

Responses to Written Comments from the General Public

Throughout the 45-day comment period, a total of 56 members of the public submitted written comments and comment cards related to the project. A copy of each written comment and responses are presented in this chapter.

**Summary of Written Comments  
Received from the General Public**

Comment Code	Commenter Name	Date Letter Received	Comment Topic(s)	Appendix J Page No.
G-1	Diane Soto	09/22/16	Roundabouts, Traffic, Access	116
G-2	Jack Tuszynski	09/21/16	Alternative 2, Traffic Signals, Traffic	117 - 118
G-3	Nina Psomas	09/19/16	High Speed Rail, Coordination with State Agencies	119
G-4	Marvin Himlin	09/19/16	Costs, Traffic, High Speed Rail	120
G-5	Val Phay	09/19/16	Property Access Points	121
G-6	Phil Schultz	09/19/16	Alignment, Project Design	122
G-7	Mary Rischar	09/18/16	Alternative 1, Antelope Acres Loop, Traffic Signals, Toll Road, Access	123 - 124
G-8	Judith Fuentes	09/18/16	Operation/Safety Improvements	125 - 126
G-9	Eddie & Lynn Stafford	09/18/16	Bird Species and Wildlife, Quail Lake	127 - 128
G-10	Jannelle Ybarra-Lloyd	09/18/16	Accidents, Traffic, Relocation, Alternative 1 Loop Option	129 - 133
G-11	Julie Schuder	09/17/16	Alignment, Little Buttes Antique Airfield, Acquisition & Relocation, Noise, Visual Impacts	134 - 136
G-12	Sheldon Eiss	09/15/16	Operation/Safety Improvements, Traffic	137
G-13	Lynette A. Lame	09/15/16	Safety Improvements, Passing Lanes	138
G-14	Sherry & Eric	09/11/16	Alternative 2, Safety	139
G-15	Patti	09/05/16	Roundabouts	140
G-16	Gong Vi	08/30/16	Alternative 2	141
G-17	York Sung	08/27/16	Antelope Acres Loop, Alternative 2	142
G-18	Yufang Tu	08/27/16	Alternative 2, Costs Savings, Safety	143
G-19	Hong Dan	08/27/16	Antelope Acres Loop, Alternative 2	144
G-20	Yanmei Lu	08/27/16	Alternative 2	145
G-21	Yao Li	08/27/16	Alternative 2	147
G-22	Jason Zink	08/27/16	Alignment, Traffic, Operational/Safety Improvements	148 - 149
G-23	Hazel Tien	08/27/16	Alternative 2	150
G-24	Mei Lu	08/27/16	Alternative 2	151
G-25	Marty Meeden	08/27/16	Roundabouts, Antelope Acres Loop	152
G-26	CW Lowery	08/27/16	Alternative 1, Traffic, Future Growth	153
G-27	Marty Meeden	08/27/16	Bike Paths, Pacific Crest Trail Access	154
G-28	Sammie Brackenbury	08/27/16	Alternative 2, Accidents	155
G-29	Claire & Frank	08/26/16	Alternative 2	156
G-30	Brenda & Barry Wood	08/25/16	Dust Pollution, Air Quality, Noise, Acquisition	157
G-31	Jason Zink	08/25/16	Alignment	158 - 160
G-32	Edward Houte	08/25/16	Antelope Acres Loop	161
G-33	Gail Kell	08/25/16	Traffic, Roundabouts, Noise, Air Quality, Safety	162
G-34	Debi Seitz	08/25/16	Alignment	163
G-35	Elinore Patterson	08/25/16	Maintain Alignment, Antelope Acres Loop	164
G-36	Michael Grimes	08/25/16	Alternative 2, Maintain Alignment	165
G-37	Judith Fuentes	08/25/16	Antelope Acres Loop, Speed Limit Enforcement	166
G-38	Robert A. Lame	08/25/16	Alignment, Operational/Safety Improvements, Traffic Signals	167
G-39	Jason Zink	08/24/16	Alignment	168
G-40	Hazel Tien	08/24/16	Alternative 2	169
G-41	Chenwei Lai	08/23/16	Alternative 2	171
G-42	Randy Givens	08/23/16	Update Contact Info	172

Comment Code	Commenter Name	Date Letter Received	Comment Topic(s)	Appendix J Page No.
G-43	Muming Chee	08/22/16	Alternative 2	173
G-44	Kuoyuan Hsu	08/21/16	Alternative 2, Safety	174
G-45	Yao Li	08/21/16	Antelope Acres Loop, Maintain Alignment	175
G-46	Chung-Hsiao Wu	08/21/16	Alternative 2, Safety	176
G-47	Brock Fergusson	08/20/16	CHP Enforcement	177
G-48	Bernard Niesen	08/20/16	Alternative 1	178
G-49	Hong-Bing Chen	08/19/16	Alternative 2, Noise	179
G-50	Jennifer Li	08/18/16	Antelope Acres Loop, Alternative 2	180
G-51	Cynthia Thompson	08/18/16	Safety, Use Antelope Acres Loop	181
G-52	Terry Kelling	08/17/16	Request CD of DEIR	182
G-53	Dean Canfield	08/07/16	Location of Improvements, Alignment	183
G-54	John & David Wang	08/06/16	Alternative 2	184
G-55	Maurice Chee	08/06/16	Alternative 2, Traffic, Cost, GHG Emissions	185
G-56	Maria Manalili	08/10/16	Request for Technical Documents	186

G-1

---

**Subject:** FW: Feedback - NW138 [#50]

**From:** Wufoo [mailto:[no-reply@wufoo.com](mailto:no-reply@wufoo.com)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 22, 2016 11:52 AM  
**To:** NW138  
**Subject:** Feedback - NW138 [#50]

**Name \*** Diane Soto

**Email** [dianesoto1@gmail.com](mailto:dianesoto1@gmail.com)  
(you@email.com)

**Phone Number** (661) 724-2078

**Select a Subject** Comment and/or Question

**Comment and/or Question \***

I live in the Holliday Valley area, two mile by two mile radius approximately. Bad weather, fires makes it extremely difficult to get in and out of our area. Trucks getting off the 5 onto the new 6 lane express to a 4 lane express will only mean more traffic. It is my option that a Roundabouts is not a good option. Consider that the larger percent of residents are older drivers and aging. Have you ever watched a senior getting onto a freeway? Consider an older person on a Roundabout with trucks, especially in bad weather. I did not care that a new improved freeway or highway was coming in until I learned in this last meeting that after 240th Ave D or 138 would merge into the new highway. I can't see myself pulling my trailer to waste managements on a highway with what speeds. Also, I have not read or seen any new info on type of future public transportation. Thank You.

## Responses to Comment Letter G-1 Diane Soto

Response to Comment G-1  
Your opposition to roundabouts is noted.

## Responses to Comment Letter G-2 Jack Tuszynski

### Response to Comment G-2

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. Since the improvements are based on this information, they consider the potential traffic impacts in the 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. It is anticipated that the early improvements in the corridor will focus on safety and operations and will not include capacity improvements, which are what is shown in the current exhibits for what is required in the year 2040 based on the traffic projections. As the traffic increases in the corridor, the capacity improvements will be implemented, as funding is available.

