Responses to Comment Letter G-21
Yao Li
Response to Comment G-21
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 is noted.
Response to Comment Letter G-22
Jason Zink

Response to Comment G-22
The routing of the new highway would run directly through the County and the City of Lancaster and the connection to SR-14 (SR-138) would require significant improvements to the existing interchanges along the SR-14 (SR-138) including Avenue G, H, I. Standard interchange spacing is 1 mile in urban areas and 2 miles in rural areas for safety and operational benefits. If this traffic was rerouted on an alignment to meet SR-14 (SR-138) as suggested, the mainline of SR-14 (SR-138) would require significant upgrades to allow the spacing and the volume of traffic anticipated. Avenue I and H would both require significant upgrades to provide this new connection and the City of Lancaster and the County land use plans would need to be revised. Neither agency has plans for a new highway through this portion of the City/County. Another major challenge will be the locations of the new highway corridor and access from the existing highway corridor. The alignment would traverse open space areas which contain sensitive biological habitat.
when not one passing lane was placed on Ave D/Hwy 138. Not even turning lanes like at LA Petite Ave going to Holiday Lake. I lost my brother and 3 very close family friends on Hwy 138 in my lifetime so far over the years. Why should A.V. voters vote for it again, what benefits do AV citizens get from being taxed? We in AV will have to stand together as a voting block and vote against it if we are not guaranteed first funding from it for Hwy 138. Lobby Metro now for agreement before election. Together we have 4% of the voting power which would defeat it from passing the 2/3(66.67%) vote requirement if we were voted a "NO" block. Asking Santa Clarita City to join us would gain another 3% voting power to block it (7% total).

Measure R was a ballot measure during the November 2008 elections in Los Angeles County, California, that proposed a half-cent sales tax. The measure was approved by voters with 67.22% of the vote, just over the two-thirds majority required by the state of California to raise local taxes. Measure J went before the voters on November 6, 2012. It failed to pass, receiving 66.1%.

Below you will find links to City of Lancaster's City limits and Zoning Map.

Lancaster Zoning Map:
http://www.cityoflancaster.org/home/shadowdocument?id=12653

DTV AVENUE IREVOWT SE W JACKMAN STR...

www.cityoflancaster.org

PHHLLPSR 83 OP Fox Field Industr i Co ro or Specific Plan R 25 RR 23 M 5 RR 7,000 HE SR RR 25 RR 22 5 RR 25 25 RR 25

City Limits Map Link:
https://www.bing.com/mapspreview?hty=18&g=Lancaster&submit-id=xstl1367564-8d30-43ce-4f13 c7f62025527e0v0xid=41000&bmb=34.761547~118.325325~34.690090~
117.83511&geoids=150043981509203~118.1478302022.Lancaster ~area=34.690090~
118.1478302022.Lancaster ~sv=1

Cut and Paste from Last Email to the State & County:
Please consider this route I emailed to the State and County over a year ago. Just wondering why it was not considered then, and placed in Study? The Ave H-H Route makes much more common sense I believe, over the Ave D Route for Antelope Valley Community, and for the State.

HWY 138 West Realignment Freeway Plans should be reviewed from present Ave D, to go along my proposed route Ave H-H (between Ave H & Ave I) then Angled heading North from 110th West to 140th West parallel along the High Power Transmission Lines, to Ave D, then go West along planned Study route.

Why?
-Will cut travel time by 10+ minutes.
-Less Carbon Pollution/Smog because of reduced travel time.

Improved Travel Commerce Productivity.
-Will protect Antelope Acres Rural Atmosphere from freeway travel, by placing it far too the South of Antelope Acres community and not splitting the community in half.
-Gives closer access to State Prison 60th West, Fox Field Airport 50th West, New Planned Westside High School 70th West & I.
-Routes freeway though Higher Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Zoning. Not though Rural Country Area Communities of AV.
-Better drive for future residence then local roads for planned development to the South in the City of Lancaster. And future Fort Tejon/Centennial City residence that will travel to Lancaster for shopping/work/government services.
-Quicker Emergency Route for the Westside residents to AV Hospital ER.
-Safes then Wind and Dust Visibility Prone Area to the North that has caused many vehicle wrecks, injures for decades.
-Less exposure to Sewer Plant and it's smell.
-Construction Costs for Freeway would be less.
-It builds New Economic Development Wealth in AV with this South Freeway Route, because sewer and water infrastructure is in place. At Ave D there is no local infrastructure.

