals would be warranted at White Avenue between First Street and Bonita Avenue. City asks only appropriate intersections be signaled and not have excessive traffic signals along White Avenue (one single in this three block stretch is needed, more than one signal is evaluated as excessive)                                         |

---

**Table 6: Summary of Agency Comments – Project Funding**

| <b>Date<br/>Comment<br/>Submitted<br/>or Received</b> | <b>Commenter</b>            | <b>Summary of Comments</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/2/2011                                              | Metro, Shahrzad Amiri       | Construction is shown on the handout provided during the scoping meeting as anticipated between 2014 and 2017. However, this timeframe is contingent upon securing sufficient funds for the project since Measure R does not provide full funding for Phase 2B. Therefore, Metro requests that future communications regarding the Phase 2B EIR/EIS clearly underscore the fact that construction is dependent on available funding at federal and state levels. |
| 1/31/2011                                             | City of La Verne, Bob Russi | Additional parking studies to investigate the parking needed for the La Verne station and possible funding that will be made available to the City, particularly if the La Verne Station becomes a temporary terminus on the Gold Line route.                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

**Table 7: Summary of Agency Comments – Safety**

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                                                   | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/25/2011                          | State of California Public Utilities Commission, Rosa Munoz | <p>This project is subject to a number of rules and regulations involving the CPUC. These may include: Sections 1201 et al, and 99152 of State of California Public Utilities Code, which requires Commission authority to construct rail lines over existing streets.</p> <p>The design criteria of the proposed project must comply with CPUC General Orders (GOs) such as, GO 72-B rules governing the construction and maintenance of crossings at grade of railroads with public streets, roads and highways; GO 75-D standards for warning devices for at-grade highway-rail crossings; GO 143-B Safety Rules and Regulations governing Light-Rail Transit; and GO 164-D regulations governing State Safety Oversight of Rail Fixed Guideway Systems.</p> |
| 1/25/2011                          | State of California Public Utilities Commission, Rosa Munoz | <p>As part of its mission to reduce hazards associated with at-grade crossing, the Commission's policy is to reduce the number of at-grade crossings on rail corridors. In acquiring Commission approval for construction of at-grade rail crossings, Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority has two options: (1) Filing a Rail Crossing Hazard Analysis Report, or (2) Filing formal applications in accordance with the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. These options are contained in greater detail in Commission GO 164-D</p>                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 1/25/2011                          | State of California Public Utilities Commission, Rosa Munoz | <p>The Build Alternative described in your NOP passes through high density commercial, residential and industrial areas of the greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area. High density areas near rail tracks lead to a high amount of pedestrians around the tracks. Constructing tracks at the existing Right of Way elevations is likely to result in trespassing issues and pedestrian conflicts similar to those currently experienced along other Metro Rail corridors in Los Angeles. Elevating or lowering the tracks would mitigate this concern. Additionally, fencing any remaining at-grade portions of the rail alignment selected should be a requirement of the project.</p>                                                                         |

|           |                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-----------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/31/2011 | City of La Verne, Bob Russi | The City strongly opposes closing several at-grade crossings along the Gold Line Corridor in La Verne. A, D, and E Streets in La Verne and Fulton Road at the La Verne/Pomona border should all remain open and continue to be through streets. There is significant pedestrian activity at each crossing given the interaction of the housing and employment centers south of the tracks and the University of La Verne and the downtown commercial area north of the tracks. We understand the rail right-of-way will be fenced to prevent trespassing. However, experience has shown openings get cut in fences and pedestrians cross at locations where there is no protection afforded by gates, warning lights, etc. |
| 2/1/2011  | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | Study should evaluate the safety and impact to pedestrians at proposed crossings.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2/1/2011  | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | Preliminary design of the Pomona Station location does not appear to accommodate pedestrians within the track. Also the platform location does not appear to provide free and unobstructed accessibility. The local alternative is to construct a station/platform on the north side of the outside rail.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 2/1/2011  | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry | Pedestrian crossings of tracks should be avoided, reduced and/or improved.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

