G-21

Edgar Gutierrez

From: Yao Li <yli@AFOP.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2016 4:14 PM
To: NW138
Subject: We want Option 2

"Alternative 2 existing connector for 6-lane Freeway" !

Yao Li

发自我的 iPhone

1

Responses to Comment Letter G-21
Yao Li

Response to Comment G-21
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 is noted.

G-22

Edgar Gutierrez

From: JASON ZINK <zinkjason@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2016 1:36 AM
To: NW138
Cc: Christine Borzaga; Mayor Mike Antonovich; Town Council Assoc.; debbie@avbot.org; L Jason Caudle; danny.bazzell@sen.ca.gov; senator.runner@senate.ca.gov; Assemblyman Lackey; Glenna Mckie; L R Rex Parris; L R Rex Parris; L Marvin Crist; L Kenn Mann; Raj Malhi; L Angela Underwood-Jacobs; Jim Purtee; Jim Ledford; p Mike Dispenza; p Steve Hofbauer; P Fred Thompson; Roxana Martinez; Mike Mischel; AV AQMD Bret Banks; Greater AVEA
Subject: More Input on NW SR- 138 Lancaster City Limits & Zoning Map

Ron Kosinski,
Deputy District Director,
California Department of Transportation;
Division of Environmental Planning
for NW SR-138

Your Head Engineer you had me talk with at the Public Meeting at Fox Field Community Room yesterday, didn't even know that Lancaster City Limits and Zoning went out to 110th West. (????that tells me that your staff really did not scope out the area) I fell the State/County did not due it's "due diligence" on planning for this project. This area South of Ave G and East of 110th West will be developed and will have even more higher density zoning in the next General Plan Update in the future. That is where the infrastructure is also. There never will be sewer or water mains along Ave D. I know A.V., my family moved to Antelope Valley in early 1900's and has been farming, real estate, construction, and development, in the area here since the beginning of Antelope Valley. I have had a real estate license right after high school, and worked in a land office in my early teenage years as a Land researcher.

By using Ave H-8 you will divert at least 50-75% of the traffic on ***present day*** Ave D away from Antelope Acres Community. The future population will be able to use Ave H-8 Freeway to get to their homes on the Westside. It will save time, fuel, Air pollution and congestion for residents, and give them and the Far Westside of A.V., Antelope Acres, and future community Fort Tejon/Centennial a more direct faster route to Lancaster City Service, Government, and Shopping. And long haul travelers who want to by-pass LA Basin (AKA Metropolitain By-Pass Freeway). Plus a more direct quicker route to AV Hospital Emergency Room which will *save lives*.

I recommend and urge the State, County, and AV Leaders to look at my proposed route. I'm pretty 99% sure I am right. It is the States job to consider all reasonable options, and look at all information for planning this route. Since this is long term investment in California, LA County and Antelope Valley's Future. A.V. is the San Fernando all over again. LA Basin and it's Valley's are 99% built-out. LA population and Industry will have no where else to go except A.V.. We must plan it right to save taxpayers money, buy right of ways now, and protect the environment and air quality, and look at productivity and saving costs of fuel and wear and tear to citizens of our State.

I recommend placing passing lanes, turning lanes, on Ave D ASAP to prevent less accidents and deaths. It disturbs me that LA County is asking Antelope Valley Voters to extend the LA County Transportation Sales Tax

1

Responses 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 voted as 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 taxes 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.cityoflancasterca.org/home/showdocument?id=12653

D T V AVENUE IVENUE I R E V O W T S E W J AC K M A N S T R ...

www.cityoflancasterca.org

P H IH L I LI S P 95-02 SP Fox Fie ld Industr ia l Co rid or Specifi c Pla n HI R R- 2.5 MU-E R .5 R-7 ,000 HI SRR RR-2.5 R R-2 .5 R R-2.5 RR-2 .5 -2.5 R R-2.5

City Limits Map Link:
https://www.bing.com/mapspreview?&ty=18&q=Lancaster&satid=id.sid%3ae2f2296d-d830-43ce-af83-c7f26926552e&vdpid=41800&mb=34.769154~-118.325188~34.630947~-117.938416&ppois=34.6988983154297_-118.14478302002_Lancaster_~&cp=34.698898~-118.144783&v=2&sV=1