---

**Subject:** FW: Feedback - NW138 [#49]

**From:** Wufoo [mailto:no-reply@wufoo.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 21, 2016 5:02 PM

**To:** NW138

**Subject:** Feedback - NW138 [#49]

**Name \*** Jack Tuszynski

**Email** [jacktwork@gmail.com](mailto:jacktwork@gmail.com)

[\(you@email.com\)](#)

\*

**Select a Subject** Comment and/or Question

\*

**Comment and/or Question \***

I think that there is a major flaw in alternative 2 of the Highway 138 upgrade DEIR. There are about half a dozen traffic lights in the portion west of 300th Street west. I own a house in Neenach. It takes exactly 1 hour stopwatch to drive from Burbank airport to the house. With traffic lights that time is increased by 5 minutes. What exactly is out there to warrant traffic lights??? There is nothing out there. They MAY be a town called Centennial. If this town is built the traffic lights might make sense. That would involve acquiring billions of dollars of capital from investors on New York wall street to take place. TRC (Tejon Ranch) stock symbol investors do not want to see huge amounts of capital be applied to this project. They want to see profit and let someone else do the heavy lifting. They make their profit by buying real estate stock and avoiding short term capital gains, not by building houses. So it is not apparent if there is an actual will on the part of Tejon Ranch to build this community. They could just as well be making lots of money off of machinations on the stock market and tax shelters based on the real estate foundation and the promise to build rather than to actually build. So decisions in your DEIR make life more miserable for the locals and assume that an act will take place that is based on a decision by a private company with seriously questionable motives. Currently if you are in Neenach and you need something from Home Depot or a supermarket the travel time to the nearest store of that type is 35 minutes. Adding 5 traffic lights will increase the distance to civilization by that much. Nearby is Kern county: a third world country. No paved roads, no water, no sewage, no electricity, no internet, etc. These kinds of decisions to increase travel time just make the place that much more desolate and backward. Half a dozen traffic lights just in case

The job actually starts to build Centennial is unnecessary and unwarranted. Currently those lights serve nobody except maybe a few coyotes. That state should be the assumption of the DEIR.

---



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

NR  
G-3

Comment Sheet

Date: 9-19-2016  
 Name: Nina Psomas  
 Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): Abbottway engineering and design Agency  
 Address: 1/2 Nicole Panson 506 W. Tackman St Lancaster 93534  
 Phone/Cell: (818) 979-4741  
 Email: P267126826@gmail.com

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

#1 What role if any would Caltrans be willing to play in with us the stakeholders, urban citizens and the Ca. Governor, Mr. J. Brown in a productive quality and beneficial effort ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> unbelaking to connect the currently under construction Northern Ca Bullet train To the newly submitted Southern Ca Bullet train?

#2 Does Caltrans contract or partner with surrounding state jurisdictions? #3 what are the barriers if removed permit Caltrans to cross state line if need be to say; complete a possible parallel cargo tracks to new places and markets of good exchange?

What increase ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> economic benefit would ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> intercity port yard <sup>or yards</sup> warehouse, transfer, staging and or quality assurance etc. if sited in Kern county, Palmdale ~~CA~~ <sup>City of</sup>, and ~~or~~ <sup>or</sup> in San Bernardino County have ~~or~~ <sup>or</sup> Southern Californians?

**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/nw138](http://metro.net/nw138) and comments can be emailed to: [nw138@metro.net](mailto:nw138@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-3  
Nina Psomas

Response to Comment G-3

As part of the statewide and regional transportation planning process, Caltrans regularly works with the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and regional transportation planning agencies to develop the California Transportation Plan and other regional transportation plans. More information about the California Transportation Plan can be found at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/californiatransportationplan2040/2040.html>. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) also is responsible for preparing the regional transportation plan (RTP) for a five county area in southern California and more information about the RTP can be found at: <http://scagtrpscs.net/>.

G-4

---

**Subject:** FW: Feedback - NW138 [#47]

**From:** Wufoo [mailto:no-reply@wufoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2016 11:41 AM  
**To:** NW138  
**Subject:** Feedback - NW138 [#47]

<b>Name *</b>	Marvin Himlin
<b>Email (you@email.com) *</b>	<a href="mailto:Marvin@himlinrealty.com">Marvin@himlinrealty.com</a>
<b>Phone Number</b>	(661) 948-8596
<b>Select a Subject *</b>	Comment and/or Question
<b>Comment and/or Question *</b>	The planners of this project have of course considered the necessary and the costs of widening the Antelope Valley Freeway to the 5 , the expressway to Las Vegas and the 15 to the Inland Empire to facilitate the additional traffic this will inevitably cause, as well possibly coordinating this project with the High Speed Rail debacle?

## Responses to Comment Letter G-4 Marvin Himlin

### Response to Comment G-4

Please refer to Chapter 1 for a discussion of the scope and need for the Project and Chapter 3 for a discussion of existing and future traffic conditions which support the stated need.

The purpose of this project is to:

- Improve mobility and operations on SR-138 and in NW Los Angeles County;
- Enhance safety within the SR-138 Corridor based on current and future projected traffic conditions;
- Accommodate foreseeable increases in travel and goods movement within northern Los Angeles County.

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.

G-5

---

**Subject:** FW: Feedback - NW138 [#48]

**From:** Wufoo [mailto:[no-reply@wufoo.com](mailto:no-reply@wufoo.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2016 1:11 PM  
**To:** NW138  
**Subject:** Feedback - NW138 [#48]

<b>Name *</b>	Val Phay
<b>Email (you@email.com) *</b>	<a href="mailto:avbrokerval@gmail.com">avbrokerval@gmail.com</a>
<b>Phone Number</b>	(661) 728-9449
<b>Select a Subject *</b>	Comment and/or Question
<b>Comment and/or Question *</b>	<p>If this eminent domain for the 138 Corridor takes our home it will be the third time it has happened in the Phay Family. Parents and Aunt &amp; Uncle had their property taken too. Where does it show there'd be access to properties if they can't get onto the highway directly? How long does this need to go on until we know something definitive? It is difficult to sell property in this area because of the unknown we must disclose to buyers.</p>

## Responses to Comment Letter G-5 Val Phay

### Response to Comment G-5

Existing access is maintained throughout the corridor. 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 and provide for local circulation for property access as a condition of approval.

---

**Subject:** FW: 138 alignment

**From:** Philip Schultz [mailto:phil.schultz@airspeedcorp.com]

**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2016 9:46 AM

**To:** NW138 <NW138@metro.net>

**Subject:** 138 alignment

I have previously made this comment, but for the record I would like to make it again and hope you have given some serious consideration for it.

Starting at Highway 14, the Antelope Valley Freeway going west on Avenue G to 95<sup>th</sup> street west and then a gentle curve to intersect the present 138, I think is a much better path for the following reasons.

1. It connects the community of Antelope Acres with Lancaster more directly.
2. It affects fewer houses by the road width expansion.
3. It serves the Fox airport better.
4. It serves the warehousing area northwest of Lancaster more directly.
5. In the future extending this route east to 90<sup>th</sup> or 110<sup>th</sup> street east provides for daily commuters to Edwards AFB via the south gate entrance and the rocket base.

Phil

Phil Schultz  
661-948-0577  
Cell 661-839-2378

## Responses to Comment Letter G-6 Phil Schultz

### Response to Comment G-6

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 and H interchanges. 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 G 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 contains biological habitat.



G-7

---

**Subject:** FW: Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project

**From:** Mary Rischar [mailto:mriskhar619@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 18, 2016 3:18 PM  
**To:** NW138 <NW138@metro.net>  
**Subject:** Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project

Good Afternoon,

I attended the 8/25 meeting and would like to provide my thoughts & concerns.