**Table 8: Summary of Agency Comments – Conservation**

| Date Comment Submitted or Received | Commenter                                        | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson                   | Green Infrastructure: EPA encourages Caltrans to implement "green infrastructure" such as bioretention areas, vegetated swales, porous pavement, and filter strips in any onsite stormwater management features. Features serve both stormwater treatment and visual enhancements. More detailed information on these forms of "green infrastructure" can be found at:<br><a href="http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/home.cfm?program_id=298">http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/home.cfm?program_id=298</a>                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2/2/2011                           | US EPA Region IX, Chris Ganson                   | For the construction of new infrastructure, EPA recommends industrial materials recycling, or the reusing or recycling of byproduct materials generated from industrial processes. EPA recommends that, for any new construction proposed, the DEIS identify how industrial materials recycling can be incorporated into project design. More information can be found at<br><a href="http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/conservation/rrr/imr/index.htm">http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/conservation/rrr/imr/index.htm</a>                                                                                                                                    |
| 1/21/2011                          | California Energy Commission, Melissa Jones      | The Energy Commission would, however, like to make you aware of the <i>Energy Aware Planning Guide</i> . This guide is available as a tool to assist in your land use planning and other future project. The purpose of the Guide is to provide technical information to local governments seeking to improve energy efficiency, reduce energy use and greenhouse gas emissions, and enhance renewable energy resources. For further information on how to utilize this guide, please visit:<br><a href="http://www.energy.ca.gov/energy_aware_guide/index.html">www.energy.ca.gov/energy_aware_guide/index.html</a> .                              |
| 1/26/2011                          | Metro Water District of Southern CA, John Shamma | Metropolitan encourages projects within its service area to include water conservation measures. While Metropolitan continues to build new supplies and develop means for more efficient use of current resources, projected population and economic growth will increase demands on the current system. Water conservation, reclaimed water use, and groundwater recharge programs are integral components to regional water supply planning. Metropolitan supports mitigation measures such as using water efficient fixtures, drought-tolerant landscaping, and reclaimed water to offset any increase in water use associated with the project. |

---

|          |                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/1/2011 | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry                                     | If any electrical sub-station (transformer bank or similar power installation) is needed, then the proposed site of the electrical installation needs to be provided with the design to address aesthetics, noise, and related matters. Please see Attachment B for an exhibit of residential areas in Pomona. |
| 4/8/2005 | City of San Jose, Department of Transportation, James R. Helmer | Interested in developing opportunities for renewable energy generation along the HSR corridor.                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

**Table 9: Summary of Agency Comments – Land Use**

| <b>Date Comment Submitted or Received</b> | <b>Commenter</b>                                               | <b>Summary of Comments</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/2/2011                                  | State of CA, Dept of Housing and Community Dev, Linda Wheaton  | The interests of the Department relate to the project objectives of improving transit accessibility for residents and employees; encouraging mode shift to transit, and reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. In particular, the Department is interested in the prospective impacts of the project on siting of new housing or residential mixed-use development, or rehabilitation of such developments, to support the project objectives, as well as to address, housing goals and objectives of State laws including integration of housing and transportation planning. |
| 2/2/2011                                  | Los Angeles County Dept of Regional Planning, Richard Bruckner | The Department of Regional Planning is in agreement with the purpose of the Azusa to Montclair project to increase multimodal mobility, increase transit access, and reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. The project complements the intent of the Los Angeles County General Plan Update, which establishes transit oriented development as a central strategy for coordinating transportation and land use to increase housing choice, preserve open space and mitigate climate change.                                                                                     |
| 12/17/2008                                | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris (12/17/2008)                  | Station to be located in area bounded by San Dimas Ave on the west, Arrow Hwy on the south, Walnut Ave on the east and the railroad tracks on the north.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 1/31/2011                                 | City of La Verne, Bob Russi                                    | Unusable Property - Property currently occupied by A, D, and E Streets in La Verne and Fulton Road at the La Verne/Pomona border would be of little value because the existing underground and overhead infrastructure would preclude building on it, which would become another maintenance burden for the City. Utility companies would probably block any attempt to vacate property.                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