Cut and Pasted 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-8 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 rerouted from present Ave D, to go along my proposed route **Ave H-8** (between Ave H & AVE I) then **Angled** heading **North** from **110th West too 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.
-Safer then Wind and Dust Visibility Prone Area to the North that has caused many vehicle wrecks, injurers 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.
http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/VirtualDirectory/AssessorMaps/ViewMap.html?val=3033-016

Sincerely,

Jason Zink
(661) 810-9931
zinkjason@hotmail.com

G-23

From: NW138 <NW138@metro.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:42 AM
To: Hill, Natalie C@DOT (natalie.hill@dot.ca.gov)
Cc: Edgar Gutierrez; Panuco, Isidro
Subject: FW: Objection of Alternative 1

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: 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. Got to go back to track, ONLY ALTERNATIVE 2 ! Please.

Hazel Tien,
co-owner of D4(138)/w.138th St.

1

Responses to Comment Letter G-23
Hazel Tien

Response to Comment G-23
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.

G-24

Edgar Gutierrez

From: Yanmei Lu <meilulin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2016 1:57 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

1

Responses to Comment Letter G-24
Mei Lu

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

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-25

Comment Sheet

Date: 8/27/16
Name: Marty Meeden
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): Resident
Address: 48261 85th St W Antelope Acres 93536
Phone/Cell: 661 301 4129
Email: mgmeeden@verizon.net

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

1. No Round abouts!
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, 2016. The Draft EIR/EIS is available for review at *metro.net/nw138* and comments can be emailed to: *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-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.

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-26

Comment Sheet

Date: 8/27/16
Name: CW Lowery
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business):
Address: 49711 Margalo
Phone/Cell: 3103659915
Email: highland_rancho hotmail.com

My residence is on the corner of 138 & Margalo Dr.

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

My Concern is, having lived & driven in So. CA specifically SM I've seen many many times lanes & areas on the Freeways closed for purpose of trying to ~~Relieve~~ Traffic grids with actually no place to access for More lanes, I recommend that this early in the Stage a 6 lane (3-Each way) with a wide Median ~~Be~~ this will accomdate the area residents as well as increased Traffic growth for the developement expected & plan for a long time without having to interrupt again the roadway for future developement, 2040

Tony Harris - EPA
Bob Bloom - Eng.
Rich - EPA
Tony
Mark

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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. 888-586-

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.

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-27

Comment Sheet

Date: 7/27/16
Name: Marty Meeden
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): Resident
Address: 48261 85th St W Antelope Acres CA
Phone/Cell: 661 301 6129
Email: mmeeden@cta.org

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

(1) Allow Bike Paths
(2) Pedistrian crossway over at Pacific Crest Trail crossing

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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-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.

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-28

Comment Sheet

Date: Aug 27, 2016
Name: Sammie Brackenbury
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business):
Address: 497 479 Margulor Rd 93536
Phone/Cell:
Email:

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

Start the Project as soon as possible
4 lanes

questions
How many accidents have we had on 138 in the last two years?

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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-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.

G-29

Edgar Gutierrez

From: Claire <clairecausa@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2016 7:00 PM
To: NW138
Subject: NW SR-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 unserved 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

1

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.

G-30

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

Responses to Comment Letter G-30
Brenda and 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.

G-31

Edgar Gutierrez

From: NW138 <NW138@metro.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 10:24 AM
To: Hill, Natalie C@DOT (natalie.hill@dot.ca.gov)
Cc: Edgar Gutierrez; Panuco, Isidro
Subject: FW: NW138

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.

From: JASON ZINK [mailto:zinkjason@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 2:01 AM
To: NW138
Subject: NW138

Ron Kosinski,

I wrote you on the NW138 and wanted to add that by using my Ave H-8 Route and saving 10 minutes a working day that would be
52 weeks X 10 minutes X twice(2) a day = 1,040 minutes divided by 60 = 15.65 hours a year in delays. Times 10,000(? estimated) vehicles per day in total both ways. That is 156,500 hours of saved time plus, fuel savings, and reduced state air pollution.

This is my estimate but it could be more. Not sure how it is calculated.

Quote from article below:
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.

Something else to consider.

Sincerely,
Jason Zink

1

Responses 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.