I have lived in the Antelope Valley all my life, the last 6 yrs in Antelope Acres, I lived in Lancaster and Palmdale/Quartz Hill previously. Growing up, Antelope Acres was always known as rural and where you could move to be near the city but far enough away to enjoy the desert and it's mountain views as well as peace & quiet. This was why we chose to build our house here.

The lot we chose to purchase is on Ave C near 90th St W, this was a long thought out decision as we knew that any house too near Hwy 138 would eventually be affected by any improvement/expansion of the hwy. Now I find that decision has "bit me in the butt" as one of your options has an alternative that runs part of the Hwy basically right through my front yard. I never thought that being 1 mile away, our lot would end up being directly affected.

I understand that progress must happen, I remember when Lancaster only had very few stoplights and I could walk or ride my bike across any part of Ave J without too much worry to my mom. I also understand how dangerous Hwy 138 can be as I have driven it since before I got my drivers license, some of my driving lessons were taking it from Lancaster to Gorman & back.

I agree that stop lights are needed at specific intersections along the Hwy and that the curves/hills toward the Gorman end need to be addressed. I understand per the meeting that even if this moves forward it will be in stages. It is my belief that once the stop lights are put in place at specific intersections you may see a slight decrease in traffic. Most people take the Hwy as it is a "non-stop" way to get from the 5 to the 14 freeways. I think once they know it is no longer non-stop they may choose to go another route. I would like to suggest that once these first improvements are completed another study is done to again verify the volume of traffic and possible decrease in accidents. Then use the results to determine if all of the other improvements are still needed. Was it ever discussed to make the Hwy a toll road? The fees may also decrease the volume of traffic on the Hwy.

Obviously due to human nature my focus is on my lot and the affect any changes will have on it. In speaking with a gentlemen on your "team" prior to the start of the meeting I feel worse rather than better. The alternative that runs down Ave C will place

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-7 Mary Rischar

### Response to Comment G-7

Alternative 1 with Antelope Acres Loop has not been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Caltrans, as lead agency under NEPA, as assigned by FHWA, and in cooperation with Metro has identified Alternative 2 (Expressway/Highway) as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would include a 6-lane freeway from the I-5 interchange connector ramps to Gorman Post Road, a 6-lane expressway from the Gorman Post Road interchange to 300th Street West, a 4-lane expressway from 300th Street West to 240th Street West, and a 4-lane limited access Conventional Highway from 240th Street West to the SR-14 interchange, generally following the existing alignment of SR-138. These improvements will be considered and built over time and will be evaluated moving forward for the correct level of improvements at various locations within the corridor as demand requires the expansion or improvements within the corridor. Flexibility is built into the proposed improvements to allow the improvements to be staged as necessary and in the priority areas identified for improvement at the time of the needed improvements. A preliminary tolling study was completed for this corridor and the results reflected that if you tolled the western end of the corridor, it could generate revenue, as the alternative route is very long. The implementation of tolling on these routes needs to be studied and considered for the current characteristics of the route to make them cost effective and meaningful. Tolling can always be evaluated at any time, but until the corridor develops, tolling is premature.

*Responses to Written Comments from the General Public*

the Hwy 30 feet from my front yard, I was told there would be an access road (yet did not see it in the map/plan) so that I would still be able to get to my house as well as trash services, etc. I asked if there would be a privacy/noise barrier and was told no, that there would be a chain link fence. When I asked how that chain link fence would stop a car from landing in or going through my yard/house in the event of an accident, drunk driver, etc., his response was that would not happen. I have no idea how he could think that it is not a possibility, 30 feet and a chain link fence will not stop a semi truck or a car at high speed from ending up in my or one of my neighbors yard or house.

Besides safety, I am also concerned about my property values, at this time my house is estimated at \$400,000 in value- yes I know this is not a definite value and dependent on many things. It will definitely not be the case if the Hwy is in my front yard. I have driven the back roads, highways and freeways to Las Vegas and Lake Mead frequently over the years and always wondered if those houses right on the side of the road chose the location or if it was forced on them to make way for the road I was on. I am very sad that if the Ave C alternative happens, people will think the same about my house and my neighbors, "Why would anyone choose to live here?" I love my house and this area and I am heartbroken that if this goes through I may have to move, if it will even be possible to sell my house.

I know that no matter what decision is made you cannot make everyone happy, I was taught that lesson early in my life and understand it. However, I would like to think that the people in the houses that are directly next to the Hwy were aware that any future improvement/expansion of the Hwy would affect their property.

I believe that the less costly alternative is the best wherein the improvements are made to the existing Hwy. I have to believe that adding additional curves to a high speed highway is not the best alternative if you are trying to avoid/lessen accidents.

Thank you for letting me provide my thoughts & concerns.

Mary Rischar  
8744 W Ave C  
Lanc CA 93536  
Cell phone 661-435-2661

[NW138@metro.net](mailto:NW138@metro.net)

September 18, 2016

Ron Kosinski, Deputy District Director  
California Department of Transportation  
Division of Environmental Planning  
(NW SR-138)  
100 South Main Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski,

Highway 138 (Project) Draft EIR Comments (DEIR)

The DEIR incorrectly names streets. If this DEIR is reporting on the Avenue D, Highway 138 project, all streets must be labeled correctly. Please note that 300<sup>th</sup> Street should be 300<sup>th</sup> Street West, 245<sup>th</sup> Street should be 245<sup>th</sup> Street West, 90<sup>th</sup> Street should be 90<sup>th</sup> Street West and 140<sup>th</sup> Street should be 140<sup>th</sup> Street West, and so on. If this is not the case, please explain the reason.

G-8.1

With NO BUILD there would be NO IMPACTS. There would be no harm to the environment, communities, wildlife, etc.

G-8.2

Alternatives 1 and 2 set in motion devastation and damage that cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificant. Energy and Environmental Justice are the only two of the 16 environmental impacts not to have Major Potential Impacts.

Instead of destroying the northwest Los Angeles County with this Project, save the money: make passing lanes, where needed; enforce traffic laws, speed limits, headlights on, cargo and weight limits, etc. Much of the truck traffic on Highway 138 is related to temporary construction trucks, equipment and migratory construction workers for the huge solar generating industry which is exploiting the west Antelope Valley.

G-8.3

It appears this Project is only for the good of Los Angeles County and certain wealthy developers of a planned sprawling community in the far north of this county. Highway 138 should not be a connection to the Central Valley. There is a road already paid for by taxpayers to hook up the SR-58 to Bakersfield. A connecting road from there to the Interstate 5 is more reasonable, would have fewer environmental impacts, and be less costly.

The DEIR is flawed by not taking in consideration the reality of communities being divided in half, the lack of neighborhood cohesion by limited access crossings, and the significant impact this Project will have to the rural areas

G-8.4

**Responses to Comment Letter G-8**  
**Judith Fuentes**

**Response to Comment G-8.1**

The Final EIR/EIS includes corrected street names throughout the document.

**Response to Comment G-8.2**

The No-Build Alternative would not accommodate the projected population growth or expected increase in goods movement truck traffic in Northern Los Angeles County. Under the No Build Alternative, SR-138 would operate at LOS E or worse conditions between Gorman Post Road and 300th Street West during AM and PM peak hours. For all other study segment locations, SR-138 would operate at LOS D or better under the No Build Alternative. The No-Build Alternative could result in indirect impacts on air quality, mobility, safety, and the economy within Northern Los Angeles County. There would be increased maintenance costs to maintain the route without any other improvements.

**Response to Comment G-8.3**

Please refer to Chapter 1 for a discussion of the scope and need for the Project and Chapter 3 for a discussion of existing and future traffic conditions which support the stated need. The purpose of this project is to:

- Improve mobility and operations on SR-138 and in NW Los Angeles County;
- Enhance safety within the SR-138 Corridor based on current and future projected traffic conditions;
- Accommodate foreseeable increases in travel and goods movement within northern Los Angeles County.

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. Existing access is maintained throughout the corridor. 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 and provide for local circulation for property access as a condition of approval. 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. Since the improvements are based on this information, they consider the potential traffic impacts in the 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. It is anticipated that the early improvements in the corridor will focus on safety and operations and will not include capacity improvements, which are what is shown in the current exhibits for what is required in the year 2040 based on the traffic projections. As the traffic increases in the corridor, the capacity improvements will be implemented, as funding is available.

Several of the project elements have been modified to avoid or minimize potential environmental impacts. Proposed mitigation measures are listed in Table S-2, where avoidance and minimization attempts could not fully resolve the impacts. Implementation of the mitigation measures listed in Table S-2 would result in less than significant impacts.

because it is **“to enhance the attractiveness of the area for additional economic and residential development.”** In other words, the Project does nothing to protect the rural atmosphere and lifestyle of those who chose a rural existence, but encourages growth and sprawl.

G-8.4

The planners and developers of the Highway 138 must look at this Project from a practical point of what it means to preserve the environment and maintain the historical rural atmosphere and surroundings of the west Antelope Valley in north Los Angeles County.

Attached are comments sent in March, 2015. Not much has changed here since then.

Sincerely,

Judith Fuentes  
47458 92<sup>nd</sup> Street West  
Antelope Acres, CA 93536

## Responses to Comment Letter G-8 Judith Fuentes

### Response to Comment G-8.4

The purpose of this project is to:

- Improve mobility and operations on SR-138 and in NW Los Angeles County;
- Enhance safety within the SR-138 Corridor based on current and future projected traffic conditions;
- Accommodate foreseeable increases in travel and goods movement within northern Los Angeles County.

The proposed project would be consistent with Antelope Valley Area Plan Policy M 9.3 (Ensure that bikeways and bicycle routes connect communities and offer alternative travel modes within communities). The project would improve existing pedestrian routes and create new pedestrian routes. Pedestrian overcrossings are proposed at 3 locations to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle movement through the corridor. The three pedestrian overcrossings considered are in the communities of Antelope Acres and Neenach, serving current pedestrian needs. The three locations include 75th Street West or 77th Street West, 100th Street West, and 280th Street West. Community input from the High Desert Cyclists also indicated that 60th Street West and 90th Street West are used as the primary routes for north-south movements across SR-138. Intersection treatment options such as signalized intersections, roundabouts, and vehicular overcrossings provide an improved bicycle crossing at these two locations.

Project design will be done in compliance with the Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance of Los Angeles County. The Ordinance established regulations that conserve energy and resources and promote dark skies for the enjoyment and health of humans and wildlife, while permitting reasonable uses of outdoor lighting for nighttime safety and security. The regulations include limitations on allowable light trespass, fully shielding outdoor lighting, and imposes maximum heights of fixtures.

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. The preferred alternative would generally follow the existing alignment of SR-138 and would not accommodate new access points to and/or from the study area that would result in growth pressures in areas where such access does not presently exist. 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. Several of the project elements have been modified to avoid or minimize potential environmental impacts. Proposed mitigation measures are listed in Table S-2, where avoidance and minimization attempts could not fully resolve the impacts. Implementation of the mitigation measures listed in Table S-2 would result in less than significant impacts.

**Responses to Comment Letter G-9  
Eddie and Lynn Stafford**

See next page.

---

**Subject:** FW: Comments NW SR-138 DEIR  
**Attachments:** NW SR-138 Expansion DEIR Comments.wpd; 1) Looking NE from west end Q L - note reed beds along shore.jpg; 2) Many water birds migrate through or winter at Q L, including these cinnamon and blue-winged teal.jpg; 3) More than 500 long-distance migrating red-breasted merganser fished for several weeks during 2015-16 winter.JPG; 4) The declining tri-colored blackbird nests at Q L.jpg; 5) This and other Q L reed beds supported 1000 - 2000 nesting tri-colors in 2015 and 2016.jpg; 6) The dense colonies of tri-colors forage in surrounding fields.jpg; 7) tri-colors forage in Tejon ranch north of Q L .jpg; 8) Red lines indicate known tri-color colonies at Q L. They also nest on the south shore.jpg

-----Original Message-----

From: Eddie & Lynn Stafford [mailto:stafford@frazmtn.com]  
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2016 9:02 PM  
To: NW138 <NW138@metro.net>  
Cc: Mary Ngo <mary.ngo@dot.ca.gov>  
Subject: Comments NW SR-138 DEIR

To whom it may concern:

Attached are my comments plus eight photographs.

In case you are unable to download Word Perfect, I am also sending the text as an email below.

Public Comment Letter  
From: Lynn S. Stafford  
P.O. Box 6160  
Stafford@frazmtn.com  
Pine Mountain Club, 93222  
California

Concerning: NW SR-138 DEIR

To whom it may concern:

I am a retired environmental biologist. I worked with Aspen Environmental Group for 18 years. I have studied California's ecosystems as a student, teacher and a consultant for 60 years. I have lived in the vicinity of the proposed highway expansion project (in Pine Mountain Club) for 19 years.

From 2013 until the present, I have cooperated with two serious amateur photographers in documenting the wildlife habitat values of Quail Lake, at the western end of the proposed Highway 138 expansion project. During this time, these photographers have documented the presence of more than 120 species of birds and many other forms of wildlife on and immediately adjacent to Quail Lake. I have confirmed the identification of the species recorded.

My comments on the NW-SR-138 Project are as follows:

1) Quail Lake:

Quail Lake was originally a natural ephemeral pond created by cataclysmic action on the San Andreas Fault. It was one of a string of sag ponds along the fault in the region. By 1972, the California Department of Water Resources had constructed and filled a larger reservoir out of the pond(s). This reservoir has dual functions of conducting the West Branch California Aqueduct over the San Andreas Fault and providing a regulatory storage body for the water system. The inflow from the Aqueduct enters the Lake at its eastern end and exits at the western end to pass south to Pyramid. Quail Lake in its present state is approximately 1.2 miles long and 0.6 miles wide with 3 miles of shoreline. It lies at 3330 feet elevation. Since the conversion of the natural pond into Quail Lake by 1972, the Lake has developed several wetland wildlife habitats to compliment the surrounding natural and rural uplands. The lake consists primarily of open water with surrounding shoreline. A few small islands and rocks are present. There are areas of steep, relatively bare banks separated by patches of emergent vegetation, mostly bulrushes (here referred to as reeds). Above the shoreline in several locations are stands of riparian brush and trees.

There are a large number of animals that use Quail Lake. There are more than two hundred bird species that utilize the Lake and its surrounding upland habitats – in migration, during breeding season, in winter and as permanent residents. Some species have special conservation protection status. An example is the tri-colored blackbird, *Agelaius tricolor*. It has been on and off the protected species status in California for years and is under consideration by the State and federal governments at present. Three to four colonies bred in the reed beds at the Lake's edge in 2015 and 2016. Two of the breeding colonies are on the northern edge of the Lake immediately adjacent to the proposed Tejon Ranch Corp's Centennial City Project; one or more colonies are situated on the southern edge of the Lake, immediately adjacent to the current Highway 138. The birds were observed to forage by flying well into the Tejon Ranch fields north of the Lake at least one half mile. Foraging tri-colored blackbirds also fly south of the Lake over Highway 138 to feed in fields and hills in that area. Tri-colored blackbirds need enormous supplies of food adjacent to their colonies because of their dense colonial nature and synchronous ovulation. The proposed Centennial City development section north of Quail Lake will definitely destroy these colonies. The proposed widening of Highway 138 to six lanes in this section also will restrict the foraging abilities of the tri-colored blackbirds. One of the alternatives to protect the Kinsey Mansion calls to Highway 138 to be routed to the north of Quail Lake. That alternative route will destroy the northern colonies by interfering with group foraging.

G-9.1

The DEIR has not addressed the effects of the proposed NW SR-138 expansion on wildlife using Quail Lake and its surrounding habitat. The tri-colored is only one of many species bound to be negatively affected. I request that the EIR thoroughly investigate the habitat values of Quail Lake and its surrounding habitat, in relation to the NW SR-138 Expansion Project, especially in regards to the nesting colonies of tri-colored blackbird.

Photographs taken recently of Quail Lake, its migrating waterfowl, its reed beds and tri-colored blackbirds during nesting at the Lake have been attached to these comments. Photo #2 was taken by Randy Cushman, Lancaster; photo #8 is a Google Earth image prepared by Lynn Stafford. All other photos were taken by Bill Buchroeder, Pine Mountain Club.

2) Wildlife/plant corridor:

The six-lane section of the proposed NW SR-138 Expansion lies right across the interconnections between five major biomes (large naturally occurring communities of flora and fauna occupying a major habitat). These include the Mojave Desert, the Transverse Mountain Ranges (including the San Gabriel Mountains, Sespe and other Ventura County mountains and Santa Barbara mountains), the southern end of the Coast Mountain Ranges, the Central Valley and the Sierra Nevada. In addition, there are elements close to the project site of the more southern Peninsular Ranges. There is no other location that has the juxtaposition of as many of the ten Landform and Natural Regions of California (from *A Natural History of California* by Allan A. Schoenherr, University of California Press, 1992).

## Responses to Comment Letter G-9 Edie and Lynn Stafford

### Response to Comment G-9.1

All riparian areas within Quail Lake are outside of the proposed construction zone. These areas will be designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) and no work will be conducted within the areas to avoid potential impacts to potential LBVI and SWWF habitat. The areas will be fenced off clearly by the use of obvious, orange ESA exclusion fencing along the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) chain-link fence prior to the onset of ground disturbance. An approved avian biologist will oversee the placement and design of this fencing. Temporary impacts to tricolored blackbirds nesting in Quail Lake will be mitigated by working with the LA County Fire Department to provide annual burns to Holiday Lake to refresh the habitat and by working with the West Valley Water District and Antelope Valley Audubon Society to provide water to sustain suitable nesting habitat in Holiday Lake during construction adjacent to Quail Lake and along SR-138 through Neenach. Efforts are underway to acquire agricultural conservation easements through the Transition Habitat Conservancy to preserve tricolored blackbird foraging habitat.

This proposed project directly, and permanently, will increase the disconnect of the flow of species of plants, animals and other life forms between these biomes. The DEIR states that north/south movement of many animals in the project area have already been disrupted by the Aqueduct, so movement is no longer an issue. This is false. Aqueducts and highways can and are being bridged by both overhead and underneath animal corridors throughout North America. A six-lane highway will be much more of a barrier to wildlife movement than a four-lane. The EIR must address the multifaceted disruption of the flow of organisms and genomes between all the biomes represented within and adjacent to the project.

G-9.2

3) Demonstrated need for a six-lane highway at the western end of the highway expansion:  
The proposal to expand Highway 138 to six lanes at the western end of the expansion project is obviously a concession to the proposed Tejon Centennial City project. That is an ill-advised project that will create urban sprawl in the middle of a low-population area. No reliable water source that does not disrupt current usage has been identified. Besides the water issue, the project will have major deleterious effects on public infrastructure needs, existing rural populations and on the natural environment. It is not advisable to use public funds to build a six-lane highway for a project that may not, and should not, be built out.

G-9.3

## Responses to Comment Letter G-9 Edie and Lynn Stafford

### Response to Comment G-9.2

There are approximately 72 existing cross culverts within the project limits. Approximately 47 existing cross culverts will be maintained or expanded. Approximately 25 cross culverts will be abandoned and an additional 93 cross culverts will be constructed to maintain hydrologic integrity and support wildlife movement during the operational phase of the Preferred Alternative. The operational phase of the expanded highway will have culverts ranging in size from 24 inches to 10 ft. by 10 ft. and vary between reinforced concrete pipes, reinforced concrete boxes, and corrugated metal pipes.

### Response to Comment G-9.3

The Centennial project is located in the Western Economic Opportunity Area as defined in the adopted Antelope Valley Area Plan. The SCAG model includes the approved land use of Los Angeles County and was utilized in developing travel demand forecasts for the project. Safety and operational improvements consistent with the elements identified in the TSM Alternative, which has been rejected for further consideration, could be elements included in the early implementation phase of a Build alternative. The types of improvements that will make up the interim safety improvements include intersection improvements, including turning lanes and acceleration/deceleration lanes; alignment corrections to the vertical and horizontal alignments to provide improved geometry, including the curve correction at County Road N, the Old Ridge route; and shoulder widening in areas to provide additional width for errant vehicles. The interim safety improvements address the short term needs in the corridor, but fail to meet the purpose and need in the long term for the corridor. TSM elements will be the priority for the near term improvements in the corridor. They are consistent with the implementation and improvements needed in the corridor now and will be incorporated as a priority into the selected alternative implementation plan.







G-10

**Subject:** FW: Divert the highway 138 AROUND Antelope Acres

**From:** Jannelle Lloyd [mailto:jannelle.lloyd@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 18, 2016 10:59 PM  
**To:** NW138 <NW138@metro.net>  
**Subject:** Divert the highway 138 AROUND Antelope Acres

To whom it may concern,

I am writing regarding the northwest 138 corridor that connects the 5 to the 14. I would like to express my concern as I live on the 138 (Avenue D) and have personally witnessed SEVERAL car accidents which range in severity, from minor accidents which NEVER GOT REPORTED to CHP all the way to devastating multiple fatality accidents. I have observed over the years that the traffic on Avenue D is a mix of two kinds, a little less than half of the use is from the people within the community of Antelope Acres and the other a little more than half of the traffic is coming from the 5 freeway and the majority of that traffic is big rig trucks. Many of my friends, family members and I live north of Avenue D, there SEVERAL people and families who are part of the Antelope Acres community who live north of Avenue D. We ALL have to cross this dangerous, proven to be deadly, two lane highway to take our kids to and from school every day, go to the local markets, community center, church, feed store, restaurants etc. The 138 cuts directly through the Antelope Acres community as it currently stands and many of our community members are creating cross traffic on the highway which is dangerous for EVERYONE. I believe that diverting the 138 AROUND the community of Antelope Acres would significantly decrease the amount of cross traffic on the highway thus making it SAFER for our community, for the commuters and help to prevent future car accidents and decrease the risk of fatality accidents on the 138. **G-10.1**

Another concern I have is we chose to move to Antelope Acres because it was a quiet, safe small community still close enough to "town". Since the recent rivets in the asphalt were put in the noise from people driving on them is AWFUL. Many people pass around slower traffic at high speeds ALL day and ALL night and now are causing a lot of noise every time someone passes on the right, I have heard the rivets at least 6 x since I have been writing this email. For several years we have been able to relax out in our front or backyard and the traffic was at most a light hum, which is one of the reasons we chose to move out here, it was quiet, tranquil and calm. The rivets in the road are very loud and startling from the outside, easily audible and distracting from inside my home as well. The rivets take away from the peaceful feeling of our neighborhood. We ALL would like the peaceful quiet restored and diverting the Highway 138 AROUND Antelope Acres would replace the peacefulness of our community

Another concern is the document released titled Table 28: Details of Displaced Residences Under Build Alternatives. Under the column titled Total Estimated Value it states that my home is valued at \$258,000 however my current property taxes state my home is significantly higher than that and the surrounding "comps" in the neighborhood suggest this "value" listed in this table assigned to my home is at least \$200,000 short. This is a big difference. I have a couple concerns on this table alone. How were these "values" assigned? What were these "values" used for? What significance does the Table 28 Total Estimated Values column have to the project? Are Metro and Cal Trans aware that these listed values DEVALUE our homes and that this list is inaccurate? Is this the amount that CalTrans is estimating it would take to displace our family? **G-10.2**

## Responses to Comment Letter G-10 Janelle Ybarra-Lloyd

### Response to Comment G-10.1

The option to construct a loop road around the northern side of Antelope Acres was done as a reasonable alternative to going straight through the current alignment and was identified as an option to reduce impacts on the existing homes along the existing SR-138 within Antelope Acres. Although there are benefits of removing the traffic from along the existing SR-138 through Antelope Acres, there are additional impacts of constructing a new roadway along a new alignment to the north of the existing highway. The road is longer and circuitous to traveling straight through the community. Additionally, opening up a new corridor along vacant land includes additional biological impacts to sensitive biological resources. The loop road option is only a design option to Alternative 1. Although the loop road alternative was developed to reduce impacts along the existing highway, there are also impacts on properties along the new alignment north of Antelope Acres, as the alignment will be placed directly adjacent to several parcels along the north edge of Antelope Acres, adjacent to the airstrip to the north.

### Response to Comment G-10.2

The estimated home values in Table 28 were provided by ParcelQuest, which is a database of property data from county assessors' offices. According to the ParcelQuest website, the data is updated daily from county records ([www.parcelquest.com](http://www.parcelquest.com)). Table 28 includes estimated home values that were retrieved from the ParcelQuest database on April 25, 2015, and shows the most recent estimated home values as of that date from the Los County Assessor's Office. Table 28 is intended to show the range of home values in the project area, which range from \$36,155 (the lowest home value shown in Table 28) to \$509,340 (the highest home value shown in Table 28). The data in Table 28 was retrieved from the ParcelQuest database on April 25, 2015, and reflects the most current information as of that date. However, the data may have changed since then, as the data is updated daily from county records ([www.ParcelQuest.com](http://www.ParcelQuest.com)). Caltrans is required to ensure that property owners receive fair market value as if the property is sold privately in the open market. A 2-step process is used to determine the just compensation amount to be offered to the property owner. First, an appraiser researches the real estate market and presents an appraisal of the fair market value. Second, a review appraiser evaluates that appraisal and recommends an amount for an agency official to approve as the agency's estimate of just compensation.

Also, we are considering moving due to my husband's job, the need for better special education programs for our son and to have access to public schools with higher scores than the schools we are currently assigned to. Now with all the current proposals I see the improvements could possibly increase the value of my home, keep the value the same, or displace my home. We are currently in the beginning phases of escrow. At what point will there be a final decision about if AVENUE D will be effected or not and IF it will be effected what would the time line be? IF the option that would displace our residence is chosen what would the next step be? At what point would CalTrans begin to offer to purchase our home? As I have spoke with a Metro representative and he stated that "there is NOTHING set yet, this is just in the idea phase and there are SEVERAL proposals, one of which is leave everything the way it is and there are SEVERAL concerns and comments that still need to be individually addressed and if any if the expansion of Ave. D is chosen it could be 15 years before it actually effects your house." Is this an accurate account?

**G-10.3**

I appreciate all of your time and consideration. Please get back to me ASAP as it is really difficult having such great uncertainty. God bless!

Sincerely,  
Janelle Ybarra-Lloyd  
8751 West Avenue D  
Antelope Acres, CA 93536  
(661) 810-2082 cell  
(661) 728-9509 home

## Responses to Comment Letter G-10 Janelle Ybarra-Lloyd

### Response to Comment G-10.3

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. Caltrans, as lead agency under NEPA, as assigned by FHWA, and in cooperation with Metro has identified Alternative 2 (Expressway/Highway) as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 2 (Expressway/Highway) would include a 6-lane freeway from the I-5 interchange to Gorman Post Road, a 6-lane Expressway from Gorman Post Road to 300th Street West, a 4-lane expressway from 300th Street West to 240th Street West, and a 4-lane limited access conventional highway from 240th Street West to the SR-14 interchange, generally following the existing alignment of SR-138.

Safety and operational improvements consistent with the elements identified in the TSM Alternative, which has been rejected from further consideration, would be elements included in the early implementation phase of the preferred alternative. Specific improvements will include enhanced channelization at intersections with higher rates of traffic accidents, shoulder widening, and curve corrections on the eastern side of Quail Lake near the Quail Lake Sky Park. The opening year for the initial phase/interim project is assumed to be 2020 and the opening year for the ultimate improvements is assumed to be 2025, subject to funding availability.

September 17, 2016

Mr. Ron Kosinski, Deputy District Director  
California Department of Transportation  
Division of Environmental Planning  
(NW SR-138)  
100 South Main Street, MS-16A  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski,

I would like to submit the following formal comment on the NW SR-138 Project:

- Antelope Acres and its' approximately 2800 residents will be significantly impacted by your decisions related to this project. We are counting on you to preserve our right to be genuinely involved in the decision-making process. I would like to ask that you please consider and take our input seriously, as your decisions greatly affect us. G-11.1
- Please research, consider and include additional alternatives that preserve the historic charm of the area and spare the homes of the local residents. G-11.2
- Please include an alternative that would allow for expansion of the highway as needed except through Antelope Acres, while maintaining the two-lane highway through Antelope Acres, and enhancing highway safety through decreased speed limits and the addition of turning lanes, expanded shoulders, traffic signals etc., as deemed appropriate. G-11.3
  - Highways 1 and 101 are two examples in California, which have significantly higher traffic volumes, and have expanded greatly over the years while successfully preserved the historic charm of existing towns by maintaining two-lane highway through towns, decreasing speed limits and installing necessary controls including signals etc.
- Please research and consider alternate highway locations that would not require demolishing homes, displacing residents, or dividing the community. Please consider West Avenue G as an alternative, as it is currently a 4 lane divided road, the area is expected to experience growth in the near future, and it passes the airport. If such an alternative is not included, please provide an explanation as to the reason. G-11.4

## Responses to Comment Letter G-11 Julie Schuder

### Response to Comment G-11.1

Alternative 2 has been identified as the preferred alternative. Identification of the preferred alternative occurs only after specific effects and reasonable mitigation measures have been identified for each project alternative. The identification of the preferred alternative is made after all comments are received from the circulation of the draft environmental document for public comment and from the public hearing process. These comments and the rationale for selecting the alternative are detailed in the final environmental document.

### Response to Comment G-11.2

Caltrans has considered a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to foster informed decision making and public participation. All reasonable alternatives, including the No Build Alternative have been considered and discussed to a comparable level of detail. No housing units or businesses would be displaced under the No Build Alternative.

The No-Build Alternative would not accommodate the projected population growth or expected substantial increase in goods movement truck traffic in Northern Los Angeles County. Under the No Build Alternative, SR-138 would operate at LOS E or worse conditions between Gorman Post Road and 300th Street West during AM and PM peak hours. For all other study segment locations, SR-138 would operate at LOS D or better under the No Build Alternative. The No-Build Alternative could result in indirect impacts on air quality, mobility, safety, and the economy within Northern Los Angeles County. There would be increased maintenance costs to maintain the route without any other improvements.

### Response to Comment G-11.3

The traffic volumes used are based on the land use and traffic projections that require 4 lanes through Antelope Acres by the year 2040. The two lane highway with turn pockets and intersection controls are expected to be implemented as interim improvements along the corridor as the traffic volumes increase. These improvements assist with traffic operations and the safety. With the forecast traffic volumes in 2040, the two lane facility will no longer be able to accommodate the traffic volumes anticipated. To meet the purpose and need of the project, the ultimate facility needs to provide improved circulation and safety in the 2040 horizon. The two lane facility will not be able to address the traffic volumes expected safely.

In many of the communities along major highways, the traffic growth has exceeded the capacity of the existing two lane facilities. When the traffic volumes increase beyond the capacity of those highways, congestion occurs and accident rates typically increase.

- Please research and consider alternate highway locations in attempt to save the Little Buttes Antique Airfield Airport. Eight single-engine planes and one multi-engine are housed permanently on surrounding properties with access to the airfield.
- Please detail impacts and associated mitigation strategies to properties located adjacent the airfield that house airplanes in hangers and have taxiways to the airfield, should the bypass option be chosen.
- Please consult with the Antelope Valley Historical Society regarding the historic preservation requirements of the Little Buttes Antique Airfield.
- Greatly increased noise levels will significantly impact residents' way of life and decrease property values. Please consult with experts to confirm that noise abatement walls are a satisfactory mitigation measure to eliminate noise impacts in an unobstructed flat desert environment, where sound travels further than in urban environments.
- The expansive native desert environment surrounding Antelope Acres draws residents due to beautiful 360-degree views. A sound wall, pedestrian overcrossings, and overpasses create a significant impact, changing the environment significantly and causing a blocking of the city and mountain views as well as expansive views of the surrounding native desert.
- Safety lighting, as well as truck and car traffic lights, will create light pollution in our dark desert. Impacts related to light pollution are significant. Please detail the mitigation strategy to address light pollution.
- Please address impacts to previously rural properties that are at risk of having an expressway or large highway installed directly adjacent their property. Please include decreased property values, loss of mountain and city views and privacy, increased noise and light, and loss of rural way of life.

G-11.5

G-11.6

G-11.7

G-11.8

G-11.9

Thank you,

Julie Schuder  
530-740-3980

## Responses to Comment Letter G-11

Julie Schuder

### Response to Comment G-11.4

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 and H interchanges. 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 G 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.

### Response to Comment G-11.5

Alternative 2 has been identified as the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative would not result in impacts to the Little Buttes Antiques or adjacent properties.

### Response to Comment G-11.6

In accordance with state and federal noise guidelines and regulations, traffic noise impact study was performed for the proposed Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project to evaluate noise impacts due to the project as well as to determine feasible and reasonable abatement measures to impacted noise sensitive land uses. Full impact analysis, study methodologies and procedures, and preliminary noise abatement measures are presented in Traffic Noise Study Report (August 22, 2016).

A field noise investigation was conducted to determine existing noise levels and environment and gather information necessary for the study. Existing ambient noise levels provide a base line for comparison to predicted future noise levels and environment with the project.

Noise abatement in the form of noise barriers has been identified and recommended to impacted noise sensitive land uses. Per state and federal policies, only acoustically feasible and reasonable abatement may be recommended and implemented as part of the project. Noise barrier is determined to be acoustically feasible if it provided a minimum of 5 decibel reduction in noise which is considered readily perceivable change/reduction. Noise barrier also has to be reasonable considering costs of constructing abatement measures/noise barriers and viewpoints of impacted residences. Noise abatement/barrier will not be provided if a majority of property owners that the noise barrier is intended for oppose the construction of noise barrier.

## **Responses to Comment Letter G-11**

### **Julie Schuder**

#### **Response to Comment G-11.7**

The NW SR-138 Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) concluded that the primary viewers of visual change would be motorists, bikers and residents. The most sensitive viewer to the change would be residential users and the overall viewer response rating is moderate. The overall visual impact is characterized as moderate. Refer to section 3.1.7 (Visual/Aesthetics).

The VIA generally follows the guidance outlined in the publication Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in March 1981. The following steps were followed to assess the potential visual impacts of the proposed project:

- A. Define the project location and setting.
- B. Identify visual assessment units and key views.
- C. Analyze existing visual resources (visual character and visual quality) and resource change.
- D. Describe viewers and predict viewer response.
- E. Depict the visual appearance of project alternatives and assess their visual impacts.
- F. Propose measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate visual impacts

#### **Response to Comment G-11.8**

Project design will be done in compliance with the Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance of Los Angeles County. The Ordinance established regulations that conserve energy and resources and promote dark skies for the enjoyment and health of humans and wildlife, while permitting reasonable uses of outdoor lighting for nighttime safety and security. The regulations include limitations on allowable light trespass, fully shielding outdoor lighting, and imposes maximum heights of fixtures.

#### **Response to Comment G-11.9**

The topics indicated in the comment were addressed in the following section of the Draft EIR/EIS:

- Section 3.1 (Human Environment)
- Section 3.1.7 (Visual/Aesthetics)
- Section 3.2.7 (Noise and Vibration)

G-12

---

**Subject:** FW: Feedback - NW138 [#44]

**From:** Wufoo [<mailto:no-reply@wufoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 15, 2016 4:15 PM  
**To:** NW138  
**Subject:** Feedback - NW138 [#44]

**Name \*** Sheldon Eiss

**Email** [sheldon7733@hughes.net](mailto:sheldon7733@hughes.net)  
([you@email.com](mailto:you@email.com))

**Phone Number** (661) 724-0193

**Select a Subject** I have a suggestion

**Comment and/or Question \***

With the money that has been spent on these Pork Barrel engineering schemes that will never be built, there is enough shoulder room on the north and south side of Hwy 138 to build a third middle passing lane and light up the entire length of the north section of Hwy 138. This will eliminate accidents and allow cars and trucks to pass slower moving traffic safely but that is too simple and you would not be able to contract Democratic croonies engineering firms who donate to Democratic reelection campaigns. I spent 9 years working for FEMA and contracted and inspected more roads and highways than you'll ever see.

## Responses to Comment Letter G-12 Sheldon Eiss

Response to Comment G-12  
Thank you for your comment.

G-13

---

**Subject:** FW: EIS/EIR Comments - Proposed nw138 Corridor plans

**From:** Robert Lame [<mailto:boblynlame@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, September 15, 2016 7:51 PM

**To:** NW138

**Subject:** EIS/EIR Comments - Proposed nw138 Corridor plans

Dear Mr. Kosinski and Staff:

I attended the information meeting in Lancaster last month. You seemed to have some very extensive plans. Although these plans appear very good in the long term, this corridor needs help NOW.