|            |                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/2/2011   | City of Glendora, Dianne Walter                             | The Gold Line Authority entered into an MOU with the City agreeing to provide adequate parking for the Glendora station which is located between Glendora Ave and Vermont Ave. Authority staff has provided concept sketches showing a parking structure along the south side of the proposed station with access possibly from Vermont and Glendora Avenues. City has concerns regarding the location of the parking structure, traffic conflicts with ingress/egress so close to the rail crossings at Glendora and Vermont Avenues. Please provide detailed site plans, floor plans, elevations and traffic analysis for the proposed parking including any plans for expanding parking to meet future demand pursuant to the MOU for City review and comment. |
| 1/31/2011  | City of La Verne, Bob Russi                                 | The City of La Verne would like to have additional parking studies undertaken to investigate the parking needed for the La Verne station and possible funding that will be made available to the City, particularly if the La Verne Station becomes a temporary terminus on the Gold Line route. More research is needed and should be conducted on parking obligations researching different scenarios with the completion of the Phase IIB extension.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 2/1/2011   | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry                                 | Identify access and rights to the property for the north parking structure                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 2/1/2011   | City of Pomona, Linda Lowry                                 | The long-narrow parking structure in the middle of the tracks appears to be a practical/possible alternative.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 1/28/2011  | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris (1/28/2011)                | Impacts associated with the development of an intermodal station in the City located between San Dimas Ave and Walnut Ave, including parking structures that is limited to 2 levels with a maximum of 400 parking spaces (also mentioned in the 12/17/2008 letter)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 12/17/2008 | City of San Dimas, Curtis Morris (12/17/2008)               | Parking to support that station to be limited to a maximum of 400 parking spaces                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 2/2/2011   | County of Los Angeles, Dept of Parks and Rec, Jui Ing Chien | The proposed station is approximately 1/2 mile north of Frank G. Bonelli Park which is located at 120 Via Verde, San Dimas, CA 91773. A water park known as "Raging Waters, California's Largest Waterpark" is located in the northwest corner of the park at 111 Raging Waters Drive, San Dimas, California, 91773. Parking capacity is limited within the Park in order to protect natural resources. The proposed project could help reduce parking needs as the park patrons and especially guests to Raging Waters will be able to take public transit to San Dimas and possibly walk to the park. Could alleviate traffic loads at the Park's main entrance (Via Verde exit off the 57 freeway) on peak attendance days during summer weekends.             |

---

**Table 10: Summary of Agency Comments – General**

| Date<br>Comment<br>Submitted<br>or Received | Commenter                                                                | Summary of Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2/1/2011                                    | Advisory Council on<br>Historic Preservation,<br>Louise Dunford Brodnitz | At this time, we do not expect to attend meetings or provide formal comments at environmental review milestones. However, we retain the right to become involved in the environmental review for this action in the future if, based on information provided by you or other consulting parties, we determine that our involvement is warranted. |

---

## 4.0 NEXT STEPS IN THE EIS/EIR PROCESS

The information obtained during scoping from public agencies, organizations, and individuals will be used in the subsequent phases of preparing the environmental documentation. Specifically, the Construction Authority and FTA will:

- Review the suggestions for station and parking concepts
- Continue the public involvement process as the design of the project progresses
- Refine the definition of the project
- Commence design and environmental technical studies

These tasks will occur during this year. It is expected that towards the end of 2011, a Draft EIS/EIR will be distributed to the public for review and comment. The Draft EIS/EIR will be a compilation of the technical studies, and will describe the environmental consequences if the Azusa to Montclair Project were to be approved but also the mitigation measures that could be taken to avoid or reduce significant impacts identified in the Draft EIS/EIR. Substantive comments on the Draft EIS/EIR will be responded to in a Final EIS/EIR. Construction Authority approval of the Final EIR/EIS is anticipated by the end of 2011. FTA approval is expected to follow by mid-year 2012.

## **5.0 PREPARERS**

### **Parsons Brinckerhoff**

Eugene Kim, Project Manager

Steven Wolf, Environmental Manager

John Gahbauer, Planner

### **Consensus Inc**

Sarah Costin, Project Manager

Naomi Goldman, Public Participation Team Member

Ana Haase-Reed, Public Participation Team Member