Also: here is the first State Purchase for the Metropolitan By-Pass Freeway Project in Antelope Valley for those that don't know how smart planners were 50 some years ago. Maybe it will inspire us. We must be Visionary like them.

Sincerely,

Jason Zink
(661) 816-9931
zinkjason@hotmail.com
| **From:** | NW138 <NW138@metro.net> |
| **Sent:** | Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:42 AM |
| **To:** | HR, Natalie CB/DOT (natalie.h@dot.ca.gov) |
| **Cc:** | Edgar Guerezes, Panuco, Studo |
| **Subject:** | FW: Objection of Alternative 1 |
| **Categories:** | SR-138 |

Mark Clerking  
Community Relations Manager - North County and Regional Rail Community and Municipal Affairs  
X22426  
We provide excellence in service and support.

--- Original Message ---

From: Hazel Tien [mailto:hazeltien@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:40 AM  
To: NW138  
Subject: Objection of Alternative 1  

Dear Mr. Regulator,  

Please be advised that Alternative 1 is extremely selfish and irresponsible. We wonder how this could become a listed alternative. Let's go back to track ONLY ALTERNATIVE 2 I please.  

Hazel Tien  
Co-owner of D41(138) Av. 138th St.
Responses to Written Comments from the General Public

Responses to Comment Letter G-24
Mei Lu

Response to Comment G-24
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 is noted.

Mei Lu

From: Yermel Lu <meilu@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2016 157 PM
To: NW138
Subject: I vote for the "Alternative 2 existing connector for 6-lane Freeway"

I vote for the "Alternative 2 existing connector for 6-lane Freeway"

Mei Lu
Responses to Written Comments from the General Public

NW 138 Corridor Improvement Project
Draft EIR/EIS – Public Hearings

Comment Sheet

Date: 9/12/14
Name: Marty Meeden
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): Resident
Address: 49261 88th St W Antelope Acres 91358
Phone/Cell: 661-301-4124
Email: mgmeeden@verizon.net

Thank you for your interest in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project. We welcome your comments.

1. No Roundabouts!
2. Loop north of Antelope Acres

PUBLIC COMMENT SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS: The Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (Draft EIR/EIS) for the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project is available for public comment through September 19, 2014. The Draft EIR/EIS is available for review at metro.net/wt3/EIS and comments can be emailed to NW138@metro.net or mailed to: Mr. Ron Kvasnick, Deputy District Director, California Department of Transportation, Division of Environmental Planning (NW 138), 190 S Main Street, MS-16A, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

Responses to Comment Letter G-25
Marty Meeden

Response to Comment G-25
Your comment in support of Alternative 1 - Antelope Acres Loop option and opposition to roundabouts is noted.
Responses to Comment Letter G-26
CW Lowery

Response to Comment G-26
The need for the project is based on an assessment of the existing and future transportation demand in the project area compared to the existing capacity of the facility. The improvements included in the alternatives were developed based on the approved land use plan by Los Angeles County and as defined in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) forecast traffic volumes for the 2040 horizon year. The improvements will not be needed until the traffic increases and the traffic increases are based on how quickly the land use buildout occurs. Local land use decisions are at the local level and Caltrans is responsible for implementing and maintaining the state infrastructure identified in these plans. A widening of SR-138 is in this area needs to comply with the local land use decisions and the transportation elements identified to allow the growth to occur. A Draft Freeway Agreement has been prepared that will be executed between Caltrans and Los Angeles County for consistency with future access and circulation within the region. As new locations are considered for development, Los Angeles County as the approving agency will need to determine future improvements that are required to meet the access locations agreed to with this project.
Responses to Written Comments from the General Public

