

22 Is it better with the mic or without the mic?

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: With.

24 MR. BALIAN: I just want to begin the presentation

25 talking a little bit about what we're going to be doing

1 tonight. First, we're going to take you through a project
2 overview. And then we're going to explain the environmental
3 review process, the purpose of the scoping meetings and why
4 we're here tonight, and talk a little bit about how
5 important this is for the project. And then we're going to
6 provide an opportunity for the public to ask questions and
7 make comments.

8 The -- we are a partner in this endeavor with the
9 FTA, the Federal Transit Administration. They are the
10 federal agency that, ultimately, we will work with to go
11 after funding. This is not a fully funded project, but in
12 order for us to get funding, we need to go through these
13 very important steps of understanding a project and making
14 sure we understand the community concerns and comments about
15 the project.

16 As I said, we're going to start at 6:15 tonight,
17 we'll go to about 7:00 with our presentations. From 7:00 to
18 8:00, we'll have an open house; you can walk around the room,
19 you can look at the boards around the room. There will be
20 project specialists at each of the boards, you can ask
21 particular questions. We want to make sure that we're

22 understanding and that you understand that's what we're

23 proposing for the project, and that we understand your

24 comments or your questions about the project.

25 It's important that we log your questions and

1 comments tonight. So as part of the format for the evening,
2 there are a couple different ways you can participate.
3 Following the presentation, if you have a comment card,
4 speaker cards on your chairs, you can fill those out. Once
5 you fill those out, you can hand them to the aisle. And then
6 you'll be introduced and you can come and speak in this
7 microphone over here. We will take down your comments.

8 There is a court reporter present; please state
9 your name and speak clearly, and we will get your comments
10 down. If it's a question we can answer on the spot, we
11 will. There's a lot of things that we don't know about the
12 project at this point, and we'll get back to you or will
13 publish your comments and responses as part of this ongoing
14 effort.

15 Once this portion of the event is finished at 7:00,
16 you can, again, come to the court reporter and speak
17 directly with the court reporter, if you're not comfortable
18 speaking in a microphone or wish to do it after the meeting.
19 You can do that at the court reporter between 7:00 and 8:00.

20 If you want to fill out a comment card on a separate
21 piece of paper, which will available after this part of the

22 event, and you can have your comment logged as part of the
23 official record of the evening. So there are lots of
24 opportunities for your comments. This is only meaningful
25 if we hear from the public. And, again, we're very pleased

1 that so many of you are here tonight.

2 Generally, you know about the project. It's about
3 12.5 mile extension from Azusa to Montclair. It goes
4 through six cities, six stations. It has two grade
5 separations as part of this project, Glendora and in Pomona.
6 It has a shared corridor with Metrolink and the freight. We
7 do not share track with the other modes of transit. We have
8 a separate dedicated track for east and westbound trains,
9 light rail trains, but we will be within the same 100 foot
10 railroad right-of-way that the Construction Authority
11 currently owns.

12 This project is not fully funded, as I mentioned
13 earlier. It's partially funded through Measure R., the
14 County's sales tax increase that went into effect in 2008.
15 The phase from Pasadena to Azusa is funded 100 percent
16 through Measure R. through local dollars. There should be
17 some residual dollars left available for this phase of the
18 project, which we'll use as matching dollars for federal
19 dollars, ultimately.

20 Many of you know that Metro does the countywide
21 planning for rail. This is the 2009 long-range

22 transportation plan, which incorporates all the projects
23 that it has within its planning documents, all the projects
24 that are included in Measure R that are funded through
25 Measure R. And we're very fortunate that the phase from

1 Pasadena to Azusa is fully funded, and we're pleased that we
2 will have some residual dollars available for this phase of
3 the project and to give us an opportunity to go after
4 federal dollars.

5 Our project history, many of you are familiar
6 faces, and know about the project. We did begin in 1999
7 with the establishment of the Construction Authority. We
8 were Metro. We're a special purpose agency created by the
9 legislature. It gave us all the rights and responsibilities
10 to build this project, to allow us to award contracts, to
11 acquire right-of-way, to acquire land that is necessary for
12 the project, and it allows to build to the specifications that
13 are required by Metro, who will, ultimately, operate it, as
14 with Phase 1 from Union Station in Pasadena, we build it to
15 specifications and turn it over to Metro to ultimately
16 operate the system.

17 This project began with the Alternatives Analysis
18 in 2003; since then, we've adopted several series of
19 documents that allowed us to do some planning with this
20 project. It got us to a point not only for the phase of
21 Pasadena to Azusa, but also to have an understanding of what

22 needs to be planned from Azusa to Montclair, which brings us

23 here today.

24 We believe that now, beginning in 2010, we started

25 taking a fresh look at the environmental document that was

1 previously done, allowed us to tear off of that, take that
2 important information freshen it up, come out to the
3 community, do these scoping meetings, get comments and do
4 more research and evaluating of the project, itself, so that
5 we can qualify, hopefully, for federal funds.

6 This project will be cleared both under the
7 national and the state Environmental Quality Act. This
8 allows us to go after funding both at the state level and
9 the federal level. It a complicated process, takes between
10 a year to a year and a half. We believe we'll get through
11 the CEQA, which is the California process by the end of this
12 year. And then in about a year from now, get through the
13 NEPA process. Again, this is all to position ourselves to
14 go after federal dollars, so that the project can get funded
15 and into construction as soon as possible.

16 I'll introduce now Gene Kim, who will walk you
17 through the environmental process and talk about the steps
18 of the process, itself.

19 MR. KIM: Thank you. This is a slide that talks about
20 the project environmental process. And, basically, it
21 occurs in five steps, and where we are right now is at the

22 second step, which is the initiation of environmental
23 process. That environmental process is, as Habib said,
24 what we can call a combined environmental document.
25 I would like to emphasize that it would be the

1 same. The certifying agency for the federal document is
2 the Federal Administration (sic) and the certifying agency
3 for the CEQA document, the state document, is the Foothill
4 Construction Authority. At the conclusion of the
5 environmental process is something called Record of
6 Decision that is filed and it really signifies the clearance
7 of the project from an environmental standpoint both by
8 federal and state law.

9 The next stage is engineering and then is
10 construction. Assuming all the good things that Habib is
11 talking about happening, with respect to funding, the
12 construction period lasts about three years. And if
13 everything lines up and the project is able to stay on track
14 that way, we expect to go into construction somewhere around
15 2014, 2015 time frame. Again, construction takes about
16 three some-odd years. So the final step is opening day for
17 the project.

18 I want to talk a little bit about the EIS/EIR
19 process. It's a combined process, as we talked about
20 earlier. It happens in two phases. The first phase is
21 called the draft environmental process, and the initiation

22 of the draft environmental process is something called

23 public scoping. And that's where we are right now.