(661) 810-9931
zinkjason@hotmail.com

Report: Roads in bad shape

By: Andrew Clark

Rough and congested Los Angeles-area streets and highways cost drivers an average $2,826 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 national transportation organization TRIP said 83% of the roads in the Los Angeles metropolitan area are 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 $556 billion in needed transportation improvements in the region over the next 25 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 expected to increase 15% by 2030. Vehicle miles traveled topped 354 billion in 2015.
The study also showed 14,437 people died on California roads between 2010 and 2014, with the annual toll rising from 2,715 in 2010 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 widths and intersection designs.
The report said the Fixing America's Surface Transportation, or FAST, Act was signed into law in December 2015 and provided a 15% increase in funding national highway projects and an 18% increase in national 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 editor@avpress.com or mail it to Letters to Editor, PO Box 4050, Palmdale, CA 93590-4050.
aclark@avpress.com

Recent Columns >

Deputies follow trail of blood
Increase in gas tax, vehicle fee?
Rosamond substation to stay open with...
Homeless avid users of free web kiosks

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 Assemblyman Jim Frazier, D-Oakley, and Sen. 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 upping 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 $900 million by raising the diesel fuel excise tax by 30 cents a gallon.
Frazier and Beall's plan also calls for $216 million extra from a diesel sales tax, $300 million from unallocated "cap-and-trade" fees on "greenhouse" gas emissions and $16 million from a zero emission vehicle registration fee of $165 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 78 cents per gallon including state and federal fees should the Democrats' 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 $500 million annually and eliminating 25% of vacant state positions would make another $685 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 shovel-ready 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.

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@avpress.com or mail it to Letters to Editor, PO Box 4050, Palmdale, CA 93590-4050.
aclark@avpress.com

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-32

Comment Sheet

Date: 8-25-16

Name: EDWARD HOUTE

Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): RESIDENT

Address: 8266 W AVE I7-8

Phone/Cell: 661 728-0059

Email:

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

I'M AGAINST THE ANTELOPE ACRES VARIATION.

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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-32
Edward Houte

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

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-33

Comment Sheet

Date: 8-25-2016
Name: Gail Kell
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): Resident
Address: 8625 W. Ave C-4
Phone/Cell: 661 675-5704
Email: gailkell@yahoo.com

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

I have been looking at your charts and their projectives. I am very disappointed. Even though the projective isn't until 2035, the options that are being given, may not suit the problem. You are projecting heavy traffic. Having a Round-a-bout on 90th & D (138) will slow down traffic but doesn't seem feasible. People that live North of 138 drive their children South to school. Another option is to cut through the small rural town of Antelope Acres. Families live on 2½ acre parcels. Noise, air quality, safety of homeowners are now a problem. Not to mention animals, horse riding, cows, 4-H animals. All Antelope Acres have ~~been~~ had families move here just for the simple life. I have raised my family here for 30 yrs. I feel so bad that this is happening. There has to be a better idea.

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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-33
Gail Kell

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

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-34

Comment Sheet

Date: Aug 25, 2016
Name: Debi Seitz
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): Greater Antelope Valley Assoc of Realtors
Address: 1727 W Ave K
Phone/Cell: 661 609-1222
Email: debiseitz@yahoo.com

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

1. Please consider Acquiring land closer to Apollo Park and the industrial areas. This makes more common sense for the use of a freeway And to preserve our Rural Home Values.

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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-34
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.

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-35

Comment Sheet

Date: 4/6 25, 2016

Name: ~~RESIDENT~~ ELINORE PATTERSON

Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): RESIDENT / PROPERTY OWNER.

Address: 8051 W. AVE. B10, LANCASTER, CA 93536

Phone/Cell: 661-942-0154

Email:

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

KEEP THE HIGHWAY IN ITS PRESENT ALIGNMENT,
AND NOT TO CONSIDER THE ANTELOPE ACRES
VARIATION.

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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-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.