Responses to Comment Letter G-27
Marty Meeden

Response to Comment G-27
To maintain the continuity of the bike routes within the western project limits, a bicycle path is proposed along the access road between the highway and Quail Lake outside of Caltrans right-of-way. Also, specific improvements include a Class I bike path, which will be established by utilizing the proposed utility corridor and remnant portions of the existing SR-138. Other improvements include pedestrian and bike refuge areas, cross-walks, and median cutthroughs for bikes. All County identified multimodal facilities, including bike, pedestrians, and equestrian trails are enhanced where they cross the existing or proposed highway. Improvements off the corridor are not included with this project.
Responses to Comment Letter G-28
Sammie Brackenbury

Response to Comment G-28
Accident data is included within the DEIR. Safety improvements will be implemented as early priority improvements. These will include intersection improvements with turning lanes pockets, alignment corrections for vertical and horizontal non-standard alignments (such as The Curve at the intersection with the Old Ridge Route), and shoulder widening to provide adequate shoulders for distressed or errant vehicles.
Responses to Comment Letter G-29
Claire and Frank

Response to Comment G-29

Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.

---

Edgar Gutierrez

From: Claire <claireausx@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2016 7:00 PM
To: NW138
Subject: NW 138

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

We're the future residents in the Antelope community at 80th-90th street.

Regarding the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project, we strongly support the plan of Alternative 2, which provides a better traffic flow, better future planning and development for Antelope corridor.

For the interest of residents and community, Alternative 1 is unserviced in terms of greenhouse emission, noise and security. With all these disadvantages, the new community will be less attractive and less long term values to the residents and community. We’re writing to express our strong opposition to Alternative 1 plan.

We trust our government will use our tax dollars in the best interest of the community and its residents, as well as future economic prospects of the Antelope corridor.

Our vote is Alternative 2 plan and 6-lane conventional freeway with exit in every 10 streets. We look forward to seeing a booming and bright future of Antelope Valley!

Thank you and appreciated!

Sincerely,

Claire, Frank and many other fellow residents

Sent from my iPhone
We are very concerned about the dust/noise/pollution from this project and are requesting at least a wall/barrier be put North side of our house. Also requesting insulated windows for the extra burden of sound. Also improving our current ventilation system (swamp cooler) to protect from move dust. Since you are taking our easement and our driveway access to Avenue D, we are requesting complete modifications to our current property, since the back will now be the front and the front the back staring at a wall. Seeking full compensation for expected stress, interruption of daily function, moving of power poles, utilities, and mail box, loss of property, devaluation of property. If this is not feasible, we request to be bought out, as this will cause such distress and house value to plummet.

Brenda & Barry Wood

Response to Comment G-30
The Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program can provide advisory services to assist individuals and businesses being displaced by the project. All project activities will be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. In addition, interviews with potential displacees will be conducted during the plan, specification and estimate (PS&E) phase and ROW acquisition phase of the project. These interviews will provide a greater understanding of household demographics and financial challenges facing each respective owner and occupant.
Response to Comment Letter G-31

Jason Zink

Response to Comment G-31
The routing of the new highway would run directly through the County and the City of Lancaster and the connection to SR-14 (SR-138) would require significant improvements to the existing interchanges along the SR-14 (SR-138) including Avenue G, H, I. Standard interchange spacing is 1 mile in urban areas and 2 miles in rural areas for safety and operational benefits. If this traffic was rerouted on an alignment to meet SR-14 (SR-138) as suggested, the mainline of SR-14 (SR-138) would require significant upgrades to allow the spacing and the volume of traffic anticipated. Avenue I and H would both require significant upgrades to provide this new connection and the City of Lancaster and the County land use plans would need to be revised. Neither agency has plans for a new highway through this portion of the City/County. Another major challenge will be the locations of the new highway corridor and access from the existing highway corridor. The alignment would traverse open space areas which contain sensitive biological habitat.
Responses to Written Comments from the General Public

Report: Roads in bad shape

By: Andrew Clark

Rough and broken Los Angeles-area streets and highways cost drivers an average $5,956 a year in congestion-related delays and fuel costs as well as higher vehicle operating costs including tire wear, repairs, and accelerated depreciation. The Washington-based transportation organization TRIP said 63% of the roads in the Los Angeles metropolitan area were in poor or mediocre condition.

The TRIP report confirms what everyone in California knows: the transportation system in this state is in bad shape,” said Will Kempton, executive director of Transportation California. “It is past time for our elected officials in Sacramento to step up and deal with this problem.”

The report noted the Southern California Association of Governments, or SCAG, identified $10.5 billion in needed transportation improvements in the region over the next 20 years. "This is a problem that will not fix itself,” SCAG President Michael Martinez said. "The only real solution is to make investing in our transportation infrastructure the urgent priority it needs to be.”

The study noted that California’s population and number of vehicles have been increasing. According to TRIP, the Golden State was home to 24.8 million licensed drivers in 2014 and vehicle travel is projected to increase 15% by 2035. Vehicle miles traveled topped 394 billion in 2015.

The study also showed 54,437 people died on California roads between 2000 and 2014, with the annual toll rising from 2,715 in 2000 to 3,074 in 2014. Rural roads have a fatality rate nearly four times higher than urban roads. TRIP estimates 33% of fatal traffic crashes can be attributed to roadway features such as lane width and intersection design.

The report said the agency’s Surface Transportation Program, or STP, Act was signed into law in December 2010 and provided a 15% increase in funding national highway projects and an 18% increase in transit funding. "But the FAST Act does not provide adequate funding to meet the nation’s need for highway and transit improvements and does not include a long-term and sustainable funding source,” the report said.

To share your opinion on this article or any other article, write a letter to the editor and email it to letters@latimes.com or mail it to Letters to Editor, PO Box 4005, Palmada, CA 93050-4005. (805) 984-1793.

Increase in gas tax, vehicle fee?

By: Andrew Clark

A proposal from Democratic lawmakers to put $5.9 billion annually into repairing and maintaining California’s streets and highways includes a gas tax increase of 17 cents a gallon and a $38 increase in the annual vehicle registration fee.

Made public by Republican officials, the plan by Assemblymembers Jim Frazier, D-Oakley, and San. Jim Beall, D-San Jose, calls for allocating $2.9 billion more annually for maintenance and rehabilitation of state highways, and $2.5 billion for streets and roads. Another $900 million is designated for improving freight and goods movement and $516 million is earmarked for transit capital projects, plus another $80 million for bicycle lanes and pedestrian pathways.

The plan proposes to raise $2.5 billion by applying the gasoline excise tax, $1.3 billion by raising the vehicle registration fee, $1.1 billion by eliminating an annual adjustment called the “true up” to the gasoline excise tax, $1 billion by increasing truck weight fees and $500 million by raising the diesel fuel excise tax by 30 cents a gallon.

Frazier and Beall’s plan also calls for $750 million extra from a diesel sales tax, $300 million from unallocated “cap-and-trade” fees on “greenhouse” gas emitters and $15 million from a zero emission vehicle registration fee of $156 per year.

The proposal includes changes to state government, including the creation of an office of transportation inspector general to oversee spending on transportation, proposes a constitutional amendment that would bar new funding from being diverted from transportation and permanently extending California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, exemptions for improvements in existing roadways.

Calls to the office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon, D-Paramount, were referred to Frazier’s office. A spokesperson for Frazier declined comment, referring a reporter to Beall’s office. A spokesperson for Beall did not return emails or calls seeking comment.

But Republican lawmakers criticized the proposal, saying it is inferior to an Assembly GOP transportation plan introduced a year ago that has received no Capitol hearing, vote or public discussion. Assemblyman Tom Lackey, R-Palmdale, said the new taxes would be detrimental to Antelope Valley drivers, noting that the total gasoline excise tax would be 79 cents per gallon including state and federal fees should the Democratic proposal become law.

“that is a considerable cost to their family budget,” Lackey said of commuters.

The Assembly Republicans’ plan calls for $6.6 billion in funding through existing taxes, fees and other revenue. They want to divert to streets and highways 40% of the cap-and-trade funds, which now are going to the California High-Speed Rail Authority and other programs intended to reduce “greenhouse” gases.

“If they’re going to tax us, let’s use it for transportation,” Lackey said of the cap and trade funds.

The Republican plan says cutting redundancies within Caltrans will save $300 million annually and eliminating 25% of vacant state positions would make another $485 million annually available for transportation spending.

Also included in the proposal is a measure to invest half of the governor’s “strategic growth” fund into above-ground projects, which Republicans say would set aside $200 million annually.

Republicans also propose more public-private partnerships, also known as P3s, for transportation. Locally, the High Desert Corridor between Palmdale and Victorville has been talked about as a P3. There is some overlap in the two plans. Both proposals want to restore $1 billion or more in vehicle weight fees to transportation projects.

“Weight fees are something we can support,” Lackey said.

NW 138 Corridor Improvement Project

Appendix J
Also, both plans use cap-and-trade funding for transportation, but different amounts. Democrats propose $300 million and Republicans suggest $1 billion. Both proposals suggest insulating highway projects from CEQA requirements and moving the California Transportation Commission from out of the executive branch and making it an independent entity.

Nick Mirman, deputy press secretary for the Assembly Republican Caucus, noted a report released this month by a Washington-based national transportation organization that said drivers in the Los Angeles area spend 80 hours a year on average in delays, costing them $1,711 in lost time and wasted fuel. “This is a serious issue for all California residents,” he said. “Eighty hours of gridlock a year is just ridiculous.”

To share your opinion on this article or any other article, write a letter to the editor and email it to editor@avonews.com or mail it to Letters to the Editor, PO Box 4050, Redlands, CA 92385-4050.

editor@avonews.com
Responses to Written Comments from the General Public

Responses to Comment Letter G-32
Edward Houte

Response to Comment G-32
Your opposition to Alternative 1 - Antelope Acres Loop option is noted.

Thank you for your interest in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project. We welcome your comments.
Responses to Comment Letter G-33
Gail Kell

Response to Comment G-33
Your opposition to the Project and roundabouts is noted.
Debi Seitz

Response to Comment G-34

The existing highway and transportation corridor is established and provides access to many current users. To move the corridor to another location results in other impacts that have been studied and included in the Draft ED. Opening up a new transportation corridor in this rural and environmentally sensitive area is not consistent with current LA County planning documents and is considered undesirable and will have many similar issues with property owners along those proposed alignments.

Debi Seitz

Date: Aug 25, 2016

Name: Debi Seitz

Address: 1627 W Ave K

Email: debi.seitz@yahoo.com
Responses to Written Comments from the General Public

Metrolink

Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project
Draft EIR/EIS – Public Hearings
Comment Sheet

Date: 4/10/2016
Name: Elinore Patterson
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): Resident/Property Owner
Address: 80510 Ave B1A, Lancaster, CA 93534
Phone/Cell: 661-742-8157
Email:

Thank you for your interest in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project. We welcome your comments.

Response to Comment Letter G-35
Elinore Patterson

Response to Comment G-35
Your comment in support of Alternative 2, maintaining SR-138’s currently alignment and opposition to Alternative 1 – Antelope Acres Loop option is noted.
Responses to Written Comments from the General Public

NW 138 Corridor Improvement Project
Draft EIR/EIS – Public Hearings

Comment Sheet

Name: Michael J. Grimes

Address: 53043 Dr. H. F. W. Circleville, CA 93036

Phone/Cell: 661-494-1969

Email: meaghan@bestweb.net

Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 – Antelope Acres Loop option is noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS: The Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (Draft EIR/EIS) for the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project is available for public comment through September 19, 2016. The Draft EIR/ EIS is available for review at metro.net/138 and comments can be emailed to nwc138@metro.net or mailed to: Mr. Ron Kosinski, Deputy District Director, California Department of Transportation, Division of Environmental Planning (NW SR-138), 100 S Main Street, MS-16A, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

Responses to Comment Letter G-36
Michael J. Grimes
Response to Comment G-36
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 – Antelope Acres Loop option is noted.
Response to Comment Letter G-37
Judith Fuentes

Response to Comment G-37
Your comment in support of the No Build Alternative and opposition to Alternative 1 – Antelope Acres Loop option is noted.

No build is the alternative. That is the only one (see DEIR) that would have no impacts—significant or otherwise, on the rural community of Antelope Acres. A loop around Antelope Acres still separates an established community, disrupting the community in such a way that is as imposing as any other build out of Avenue D.

There is already a highway that crosses from east to west that was built to accommodate traffic — supposedly for the transportation of goods going from the LA basin (mostly truckers) that is being ignored. This is probably because speed limits and passing laws are very ignored and law enforcement is lax on 138.