24 The purpose of draft environmental process is to

25 define the alternatives, get them to a level of engineering

1 in order to be able to assess the impacts of the
2 alternatives that we carry forth through that full draft
3 environmental document. The point of the environmental
4 document is take a look at the alternatives, and I'll talk
5 about those in a minute, and really understand what the
6 benefits of project are, and what the impacts and effects of
7 project are. And that's the type of feedback we want to
8 hear tonight from you guys at this scoping meeting.

9 At the conclusion of environmental process, really
10 what happens is, the draft environmental document gets
11 published, it's circulated publicly. And there's a period
12 called the public comment period, where everyone who has an
13 interest in the project has an opportunity to comment on
14 that project.

15 Before we advance to the next phase, which is the
16 final environmental document, the Authority board is really
17 going to go through a process of selecting a locally
18 preferred alternative. And that's the alternative that the
19 environmental document will clear. Okay?

20 In the draft process, it's possible to carry more
21 than one alternative through. And as we do more detailed

22 engineering, it may turn out that one or more of the
23 alternatives end up falling out, but the key point is that
24 the between draft environmental and the final environmental,
25 the Authority board will be selecting a locally preferred

1 alternative.

2 That's the alternative that ultimately that will
3 be environmentally cleared with the conclusion -- with
4 the record of decision, as I talked about earlier.

5 Now, the purpose of the public scoping meeting
6 today is to initiate the NEPA and CEQA environmental
7 clearance processes, we talked about those. It's also to
8 help define the scope of the environmental study. What we
9 want to do is focus our study on those key areas of concern.
10 And a lot of what helps us is the type of feedback and
11 comments we get at the public scoping meetings. This is a
12 very important function for us.

13 We want to hear what you guys think about the
14 proposed action, and I'm going talk about the alternatives.
15 We want to hear what you think about the purpose and need of
16 the document. That document is very important, because it
17 frames how we evaluate which of the alternatives is best
18 suited as locally preferred alternative. So have we framed
19 the purpose and need correctly and then when I talk about
20 the alternatives, which of the alternatives that we talked
21 about best meet that purpose. Okay?

22 Talk about the alternatives under consideration,
23 and then really what we want to get to is we're going to
24 document existing conditions. And then an important part
25 of what we review environmental document is our impact

1 analysis. And for us the is most important thing is to be
2 able to focus the environmental document on those areas of
3 concern.

4 I've talked about the purpose and need of the
5 project. We have a purpose and need in the back, and if you
6 haven't had a chance to look at it, I just want to go over
7 it real quickly how we're defining the purpose for this
8 environmental process in this proposed action.

9 The need for project, first thing is the 210, it's
10 very congested. Right now, we know that it can't accommodate
11 the amount of traffic forecasted, peak-hour traffic,
12 forecasted in the future. Bus and commuter rail service,
13 the amount of bus and commuter rail service along this
14 corridor is somewhat limited. There is an opportunity to
15 expand transportation by making the best possible use of
16 this Metro owned right-of-way.

17 The corridor's arterial network. There's a lot of
18 spillover traffic, because of the congested conditions on
19 the 210. And then we know from SCAG projections that the
20 traffic and employment is growing within the study area.
21 That means more trips; that means more congestion.

22 So the purpose of the project is bi-fold. First,
23 improve transit accessibility. That's actually being able
24 to get to places much easier, with much easier connections.
25 There are lots of activity centers along this particular

1 corridor. Reliability of transit service.

2 We're talking about shortening transit travel
3 times, we're talking making travel times more reliable,
4 we're talking about making schedules more reliable. An
5 alternative mode to having to use the 210. There are a
6 lot of trips right now that end up as auto trips along
7 that 210 corridor, because there are competitive modes of
8 traffic travel. Are there options to offer people to have
9 a competitive trip for trips that would otherwise be
10 served by the I-210?

11 Connections to Metrolink, we feel local bus service
12 it's really important. There's an opportunity here to
13 provide connections to the existing Metrolink service and
14 then connect people to regional and local buses to get to
15 where they want to go throughout the study area. And then
16 finally, this is really about balance in the system. We're
17 very imbalanced, in that a lot of the trips that take place
18 in the study area, an overwhelming number of trips is really
19 by automobile.

20 So by improving the transportation supply, through
21 a really wise choice, a wise investment with infrastructure

22 and access that we already have, is there a way that we can

23 change the mode sharing? Is there a way that we could

24 reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions and tailpipe

25 emissions that's being produced by the way we travel right

1 now?

2 So there are three alternatives that we're studying
3 as part of this environmental process. And I'll go through
4 them one by one. The first is called the No Build. And
5 really, the No Build is what if we didn't do anything, what
6 would things be like in 2035, if there was no action
7 whatsoever? How well does this action meet the Purpose and
8 Needs Statement that I talked about earlier.

9 The second is called the Transportation System
10 Management or TSM Alternative. The best was to think of
11 this is what is the best that we can do without actually
12 building a new project?

13 So the way to think about this is kind of a best
14 bus alternative. It would operate on existing streets, but
15 there would be enhancements, operational enhancements, like
16 signal synchronization and transit priority that would allow
17 to get to point A to point B as quickly as possible through
18 the existing street network. No capital investment, we're
19 not building anything. Okay?

20 The final alternative is called the Build
21 Alternative. And we're only carrying one Build alternative

22 into this environmental document and the Build Alternative

23 we're talking about is an extension of the existing

24 Gold Line. It's a light rail technology. And I'm going to

25 get into the specifics of the things you kind of want to

1 know about it, the characteristics of this particular
2 technology in a little bit.

3 But the things to the point out really is it's a
4 12.5 mile extension that goes through the cities of
5 Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont and
6 Montclair, with a station proposed within each corridor
7 city. Six stations total. Each station, you can think
8 about each station really like as a Park and Ride station,
9 given the amount of access that we need to provide, we think
10 that that is really necessary in order to make these
11 stations useful to people.

12 So the No Build and TSM Alternative. I'm going to
13 focus more on the TSM. I think the No Build is pretty
14 self-explanatory. But the TSM Alternative is the best bus
15 solution. There are examples out there in operation today.
16 There is something called the Metro Rapid service. And what
17 that is, is a high frequency service using an articulated
18 bus.

19 It's a 60-foot bus; it's a high-capacity bus. It
20 operates along existing streets. And in this cases, it
21 would move along with configurations that pretty much

22 parallels the corridor. Its stop locations that would be

23 co-located really with the stations that I talked about that

24 are part the Build Alternative.

25 As I mentioned earlier, there are some enhancements

1 that would be considered as part of this alternative.
2 Things like signal priority, signal synchronization
3 operational low-cost things you can do in order to really
4 get the buses through the network to serve trips from
5 point A to point B as fast as possible.

6 I want to talk about the Build Alternative now.
7 The Build Alternative, as most of you are aware, operates
8 along the existing Metro-owned right-of-way. I guess the
9 thing to point out is there is sort of a break point in the
10 corridor, where east of the corridor, it's really east of
11 San Dimas, there are four tracks going east through
12 Claremont. So the idea with this particular concept is
13 integrating two new light rail tracks for the Gold Line,
14 dedicated for the Gold Line, into the corridor. And that's
15 going to require a relocation of the existing two tracks.

16 As Habib mentioned earlier, the Gold Line would
17 operate exclusively on the Gold Line tracks, the freight
18 service and the Metrolink would operate on the freight
19 tracks that would be relocated. A couple things to point
20 out, for the most part, throughout the entire corridor, the
21 Gold Line and relocated tracks generally fit within the

22 right-of-way. There are a few locations where it does get
23 very tight. On the eastern end of the corridor, there are
24 three stations where a Gold Line co-located next to a
25 Metrolink station. The proposed station near Claremont is

1 one of those. By and large this is at grade running system.

2 Okay?

3 There are two locations where there are grade
4 separations that are planned. Those locations are Lone Hill
5 in Glendora and Towne Avenue in Pomona. The reason why the
6 grade separations are needed is because there are two
7 locations really where the Gold Line tracks need to switch
8 sides with the freight tracks. And the only way to do that
9 really is to take the Gold Line and fly it up and over the
10 existing freight track. That's the reason why the grade
11 separations are planned in those two locations.

12 In terms of total travel time from Azusa to
13 Montclair, we're talking about 18 minutes. In terms of span
14 of service, we're talking about a service that starts a
15 little bit before 6:00 a.m., about 5:45, 5:50. And the
16 service would continue throughout the day to somewhere right
17 around midnight, that will give you an idea of the span of
18 service. And during -- and then the service is broken up
19 into periods, the peak period and the off-peak period. In
20 the peak period, the operations that are proposed for this
21 service is six trains an hour, both directions, and the

22 off-peak, probably four or five.

23 This is a picture of the light rail mode that is

24 the Build Alternative. The image is of an existing

25 Gold Line. It's a train that's currently in operation in

1 the Metro Regional Rail System. As I said, the Gold Line is
2 also used on the Green Line and the Blue Line. Its power
3 source is from overhead wires. So there are overhead wires
4 that power the light rail trains on the tracks.

5 And the cars can be coupled in three-car sets. The
6 maximum capacity of the train is about 500 passengers per
7 hour (sic). And it's a very high capacity system.

8 MS. LEVY BUCH: Per train.

9 MR. KIM: Per train. And it will require the location
10 and siting of the traction power substations. For a system
11 like this, we're talking about a mile, mile and a half
12 apart, for the most part those traction power substations
13 can be sited within the right-of-way of way or within the
14 footprint of the station area. We're going to be moving
15 forward into the process of doing the siting analysis for
16 that.

17 And so what we really want to hear from all of you
18 today are your thoughts about the Purpose and Use
19 statement, your thoughts about the Build Alternative. These
20 are topics that we're looking at as the part of
21 environmental study. Tell us which ones you think are the

22 ones we need to focus on. It's very helpful for us. There

23 are lots of ways that you can do that. Tell us if missed

24 anything.

25 We have boards here that really are meant to

1 characterize some preliminary concepts. Okay? I think the
2 thing to point out is that there is nothing at this stage
3 that is set in stone. What we want to do is present as much
4 information as we can to you as possible, to characterize as
5 accurately as possible the concepts that we developed in terms
6 of the alignment in some of the stations and really get that
7 feedback from you about where you think we're headed, what
8 you think the impacts are. Those comments are very
9 important for us, they help us focus the environmental
10 document.

11 So with that, I guess what I would like to do
12 really quick is just to reiterate how comments can be
13 provided. You can provide a comment during Q and A that
14 will happen momentarily. You can complete a comment sheet.
15 If you haven't seen one, ask any of the staff for one.
16 After the Q and A session is over, there will be a comment
17 box. Put your comment in the comment box, and that becomes a
18 part of the record.

19 You can also send a comment by mail, take a comment
20 card home with you, if you don't have a thought yet as to
21 what you want to put on the record, fill it out, mail it back

22 to the Authority at that address, right here. You can also
23 E-mail comments. And you don't have a comment, but you want
24 to come to the scoping meeting and hear a little bit more
25 information, we have one more tomorrow night in San Dimas at

1 the Ekstrand Elementary School.

2 Comments, if you're mailing them, have to be post
3 marked on or before February 2nd to make it within the
4 official comment period, to make it into the record. With
5 that, I guess I would like to hand it over to Lisa to talk
6 about the remaining schedule and just kind of the
7 housekeeping, ground rules for the Q and A.

8 MS. LEVY BUCH: We're going to turn it over to you now
9 to hear your comments and questions. We'll do our best; at
10 this point, we may not have all the answers, but we'll do our
11 best to answer those that we can. I have one speaker card
12 so far. So if you want to speak and you have a card filled
13 out with your name, just put your hand out and we'll pick
14 them up.

15 This table, magically, after we're done, will turn
16 into a comment table for everyone. So if you want to write
17 a comment, you can do that at this table following our
18 Q and A session. And then our court reporter will also be
19 available for private comments follow this.

20 So with that, Deborah Page, do you want to come up?

21 MS. PAGE: Thank you very much for having a meeting

22 today. We really appreciate it. I actually live on
23 Elder Drive. It's just south of where the tracks are going
24 to run between College and Claremont Boulevard. It's has
25 had a lot of impact to our neighborhood recently.

1 We're bearing the burden of a lot of things that
2 actually support the whole community, where we live, including
3 noise from the trains, and increased use of the park right by
4 us for Little League and extra lights have impacted the
5 quality of our life there.

6 I'm actually a strong environmentalist, so I'm not
7 against light rail reducing greenhouse gasses from using
8 cars, but I just wanted to ask a few questions. One is, I'm
9 considering how when you put the train tracks right behind
10 where those houses, they're going to be practically scraping
11 the walls of my neighbors. And it's going to really impact
12 them, their quality of life, I think really strongly.

13 And the other thing I'm concerned about in that
14 regard is the sight lines for us, because one of the things
15 that we do have on our block is a really beautiful view of
16 the mountains. We don't live in, like, the really, you
17 know, fancy, classy part, you know, but we have these great
18 unobstructed views. So it's kind of a compensation for some
19 other things that we have to deal with.

20 And I'm really concerned about the sight lines of
21 those wires. And, quite frankly, everything you've talked

22 about -- you showed the pictures of the train, you really
23 can't see how ugly those wires are. And how frequently
24 you're going to be putting the posts that support them, so
25 I'm really concerned about that. And one thing I wanted to

1 ask was would you consider lowering the grade level, rather
2 than filling it in. Because right now, it's just a big hump,
3 you know, with a ditch on either side, so that the sight
4 lines would be lowered for our neighborhood.

5 The other thing is that I know that Claremont is
6 considered a quiet zone. And I hear it's very expensive to
7 put in the double guardrails, and so that they don't blow
8 the horns through our neighborhood. And I was wondering if
9 possibly Gold Line, since I know you're highly funded, would
10 possibly help mitigate some of costs for Claremont. Because
11 I know right now, you know, the communities are all
12 suffering, they don't have enough money. So I wanted to
13 propose that.

14 MS. LEVY BUCH: I think a lot the questions will be
15 answered in the environmental process in term of the views
16 and how the trains would affect the views, as well as the
17 proximity to the home and it would mitigate any kinds of
18 impacts to homes.

19 Do you want to talk at all about the way the
20 barriers work and all that?

21 MR. KIM: Sure. Okay. I think I remember all the

22 questions.

23 MS. PAGE: Well, basically, had you considered lowering

24 the grade, rather than raising it up. So all the trains

25 would run lower. And the second was supporting putting

1 quiet zones in Claremont, both Claremont Boulevard and
2 College.

3 MR. KIM: Okay. To answer your question directly, this
4 extension project is an at-grade running project. There are
5 two locations where it is not proposed to be running
6 at-grade. The locations that I mentioned. There is a grade
7 separation that is planned at Lone Hill in Glendora and
8 there is a grade separation that's planned at Towne. So, I
9 guess, it's related to your concern about sight lines.

10 And this is what I would say, as part of the
11 environmental study, one of things we are going to be taking
12 a look at is visual impact. Part of the visual impact
13 chapter of the environmental report is to document that
14 Group A's sight line study, to be able to actually look --
15 say something about the views of affected areas.

16 And so the Authority will be coming back and
17 sharing the information from these studies, and whatever is
18 selected for the LPA that goes into the final environmental
19 document, at that point, it's required by federal and state
20 law to identify mitigations or issues just you like the ones
21 that you mentioned.

22 At this point, I would say that the Authority is
23 mindful of the concern that you raise regarding sight lines.
24 However, because of the cost to build the system, the amount
25 of costs, what we're talking about at this point is

1 generally an at-grade running system. But I would say about
2 the height of the light rail vehicles, they're lower than
3 the height of Metrolink trains, for example.

4 MS. PAGE: I'm talking about the wires.

5 MR. KIM: I understand that.

6 MS. PAGE: Not the train. I'm not talking about the
7 train.

8 MR. KIM: So -- so above the trains is catenary that
9 does connect the overhead wire. So what we'll be doing is
10 documenting what the visual profile is on the corridor, so
11 that we make that information absolutely clear.

12 MS. PAGE: But you're documenting -- you're not saying
13 you're going to do anything about that.

14 MS. LEVY BUCH: That is part of the process. So we
15 understand that is an issue that's a concern.

16 MS. PAGE: -- the quiet zone.

17 MS. LEVY BUCH: As I said, at that issues that you
18 raised will all be addressed in the environmental document,
19 and then how they can be mitigated.

20 MS. PAGE: Thank you.

21 MS. LEVY BUCH: Jennifer Mawhorter? And then

22 Ginger Elliott.

23 MS. MAWHORTER: I'm thrilled. I wish it was built

24 tomorrow. And I hope that you will consider making sure

25 that the extension to airport gets built. That really,

1 really important to me. But you said it was 18 minutes to

2 Azusa.

3 How long does it take to get to Pasadena?

4 MR. KIM: Another 20 minutes.

5 MS. MAWHORTER: Another 20 minutes. So 38 minutes all

6 together?

7 MR. KIM: About 40 minutes.

8 MS. MAWHORTER: 40 minutes. And then another question I

9 had is about bikes. I would hope than when you're planning

10 this -- people that want to bike to the station, that

11 there's adequate bike parking that's, maybe, somehow secure,

12 so that bikes don't get trashed. And that there's ways to

13 take the bikes on the trains and that's clearly marked.

14 MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. Ginger Elliott?

15 MS. ELLIOTT: I think, like everybody here, I'm thrilled

16 that you're here, and this project might actually happen.

17 But I'm also here to talk about possible alternatives to

18 what's being proposed at this point. I'm here to speak on

19 behalf of John Neuber, the president of Claremont Heritage.

20 He couldn't be here tonight.

21 We're concerned about the impact that the proposed

22 train configuration will have on our 1926 Sante Fe, now
23 Metrolink Depot. The building is on the National Register
24 of Historic places. It faces the original track bed, the
25 road bed of the Sante Fe, which was the birth place of all

1 of our Foothill communities along here.

2 To introduce a new set of tracks north of the
3 Metrolink track, taking up -- my figures are anywhere from
4 six to 10 to 11 feet of the current platform. It not only
5 ruins that historic context, but is also makes us question
6 just how much farther things might go, and just how much
7 road we will lose. Right now, there's a fairly nice view of
8 that facade of the Depot, which is quite stunning. And it
9 can be seen as you drive up College Avenue, as you drive up
10 other streets.

11 Putting the tracks directly in front of it with
12 those wires is a real concern of ours. It's not just
13 visual, it's a historic context that's been built there, and
14 we're very happy with it. It will be closing of the Depot
15 from some of the tracks. The only other meeting I've been
16 to, it was pointed out that there will be four tracks, and
17 that, therefore -- it's currently the law, that you can't
18 cross four sets of tracks.

19 So people will not be able to come to the Depot and
20 get to Metrolink's tracks, which will now be on the south
21 side of the Depot. We find this another way of closing off

22 the Depot from public access, if you will. I realize your
23 plans are not precise now, but we're really worried about
24 how much more we're going to lose from that platform.
25 We wonder why an alternative cannot be to put the

1 Gold Line tracks at the south of Metrolink tracks, which is
2 where most of us, who've heard about Gold Line for years
3 assumed they would be built. That they would separate
4 Metrolink. I've also heard there's a problem that more
5 space may be needed for fire department access. Will that
6 come off the platform? How wide will the platform be
7 between the Depot and College Avenue, which is now where
8 most people wait for the train. Will there be any cover for
9 the weather? Will there be kiosks to buy tickets? Because
10 everything that is now out there, that's going to have to be
11 shoved so much further back with the Gold Line tracks.

12 Will there actually be a station in Claremont?
13 Stations mean depots. So will there actually be a building
14 for the Gold Line in Claremont, and if so, where? And,
15 finally, there's a rather large metal shed that sounds like
16 it has some equipment having to do with the train just to
17 south of the current platform, the further south platform,
18 and I assume that will have to be moved also.

19 It seems a shame to move things, that have already
20 been made into public improvements, 10, 20 years later and
21 pulling them all out again. So those are just some of my

22 questions and, of course, I expect to have an answer for

23 every one of them.

24 MS. LEVY BUCH: Do you want to talk at all about how the

25 station -- at what point the station concepts get more

1 defined and that we'll know the footage between things and

2 all of that?

3 MR. KIM: The preliminary station concepts that you see

4 after these scoping meetings are going to be really kind of

5 our focus going forward over the next couple of months.

6 Okay? If I might address -- a few of the questions that I

7 thought I heard, the first has to do with the Depot, itself.

8 There is no plan to take and remove the Depot at all. Yes,

9 you are correct in that the proposed alignment does propose

10 basically taking the existing freight tracks in that track

11 bed that you talked about and move and relocating the tracks

12 to the south to make room for platforms for a Gold Line

13 station. That would be very close to the existing Depot.

14 That is true.

15 As part of our environmental document, we're

16 working with the State Historic Preservation office. It's

17 one that is number one of our target list to handle the

18 right way. And so I guess what I would say is it's

19 important for the Authority to be mindful of the historic

20 nature of the Depot, the structures that are there, the

21 historic character and interaction between the old track and

22 the track bed and the Depot.

23 What I would put out there is, is there a way

24 somehow that we can develop some type of design concepts

25 that honor that, and that sort of allow the Depot to, maybe,

1 kind of carry forward a new set of functions and supporting
2 some of the ticketing that will be needed for the Gold Line
3 project. That is something that the Authority would very
4 much like to work with the City of Claremont, and with your
5 office on that particular issue. So the
6 Historic Preservation, we'll be taking a look at. We're
7 going to come back, actually, to the public. Okay?

8 And what we're going to present is more detailed
9 alignment and station concepts. And by that point, when we
10 do the level of detail, you'll get a really good idea of
11 what we're proposing for these locations, and what we've
12 done from a design standpoint to mitigate some of the
13 concerns that we've heard from you today. It's very
14 important to the Authority to hear these comments, and I,
15 myself, can assure that these considerations are very, very
16 important for us.

17 MS. LEVY BUCH: And that goes back to answer your
18 questions. Judy Wright?

19 MS. WRIGHT: My name is Judy Wright. And I go way back
20 before -- I go back to the first EIS/EIR that was written
21 for this project, when it was still called the Blue Line,

22 not the Gold Line. That's how old I am. I'm also one of
23 the mothers of Metrolink. And they are not freight tracks.
24 They were negotiated just like the Santa Fe tracks were, and
25 they're owned by MTA and they're called Metrolink tracks.

1 So I think, at least on this corridor, they ought
2 to be called Metrolink tracks in your document. I'm so glad
3 that you have had this hearing and I hear some flexibility
4 in how you just answered Ginger's question. And I would
5 like to add to some of what Ginger said.

6 My friend Sam Padroza tells me I'm biased for the
7 Depot; I am. But I'm also biased for the Gold Line. I've
8 been a transit advocate for most of my life, and I'm very
9 eager to see this come here, but I want to come and be right.
10 I don't want to see us sacrifice part of the Depot or any of
11 neighborhoods. I want to see the that it can be done in a
12 compatible fashion. We need some plans to scale, so that we
13 can tell what the problems are going to be.

14 I happen to have written the National Register
15 Nomination for the Depot, so that's why I am biased for the
16 Depot. When it was written, the back perform is part of
17 that listing. So you're saying you're not going to touch
18 the station, but when you start touching the platform;
19 you're touching the station. And we need to talk about how
20 we can maintain so that you don't squeeze it.

21 I was so proud when we listed that on the National

22 Register, that people in South Claremont said, "We're so glad
23 you left the view in the south, the same as in the north, so
24 that we can enjoy it, too." And we still should leave that
25 view for people who live in the south. Four years ago, some

1 of us came to a meeting in Claremont, the Authority I don't
2 believe attended at that time, but we had it with our
3 Planning and Transportation Commission.

4 I kept my notes from that meeting. We're still
5 discussing the same issues, and I received no communication
6 on those issues. So I'm hoping that, perhaps, this meeting
7 will be a better one in that we can have some communication
8 as we go along. I favor Claremont working the Depot
9 becoming more of a functional building. The transit --
10 there is a transit store, Foothill Transit. And there's no
11 reason why it couldn't have added services. It's
12 Claremont's best kept secret. It should be advertised more.

13 There are almost 200 people a day who go through the
14 transit. So probably more than most Village businesses.
15 And it could serve other functions if it were better
16 organized.

17 I also think that, perhaps, you need to explain to
18 us again, maybe not tonight, but sometime, about the four
19 tracks instead of three. I know that there are a couple of
20 people in the audience who would like to speak to that. I'm
21 also concerned about all of the easements needed by the fire

22 department. I know almost development that has occurred in

23 Claremont that has public access has to be negotiated with

24 the fire department.

25 And usually they're able to narrow some of the

1 streets, like in our West Village area, where they wanted
2 25-foot road, I think. Can't we work on that together?
3 Can't we move the vault next to the tracks? And put it east
4 instead of there, so that there's more room there. I just
5 think there's some flexibility here that should be looked
6 at.

7 And I have these notes here, and you answered some
8 of them with Ginger. But I think some of us would like to
9 continue to participate in this. We don't want this to be
10 the last time that we talk, because we're very concerned
11 about the impact in our community. But we also want this to
12 come as soon as possible. Thank you.

13 MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. Mark Von Wootke and then
14 Bob Tener.

15 MR. VON WOOTKE: I just want to say that I'm delighted
16 that the Gold Line is coming to Claremont and we want to
17 welcome you. As it's been pointed out, the Depot is not
18 only a historic treasure, I think it's an underused resource
19 that could very much accommodate things we're talking about
20 in terms of public use. The thing I would like to talk
21 about is the access to the train station.

22 Claremont is historically a transit oriented town.

23 And we've been able to maintain a very walkable transit

24 oriented community. And so I think it's important that

25 people on all sides of the tracks are able to come to the

1 station, which would be the Depot really, and access all of
2 the trains, not just Gold Line, but Metro. If the MET grade
3 crossing that we now have for pedestrians isn't possible to
4 extend, although, that might be considered. Because I've
5 seen it work in other places in Europe and so forth.

6 I think it's not -- it's relatively easy to have an
7 undergrade pedestrian crossing or access that accesses all
8 the trains, but it would also weave the north side of the
9 tracks together with the south side of the tracks.
10 Pedestrians here could come to the Depot and access all the
11 tracks. The fact that the grade slopes would make an
12 underground passage almost that grade on this side. Then,
13 of course, there would need to be stairs coming out to the
14 tracks. It's happened in so many stations all over the
15 world. In fact, some of the cost of that might be
16 recovered by having some shops or something in there, as
17 happens in many places. That is something to consider.