I would suggest trying to mitigate now the areas on the 138 Corridor that have the most potential for disastrous accidents first, such as:

1. Make "passing lanes" every 5 miles or so, with signage that says "passing lane ahead." Drivers would be less frustrated being caught behind trucks and less likely to speed ahead unsafely. Also, these "passing lanes" could be constructed in areas where it is not necessary to move the utility lines.
2. The busiest intersections could be made much safer by implementing "left turn lanes" and "merging lanes" from the most used intersections.

It has been my experience in driving this road that the Highway 5 and the Highway 14 interchanges are not very congested and will not be so for quite a few years. Those very large projects could be put off for awhile.

The "alternate loop" to the north may not be good for the Antelope Acres people. Perhaps an "alternate loop" to the south would work better.

Those are my comments and I hope you will consider them.

Lynette A. Lame

## Responses to Comment Letter G-13 Lynette A. Lame

### Response to Comment G-13

The initial improvements proposed are to improve safety on the existing highway. It will take years to realize the level of improvements identified in the project alternatives. The improvements will be planned as the need for improvements along the corridor have been identified as traffic increases. An early prioritization to improve current locations for safety has already been established and once the Environmental Document is approved, implementation of the short-term improvements will be pursued. The priority improvements are to provide improved shoulders, alignment corrections, and intersection improvements as defined in the project alternatives.

1) Passing lanes are definitely a possibility, but would not be the highest priority for current needed improvements within the corridor. Passing lanes have strict criteria for length and require access restrictions. Subsequent phases of improvements can consider passing lanes or other options to provide improved width within portions of the corridor.

2) Intersection improvements that include turning lanes and deceleration/ acceleration from the intersection are improvements elements to allow traffic get out of the through lanes for safer turning.

The improvements at the interchanges with SR-14 and I-5 are for the full build out project and they will not be required until the SR-138 corridor develops further in the future. A loop road to the south was considered, but required cutting through streets that had parcels with homes on both sides of the alignment, making the alignment unfavorable, due to these impacts.



G-14

---

**Subject:** FW: Vote for alternative 2

-----Original Message-----

From: Sherry Yahoo Mail [mailto:sherry120101@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 6:56 PM  
To: NW138  
Subject: Vote for alternative 2

Hi, dear Officer,  
I vote for Alternative 2 existing connector for 6- lane freeway. The reason I vote it is safety! It is safe for all truck drivers, passengers, community and better traffic flow.  
Thanks  
Sherry & Eric

Sent from my iPhone

## Responses to Comment Letter G-14 Sherry and Eric

Response to Comment G-14

Your support for Alternative 2 has been noted.

G-15

---

**Subject:** FW: Improvement Project

**From:** [patti467@verizon.net](mailto:patti467@verizon.net) [mailto:[patti467@verizon.net](mailto:patti467@verizon.net)]

**Sent:** Monday, September 05, 2016 9:28 AM

**To:** NW138

**Subject:** Improvement Project

Hello,

The project sounds great for this area except for the possibility of including a traffic circle. I really hope that this will not be included because these are very confusing to navigate. In fact, I refuse to shop at the Ralph's market on Hasley Cyn. in Castaic for the sole reason that traffic circle to be absolutely frightening.

Patti

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-15

Patti

Response to Comment G-15

Your support for the Project and opposition to roundabouts are noted.

G-16

---

**From:** NW138 <NW138@metro.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 30, 2016 10:10 AM  
**To:** Hill, Natalie C@DOT (natalie.hill@dot.ca.gov)  
**Cc:** Edgar Gutierrez; Panuco, Isidro  
**Subject:** FW: Support "Alternative 2 existing connector for 6-lane Freeway"  
  
**Categories:** SR-138

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

-----Original Message-----  
From: gongvi1@yahoo.com [mailto:gongvi1@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 3:41 PM  
To: NW138  
Subject: Support "Alternative 2 existing connector for 6-lane Freeway"

Sent from my iPad

## Responses to Comment Letter G-16 Gong Vi

Response to Comment G-16  
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 is noted.

G-17

**Edgar Gutierrez**

---

**From:** York Sung <yorksung@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 27, 2016 10:43 AM  
**To:** nw138  
**Subject:** Alternative 2 connectors with 6-Lane FREEWAY

Dear Sir or madame,  
I won't be able to the public hearing today. However, as the owner of NW138, we don't like the loop to bypass the residential area. Because when all the residence bought the land they already know they are on the SR-138 and it will be expand in the future. We vote for the alternative 2 connectors with 6-lane of FREEWAY.

Thanks,  
York Sung

## Responses to Comment Letter G-17 York Sung

Response to Comment G-17

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

G-18

---

**From:** Jessica Tu <yunfangtu@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 27, 2016 11:01 AM  
**To:** NW138  
**Subject:** Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project (Northwest 138 Corridor)- Support Alternative 2

Dear Mr. Ron Kosinski,

I would like to express my viewpoints on the Draft EIR/EIS for the Northwest 138 Corridor issue, as I have carefully reviewed the Draft EIR/EIS. I strongly support the alternative 2 for the following reasons:

#1, Alternative 2 maintains nice and quiet community for residents living between 80th St W and 90th St W near W Ave C without the Antelope Acres Variation Option.

#2, Alternative 1 will create unnecessary longer route and create more greenhouse gas emissions which is NOT helping the environment in California.

#3, Alternative 2 saves more than \$100M tax dollars compared with alternative 1

#4, Alternative 2 provides safer traffic for drivers with a straight freeway/expressway/highway combination than the alternative 1 with the Antelope Acres Variation Option.

Alternative 2 proposal obviously is the better option from budget, safety and environment perspectives. Therefore, I will strongly support Alternative 2 in Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project (Northwest 138 Corridor).

Thank you very much.

Best Regards

Yunfang Tu

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-18 Yunfang Tu

### Response to Comment G-18

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

G-19

---

**From:** NW138 <NW138@metro.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 26, 2016 11:31 AM  
**To:** 'Hong Dan'; NW138  
**Subject:** RE: What is the reason for alternative 1? 100th st HWG 138 Hearing Webcast - Draft EIR/EIS public hearing August 25 and 27

---

**From:** Hong Dan [mailto:hong\_dan@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 26, 2016 12:13 AM  
**To:** NW138  
**Subject:** What is the reason for alternative 1? 100th st HWG 138 Hearing Webcast - Draft EIR/EIS public hearing August 25 and 27

Hi, Dear fellow city officials,

I am a California tax payer and business owner, I frequently travel southern California area. One project on northwest 138 corridor improvement project recently got my attention.

I have a serious concern on the patched route serve the Antelope community. I saw a picture where a new straight highway suddenly take a deep detour in an developed area (between 70th and 100th street west). This is defined as alternative 1. The alternative 1 appears to be very costly and may take longer time to build. Do we know what is the rationale behind this project and what is the direct benefit to the neighborhood? I am not sure I understand.

Another alternative (II) propose to have 6-lane conventional freeway with an exit at 100th street for those residential communities nearby. The straight highway is much more efficient, less tax dollar, less safety concern and traffic congestion. Why we cannot take alternative II as the solution?

Thanks,  
Hong Dan  
831 59501440

## Responses to Comment Letter G-19 Hong Dan

Response to Comment G-19

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

G-20

**Edgar Gutierrez**

---

**From:** Yanmei Lu <lu.yanmei@gene.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 27, 2016 1:56 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"

Yanmei Lu

## Responses to Comment Letter G-20 Yanmei Lu

Response to Comment G-20  
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 is noted.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**