No thanks!
Response to Comment Letter G-38
Robert A. Lame

Response to Comment G-38

The implementation of improvements will not occur all at once, the implementation of improvements will need to be constructed in phases and thus will not allow full one-way traffic without full buildout of many other improvements. The interim one-way traffic patterns will make connections to existing roadways and facilities a major challenge. Additional considerations will need to be given to the interim aspects of project partial implementation that will make one-way operations very difficult. The routing of the new highway would run through the County and the connection to SR-14 (SR-138) would require significant improvements to the existing interchanges along the SR-14 (SR-138) in the area of Avenue B. Standard interchange spacing is 1 mile in urban areas and 2 miles in rural areas for safety and operational benefits. If this traffic was rerouted on an alignment to meet SR-14 (SR-138) as suggested, the mainline of SR-14 (SR-138) would require significant upgrades to allow the spacing and the volume of traffic anticipated. The County land use plans would need to be revised. The County recently adopted the Antelope Valley Area Plan that governs land use in the Antelope Valley and does not include plans for a new highway through this portion of the County. Another major challenge will be the locations of the new highway corridor and access from the existing highway corridor. The alignment would traverse open space areas which contain sensitive biological habitat.
Responses to Comment Letter G-39
Jason Zink

Response to Comment G-39
The routing of the new highway would run directly through the County and the City of Lancaster and the connection to SR-14 (SR-138) would require significant improvements to the existing interchanges along the SR-14 (SR-138) including Avenue G, H, I. Standard interchange spacing is 1 mile in urban areas and 2 miles in rural areas for safety and operational benefits. If this traffic was rerouted on an alignment to meet SR-14 (SR-138) as suggested, the mainline of SR-14 (SR-138) would require significant upgrades to allow the spacing and the volume of traffic anticipated. Avenue I and H would both require significant upgrades to provide this new connection and the City of Lancaster and the County land use plans would need to be revised. Neither agency has plans for a new highway through this portion of the City/County. Another major challenge will be the locations of the new highway corridor and access from the existing highway corridor. The alignment would traverse open space areas which contain biological habitat.

Mark Oerhing
Community Relations Manager – North County and Regional Rail
Community and Municipal Affairs

We provide excellence in service and support.

From: MASON ZINK [mailto:zinkjason@hotnetL.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 4:31 AM
To: NW138
Cc: Christine Garza; Mayor Mike Antonovich; Town Council Assoc.; debbie@savdot.org; I. Jason Coble; danny.baxxer@sen.ca.gov; senator.runner@senate.ca.gov; Assemblyman Lackey; Glenni Milke
Subject: NW 138 West Realignment - Public Input

Ron Kosinski, Deputy District Director
California Department of Transportation
Division of Environmental Planning
NW 138

Please Consider this route I emailed over a year ago. Just wondering why it was not considered then, and placed in Study? The Ave H & I Route makes much more common sense I believe, over the Ave D Route for Antelope Valley Community and for the State.

Ave H & I Route
-怄 L East Realignment Freeway Plans should be rerouted from present Ave D, to go along my proposed route Ave H & I (between Ave H & Ave I) then up to 140th West to 110th West parallel along the High Power Transmission Lines, to Ave D, then go West along planned Study route.

Why?
- Will cut travel time by 50- minutes.
- Less Carbon Pollution/Smog because of reduced travel time.
- Improved Travel Commerce Productivity.
- Will protect Antelope Acres Rural Atmosphere from freeway travel, by placing it far too the South of Antelope Acres community.
- Gives closer access to State Prison 60th West, Fox Field Airport 50th West, New Planned Westside High School 70th West & I.

1
Responses to Written Comments from the General Public

G-40

Responses to Comment Letter G-40
Hazel Tien

Response to Comment G-40
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.

--- Original Message ---
From: Hazel Tien [mailto:hazel.tien@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:40 AM
To: NW138
Subject: Objection of Alternative 1

Dear Mr. Regulator,

Please be advised that Alternative 1 is extremely selfish and irresponsible. We wonder how this could become a listed alternative. Get to go back to trash, ONLY ALTERNATIVE 2 ! Please.

Hazel Tien,
Co-owner of D4138@w.138th St.