18 The other thing, aside from walking the transit,
19 which we really want to encourage here and accommodate, is
20 biking to transit. And I was happy to see someone else talk
21 about that. We have a bike station here in Claremont.

22 We're encouraging more people to walk. Your collection area
23 for pedestrians is about a mile; you can walk to the
24 station. You can multiply that times three for four with
25 biking to transit. And the cost of getting a transit rider

1 there walking or on a bike is substantially less than the
2 cost of somebody driving there.

3 So I really would like you to encourage you to
4 accommodate bikes in every way you can, not only at our
5 station, but all stations up and down the line. Now, it
6 might be said, well, everybody in Southern California drives,
7 and no doubt, that's true. But I think you'll find that
8 people who are using public transit might be a different
9 mindset, more inclined to walk, more inclined to bike than
10 driving. And so accommodating bikes at the station,
11 accommodating bikes on the trains. I've been on the Metro
12 Folding Bike task force, and there's tremendous potential
13 for bringing folding bikes on transit. So you have them to
14 use on both ends of your ride.

15 So I just want to welcome you and encourage you to
16 explore these opportunities and to recognize that Claremont
17 is a transit oriented town. And we would love to be able to
18 walk and bike, as well as some people, of course, we'll need
19 to drive. But we don't want our Depot sitting in a vast
20 parking lot or having transit parkers competing with
21 merchants who need parking spaces.

22 Thank you very much.

23 MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. Bob Tener and then

24 Paul Wheeler.

25 MR. TENER: Good evening. I join my fellow Claremonters

1 in thanking both FTA and the Construction Authority, a very
2 important process and you're very open to us and we hope
3 that continues. I'm Bob Tener. I'm a Claremont resident.
4 I chair the Planning Commission, but my remarks tonight are
5 mine alone. They don't reflect any position of the city,
6 because the Planning Commission has not had this issue on
7 their addendum. It's has no bearing on the use of other
8 Planning Commission.

9 One thing, four very specific points and
10 recommendations for your planning studies that are going to
11 support the draft EIS. The first has to do with the very
12 broad range of positive benefits that have not yet appeared
13 either in your presentation or in the Notice of Intent.
14 Eliminating -- reducing congestion on the I-210 is a
15 certainty and that's going to happen. Don't over look the
16 reduction in congestion on the I-10. It should be in the
17 report.

18 Five of the six stations that are located east of
19 the 57 serve populace that's going to be very, very pleased
20 to Claremont and the other stations and take Gold Line
21 particularly to the west. I would suggest also that there

22 are auto commuters today who frequently use Baseline or
23 Foothill or Arrow Highway, who likewise are going to be part
24 of the auto-to-rail shift. So if your analysis is complete,
25 I think you will find the reduction of congestion to be a

1 very dominant factor.

2 Secondly, beyond simply relieving congestion, I

3 urge that Benefit Analysis go deeply and specifically to the

4 other benefits of auto drivers climbing on the rails.

5 Specific benefits to the physical environment: Air quality

6 improvement, micro and macro, fossil fuel consumption

7 reduction and many others.

8 Also, and certainly second, Mark Von Wootke's

9 comments, and would simply say if your planners take a look

10 at downtown Claremont, let's say a two to three-block radius

11 around not Depot, I think you're going to find a fairly

12 model and exemplary transit oriented development in place.

13 And the synergy between road line travel and the environment

14 in Claremont is going to have both economic benefits and

15 also provide rail riders an excellent exposure to that part

16 of Claremont.

17 With regard to the three or four tracks, you are on

18 no -- I would just remind particularly the public, that on

19 September 14th, the city council of Claremont expressed its

20 official statement in concurrence with the conceptual

21 presentation that came through the Construction Authority

22 supporting the four-track configuration.

23 I am, likewise, as long-time Claremont Heritage

24 member, very cognizant, inch by inch, of the dimensions

25 north-south across the platform of the Depot. And we will

1 trust you, and we may even assist and advise you, given the
2 opportunity as those details are worked out in carefully
3 engineering designs.

4 And, fourthly, I urge that the draft EIS give very
5 close attention to a number of mitigations matter and some
6 in particular that I would say deserve top priority. The
7 first is public safety. Public safety issues at grade
8 crossing, having to do with air quality, related nighttime
9 noise. I'm sure that you will have experienced from other
10 rails and from other analyses that we'll lead you to finding
11 the right mitigation to those issues.

12 Secondly, I especially urge that close attention
13 and detail be given to mitigating wherever the property
14 lines are intended to fall on the south side of the tracks
15 across from the Depot. As you know, it's a very tight
16 order, and literally every centimeter is going to count
17 there. And mitigation for any property -- for any property
18 that's a property taking or property intrusion, is the right
19 thing to do there.

20 MS. LEVY BUCH: Can I ask you to wrap up, because we
21 have quite a few more speakers?

22 MR. TENER: You bet. Those were the particular points
23 with regard to the EIS. But I also want to second the
24 comment that right beyond this extension to the
25 Ontario Airport is going to bring exceptional benefits of

1 all of the kinds the EIS is going to cover. And so we'll be
2 applauding every comment that appears, that may refer to
3 extending us to the east.

4 Thanks for your time here.

5 MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. Paul Wheeler and then
6 Danny -- I'm sorry if I say it wrong.

7 MR. HALZNECHT: Danny Halznecht.

8 MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you.

9 MR. WHEELER: In the first -- we're neighbors to the
10 tracks. And when we first looked at your preliminary plans
11 years ago, one track as proposed. We believed you and we
12 really believed this is a very good solution, rather than
13 having two, which really means four tracks through
14 Claremont. Currently, if you look at College Avenue and
15 Indian Hill, where they cross the track, the track, it really
16 backs up. It backs beyond Bonita and almost down to Arrow.

17 So what I ask you to do in your preliminary design
18 concepts is a couple of things. Look at -- they need a bus
19 lane. There's one in the San Fernando Valley. It's
20 extremely inexpensive. Spend the money wisely and
21 prudently, and with hard work for all us to make it.

22 Another way is to consider the conflicts of all these tracks
23 with our traffic, and, maybe, put it in like the Alameda
24 corridor and put it in a trench. I see in Pasadena you've
25 done it and it really seems, you know, an open trench, that

1 really seems to work.

2 And if that's too much money, get rid of prevailing
3 wage. You're a smart man. You don't pay the guy 45 bucks
4 an hour to lean on a shovel. Why do you want us to pay that
5 equivalent to build your railroad?

6 Thank you.

7 MS. LEVY BUCH: Thanks, Paul. Danny and then Joel --
8 another big name -- Covarrubias.

9 MR. HALZNECHT: Hi. Good evening. I'm Danny Halznecht.
10 That's kind of a tough act to follow there. One thing that
11 Paul didn't mention is he owns a property right on the south
12 side of the tracks. There's a picture of the Depot. It's
13 right there. It pretty important, the real estate is very
14 tight there. I happen to live in the planned unit
15 development complex on Leyland Court, which is on the corner
16 of Arrow Highway and Claremont Boulevard where we already
17 have some real issues with the FTA buses that come down that
18 street quite a bit.

19 We have had an issue at our complex a few years
20 ago, a couple years ago with regard to drainage and
21 flooding. We had units flooded out due to improper grading,

22 and drain clearances up there with regard to Metrolink.

23 There's been talk about don't touch the station, if there's

24 a grade separation at Towne Avenue and, apparently, that is

25 to, what, assuage Metrolink, the Metrolink gods. Why can't

1 you build a below grade on the south side of the existing
2 Metrolink tracks, make that below grade and put the
3 Gold Line down through that?

4 I assume it's going to be a narrower vehicle, it's
5 going to take less real estate to put in. And also, I
6 think, on that picture that you guys showed, it didn't show
7 the wires hanging over the top that.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, it did.

9 MR. HALZNECHT: Did it? I didn't see it. But you'll
10 notice I just took my glasses off. It's just very narrow
11 through there. There's been some talk about opening up
12 1st Street all the way through Richton in Montclair. I know
13 were -- other than being a southern Claremonter, it's also
14 on the county line in kind of nebulous area over there. The
15 maps didn't even show the area where I'm at.

16 And we're very concerned about narrowness. The lady
17 that spoke that lived on Elder Drive, I understand those issues.
18 I also sell real estate in this town. And I understand the
19 impact of that. If the Metrolink tracks are moved to the
20 south side of that corridor, that, you know, you have no
21 control over what Metrolink does with their train, whether

22 it's below grade, above grade, at grade.

23 And, you know, we have to stop playing Little

24 League on Saturday when that train comes by anyway because

25 of the sound and the force of those things coming by --

1 through there. And it's been an issue. I think we really
2 need to take a look. We fought very, very hard to get the
3 210 Freeway below grade. They said it couldn't be done.
4 Well, it was done, and we got it done. And I think we're
5 going to get to take a look at the impacts that this could
6 cause.

7 So thank you.

8 MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you, Danny. Joel then
9 Thomas Bleakney.

10 MR. COVARRUBIAS: Hi. Joel Covarrubias. I apologize
11 for the long last name. I'll see what I can do about it.
12 I just had a few comments, I act like I'm reading. Few
13 comments. Number one, I wanted to know what kind of
14 ridership has been projected on this line, on this part
15 of, apparently, a very long line, possible from Ontario to
16 Long Beach at this point.

17 And that brings me to my second point, I've been
18 working as a citizen with a lot -- on a lot of these
19 projects, working, going to these kinds of meetings, and
20 I'm aware that their current proposal is Blue Line to go
21 Pasadena from Long Beach once regional connector opens up.

22 And then we're extending it to Azusa, and then we're

23 extending it possibly to Montclair and then to Ontario.

24 It seems a little operationally suspect.

25 And I'm assuming that Metro is going to be handling

1 the operational aspects of this line. I would also assume
2 that there needs to be some discussion between Metro and the
3 Gold Line Authority about how this would work. Would there
4 be a Long Beach to Pasadena line? And then a Montclair to
5 Pasadena line broken up or would it be one single line that
6 traffic traverses, what, 70 miles or something like that?

7 Anyway, I would like to hear more about that. I
8 think a lot of other people might want to as well.
9 Especially, getting back to the Blue Line is currently
10 running a very short head ways, possibly every six minutes,
11 something like that. And would they be the same frequency
12 out here as well?

13 You know, whether or not that's a good thing, let
14 people decide. But I think it would be good to address.
15 Finally, I think a lot of people's concerns here, I've seen
16 this happen with the Westwood -- West Side Extension, where
17 lack of -- certain lack of discussion happened with certain
18 groups within the communities. And it leads to friction,
19 you know, I just urge you to, you know, keep open ears and,
20 you know, I understand a lot of these decisions haven't been
21 made yet, so you can't be too committal about it.

22 But at the same time, you know, it's just good to
23 keep the lines of communication open. Especially, with this
24 extension, probably more than any other extension. It has a
25 historical aspect to it. I think people feel very strongly

1 about it. Just make sure that you watch those structural
2 resources at the Depot.

3 Thank you.

4 MS. LEVY BUCH: To answer one of the questions. With
5 regards to the ridership, one of our functions right now is
6 to look at the ridership, and we're also going to be taking
7 in consideration the other projects, the regional connector
8 and elements of the Metro system that's being planned and
9 under construction. So that will all be part of the
10 ridership that we looked at, so we are cognizant of that and
11 we're also working very closely with Metro.

12 Thomas, and then the last card I have is
13 Duane Jackman.

14 MR. BLEAKNEY: Hi, I'm Thomas Bleakney. I have two
15 points and I did come late. So I apologize if these have
16 already been asked. The first is in regards to bus
17 connections with the stations. You've talked about the
18 frequency of train sounds nice, but it's important that
19 there be bus connections that support those trains.

20 The other issue -- suggestion is that your stations
21 make adequate provisions for multiple charging ports for

22 electric vehicles. Have you provided any in that planning

23 at all? As I understand the EV1 era of electric vehicles,

24 there was a charging station here at Claremont for that.

25 And it sounds like there's going to be a lot more electric

1 vehicle in this next phase, and so you'll probably need

2 multiple stations for that.

3 MS. LEVY BUCH: The Authority has a grant right now to

4 look at the bus interface car stations, so we are looking at

5 that. And we're also working very closely with all the

6 cities to make sure that the interfacing is there. Thank

7 you.

8 I'm going to go ask people to keep your comments as

9 short as possible, so we can open it up to open house and

10 have people be able to ask their questions one on one and

11 write their comments down.

12 MR. JACKMAN: I'm Duane Jackman. I live nearby. I was

13 interested in your maps showing the locations of the

14 stations, and also the size of the land that's available in

15 each of those. That's one thing that I would like to

16 understand why -- how that fit into when, maybe, you

17 projected the participation of the riders would be. And

18 second is the location of the stops. I know you're working

19 with cities, and you're committed to those cities to provide

20 mass transportation.

21 But there are a couple of people that referred to

22 what happens around the world with regards to
23 transportation. And I think that if you're really looking
24 at it this far in advance, you need to look a little bit
25 outside of the box and see if you might to be able to find

1 transportation that could be provided for riders to Pasadena
2 and beyond.

3 That really is compatible with all the things going
4 on currently in the cities, but it's also very conducive to
5 riders. I have a feeling that you have more riders from
6 Rancho Cucamonga probably than any other community by the
7 year 2017. The other thing I note from a transportation
8 point of view, is the concept of having foot traffic out of
9 traffic and rapid transportation at different levels. So I
10 think we can get into these tight areas. We need to look at
11 that, even if it's just a short distance underground for
12 riders or a short distance for a train. I think that's
13 really something that needs to be studied carefully.

14 And I appreciate you coming tonight.

15 MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. And I just got two, so
16 Kent Hughles will be our last speaker.

17 MR. HUGHLES: Thank you. I was sitting there listening
18 and I had a couple of questions. I'll make it fast. In
19 using the Gold Line and going to -- I mean, I like the idea
20 of going to Pasadena in 40 minutes and sitting down. Once
21 I get there, will there be connecting -- if I do this, will

22 there be connecting transportation to get me where I'm

23 going?

24 Is that being coordinated in line with us being

25 down here or is it going to be -- I hope it's going to be

1 there situation? If I want to, say, go to Pasadena and go
2 down to Lake Avenue shopping, will I be able to get a bus, or
3 is that going to be only what Pasadena does? Is that going
4 to be a Pasadena issue or a Gold Line issue?

5 MS. LEVY BUCH: Why don't you go ahead and give us your
6 questions.

7 MR. HUGHLES: The other one is the noise. People who
8 live along the corridor right now, they have to deal with
9 probably one horn every half hour, at the most. Now you're
10 talking about going to up to six trains an hour with the
11 Gold Line, which means a horn about every ten minutes. It
12 also means stoppage on Indian Hill and College Boulevard
13 about every ten minutes, and maybe a little bit more during
14 the peak periods of traffic when people are trying to get
15 around. I just wanted to mention that.

16 And the other one is, seven years is a long time to
17 be able to project what you think is going to go on. And I
18 just want to mention to people here in general, that what
19 you're projecting may not be what happens. You're counting
20 on this. So that's all I wanted to say. Thanks.

21 MS. LEVY BUCH: Do you want to talk about grade cross

22 analysis that we're going to do really, really quickly. And

23 anything with regards to how we're going to coordinate with

24 Metro with regards to buses?

25 MR. KIM: Sure. The environmental document does include

1 a section on traffic and the traffic impacts at grade
2 crossing. There is something called a Metro grade process
3 policy. It will be applied to every cross location in the
4 entire study area. So it will be looked at. And what comes
5 out of that study will help tell us what mitigations do make
6 sense for impacts at that given location, and we're aware
7 that there is concerns in Claremont about that.

8 With respect to where you get on a station in you
9 Pasadena, the Construction Authority is working very closely
10 with Metro. And Metro has a Measure R. program, and part of
11 that program is to realign their services and realign their
12 routes. There are a lot of legacy routes that have been
13 here a long time, but there are new systems coming on line.

14 So what they're very interested in doing is to come
15 up with a sort of a bus tier network that feeds into
16 stations that does serve a couple functions. One is local
17 circulation to get where you want to go in your immediate
18 vicinity of the station, and also to serve trips that are
19 a little bit longer. So, you know, it kind of happens in
20 staging, but Metro is embarking on those types of bus
21 service restructuring plan as part of the Gold Line.

22 MS. LEVY BUCH: I think the comments tonight here
23 tonight were really helpful and were all taken on the record
24 by our court reporter. We will stay a little longer then
25 8:00 if necessary to answer your questions, to get your

1 feedback in writing, if you would like to speak to the

2 court reporter.

3 And, again, you have until February 2nd, the

4 close of the comment period, to provide your comments in

5 writing. And the address and all that information is on

6 your handout as well as on your comment sheets.

7 Thank you for coming.

8 MS. IRVINE: My comment is: I live on this street that

9 runs immediately below the proposed train tracks, the

10 current Metrolink tracks, and I need that street to use the

11 Metrolink train on a daily basis. And it's greatly improved

12 the quality of my family's life. And so we're excited about

13 having more opportunities to use public transportation to

14 get more places. We wouldn't live in Claremont if it didn't

15 have the Metrolink train. And we hope the Gold Line train

16 will help with meeting other work opportunities and provide

17 other opportunities for my family.

18 And since I live, you know, just on the south side

19 of the tracks, I'm a little concerned about the noise.

20 Currently, I can't sleep past 6:30 in the morning due to the

21 train horns. And so, yeah, that's my only concern is that

22 noise being reduced as much as possible. We've already put
23 in sound proofing insulation in our walls, and they're
24 called, like, freeway sound reducer windows, but the horns
25 are still quite loud.

1 And, of course, I'm concerned about it reducing the
2 value of my house, since I live south, immediately south, of
3 the tracks.

4 MR. BELLIS: I'm a resident over on Elder Drive, and I
5 live on the north side of the street. And the north side of
6 my property is right up against the existing railroad
7 right-of-way. And I understand it's going to be very tight
8 having the tracks, four tracks, in that narrow corridor.
9 And I'm really concerned about the sound, and, like, the
10 sight and visual picture and the vibrations. And I was
11 hoping the that the Authority considers putting up sound
12 walls and other structures to mitigate the sound and the
13 sight and visual aspects of the train.

14 (End of transcript of proceedings)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 BEFORE THE METRO GOLD LINE FOOTHILL EXTENSION

2 CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY PROJECT TEAM

3

4

5

6 Public Agency Coordination)
Meeting re:)

7)
METRO GOLD LINE FOOTHILL EXTENSION)

8 AZUSA TO MONTCLAIR)

9 _____)

10

11

12

13

14

15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

16 San Dimas, California

17 Thursday, January 20, 2011

18

19

20

21

22 Reported by:

23 EILEEN ELDRIDGE
Hearing Reporter

24

Job No.:

25 B6343NCO

1 BEFORE THE METRO GOLD LINE FOOTHILL EXTENSION

2 CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY PROJECT TEAM

3

4

5

6 Public Agency Coordination)
Meeting re:)

7)
METRO GOLD LINE FOOTHILL EXTENSION)

8 AZUSA TO MONTCLAIR)

9 _____)

10

11

12

13

14

15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at

16 Ekstrand Elementary School, 400 North Walnut Avenue,

17 San Dimas, California, commencing at 6:00 p.m.

18 on Thursday, January 20, 2011, heard before the

19 METRO GOLD LINE FOOTHILL EXTENSION CONSTRUCTION

20 AUTHORITY PROJECT TEAM, reported by

21 EILEEN ELDRIDGE, Hearing Reporter.

22

23

24

25