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-36

Comment Sheet

Date: 08-25-2016
Name: MICHAEL J. GRIMES
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): PROPERTY OWNER - RESIDENT
Address: 50235 82ND ST WEST, LANCASTER, CA 93536
Phone/Cell: 661-948-1087
Email: MIKEJG@ANTELECOM.NET

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

IN ORDER TO PROPERLY CHOSE THE FINAL ROUTE ONE HAS TO REALIZE THAT THE PEOPLE THAT BOUGHT OR BUILT ON AVE. D WANTED TO LIVE ON THE HIGHWAY, THOSE PEOPLE THAT CHOSE TO BUY OR BUILD OFF OF THE HIGHWAY (IN THE COUNTY) DID SO TO ENJOY THE PEACE & QUIET AWAY FROM THE HIGHWAY, THE ONLY SENSIBLE COURSE OF ACTION IS TO KEEP THE HIGHWAY ON IT'S PRESENT ALIGNMENT AND NOT TO CONSIDER THE ANTELOPE ACRES VARIATION OPTION, ALTERNATIVE II IS THE PREFERRED OPTION WITHOUT THE ANTELOPE ACRES VARIATION.

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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-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.

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-37

Comment Sheet

Date: 8/25/16
Name: Judith Fuentes
Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): Antelope Acres Resident
Address: 47458 92nd St. W. Antelope Acres, CA 93536
Phone/Cell: 661-723-1882
Email: None

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

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. Thisisprobably because speed limits and passing laws are ~~very~~ ignored and law enforcement is lax on 138.

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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.

No thanks!!

Responses 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.

Metro

Caltrans

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

G-38

Comment Sheet

Date: 8-25-2016

Name: ROBERT A LAME

Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): AREA RESIDENT

Address: PO BOX 6742, PINE MOUNTAIN CLUB, CA 93222-6742

Phone/Cell: 661-242-1455

Email: bobfyalume@gmail.com

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

ANOTHER IDEA: MAKE EXISTING HWY 138 ONE WAY. IF 55 IS GOOD FOR TWO WAY TRAFFIC NOW, ONE WAY 2-LANE TRAFFIC SHOULD BE OK @ 65 MPH, SINCE MOST DRIVE THAT TODAY - RESULT: INSTANT DOUBLING OF CAPACITY. IMPROVE AVE A OR B FOR TWO LANE ONE WAY TRAFFIC IN OPPOSITE DIRECTION. TIE INTO NEW 4 LANE EXPRESSWAY VIC NRENACH. LIMITED R/W ACQUISITION, COST A LOT LESS THAN $2.0 MIL & COULD BE CONSTRUCTED RELATIVELY RAPIDLY. DOUBLED CAPACITY SHOULD BE GOOD FOR NEXT 20-40 YEARS. ADD ACCEL/DECEL LANES, ADEQUATE ~~SIGNAGE~~ SIGNAGE, ETC. CROSS N/S TRAFFIC AT GRADE. USE FLASHING RED STOP SIGNS AND CAUTION SIGNS.

CONTINUE PLANNING FOR FULL LIMITED ACCESS FREEWAY IN FUTURE. I ATTENDED PUBLIC HEARING @ FOX FIELD ON 8-25-16. GOOD JOB IN EXPLAINING PROPOSALS TO PUBLIC.

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* and comments can be emailed to: *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-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.

G-39

From: NW138 <NW138@metro.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:42 AM
To: Hill, Natalie C@DOT (natalie.hill@dot.ca.gov)
Cc: Edgar Gutierrez; Panuco, Isidro
Subject: FW: NW SR-138 Hwy 138 West Realignment - Public Input

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.

From: JASON ZINK [mailto:zinkjason@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 4:31 AM
To: NW138
Cc: Christine Borzaga; Mayor Mike Antonovich; Town Council Assoc.; debbie@avbot.org; L Jason Caudle; danny.bazzell@sen.ca.gov; senator.runner@senate.ca.gov; Assemblyman Lackey; Glenna Mckie
Subject: NW SR-138 Hwy 138 West Realignment - Public Input

Ron Kosinski, Deputy District Director
California Department of Transportation
Division of Environmental Planning
NW SR-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-8 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 rerouted from present Ave D, to go along my proposed route **Ave H-8** (between Ave H & AVE I) then **Angled** heading **North** from **110th West too 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.
-Gives closer access to State Prison 60th West, Fox Field Airport 50th West, New Planned Westside High School 70th West & I.

1

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.

G-40

From: NW138 <NW138@metro.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:42 AM
To: Hill, Natalie C@DOT (natalie.hill@dot.ca.gov)
Cc: Edgar Gutierrez; Panuco, Isidro
Subject: FW: Objection of Alternative 1

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: 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. Got to go back to track, ONLY ALTERNATIVE 2 ! Please.

Hazel Tien,
co-owner of D4(138)/w.138th St.

1

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.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK