G-41

**Edgar Gutierrez**

**From:** NW138 <NW138@metro.net>
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2016 5:06 PM
**To:** Hill, Natalie C@DOT (natalie.hill@dot.ca.gov)
**Cc:** Edgar Gutierrez; Panuco, Isidro
**Subject:** FW: Feedback - NW138 [#42]

**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:** Wufoo [mailto:no-reply@wufoo.com]
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2016 3:41 PM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Feedback - NW138 [#42]

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name** * | Chenwei Lai |
| **Email (you@email.com)** * | chen_wei_lai@yahoo.com |
| **Select a Subject** * | Comment and/or Question |
| **Comment and/or Question** * | I support and vote for Alternative 2. It makes more sense to build straight express and conventional highway for commute and future business development with less project costs – $725 million. I'm a land owner at 30th W & W Ave D area.<br><br>Best Regards,<br>Chenwei Lai |



## Responses to Comment Letter G-41
### Chenwei Lai

Response to Comment G-41
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 is noted.

G-42

**From:** NW138 <NW138@metro.net>
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2016 12:44 PM
**To:** Edgar Gutierrez
**Subject:** FW: Name Correction

**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:** Randy Givens [mailto:randroid2010@gmail.com]
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2016 8:25 AM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Name Correction

Good morning,

Please update/add my name to your mailing list:

Randy Givens
15507 S. Normandie Ave. STE 452
Gardena, CA 90247

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Randy Givens



## Responses to Comment Letter G-42
### Randy Givens

Response to Comment G-42
Your name and address have been added to our mailing list as requested.

G-43

**From:** NW138 <NW138@metro.net>
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2016 2:47 PM
**To:** Hill, Natalie C@DOT (natalie.hill@dot.ca.gov)
**Cc:** Panuco, Isidro; Edgar Gutierrez
**Subject:** FW: 100TH ST HWY 138 HEARING : VOTE FOR - Alternative 2 make NW138 straight

**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:** Elvina Chee [mailto:elvinachee@yahoo.com]
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2016 12:36 PM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** 100TH ST HWY 138 HEARING : VOTE FOR - Alternative 2 make NW138 straight

Hi,
I would prefer Alternative 2 as it make more sense for the city (both logistic and money wise).
Thanks and regards,
Muming Chee

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-43
### Muming Chee

Response to Comment G-43
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 is noted.

**G-44**

**From:** Peter Hsu <peter_hsu@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Saturday, August 20, 2016 7:28 PM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Vote for Alternative 2.

Against Alternative 1.
Vote for Alternative 2.
Reason: Alternative 2 : cost less tax dollars, safer for all the truck drivers, community and better traffic flow. The 6-lane conventional freeway or expressway straight all the way to FRW 5 , makes more sense.

Thanks for your consideration of my opinion !
Owner of 100th street area land owner
Kuoyuan Hsu

Sent from my iPad

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-44
**Kuoyuan Hsu**

Response to Comment G-44
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.

**G-45**

**From:** Yao Li <yli@AFOP.com>
**Sent:** Sunday, August 21, 2016 5:59 AM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Concerns for 100TH ST HWY 138 Planning

Hi

I am a concerned citizen for this upcoming hearing. One of the options looks like a shortsighted solution with a patched route to serve the community of Antelope Acres. What happens if there are more developments added around the area ? Are we going to build more loops like this ? So in the eyes of future residents, I hope we do not leave a big regret only due to some short-term cost concerns. It will make better sense to have a straight highway with proper ramps at the 138/14 junction and improve those W Aves. So we favor Option 2.

Thanking for allowing us to voice out such concerns

Yao Li

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-45
**Yao Li**

Response to Comment G-45
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 - Antelope Acres Loop option is noted.

G-46

**From:** Chung-Hsiao Wu <wuchunghsiao@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Sunday, August 21, 2016 8:46 PM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project (Northwest 138 Corridor)

Dear Mr. Ron Kosinski,

It has been brought to my attention that the Draft EIR/EIS for the Northwest 138 Corridor is now available for public review and comment through September 19, 2016. I have reviewed the Draft EIR/EIS, and would like to provide my comments particularly for supporting alternative 2 indicated in the report for the following reasons:

1. Alternative 2 will SAVE more than 100 million tax dollars compared against alternative 1

2. Alternative 2 provides SAFER traffic for truck drivers with a straight freeway/expressway/highway combination than the alternative 1 with the Antelope Acres Variation Option.

3. 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.

4. Alternative 2 results LESS greenhouse gas emissions than alternative 1

I strongly vote for alternative 2 proposed in Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project .

Best Regards,

Chung-Hsiao Wu

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-46
### Chung-Hsiao Wu

Response to Comment G-46
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 is noted.

G-47

**Edgar Gutierrez**

**From:** brockfergusson@gmail.com
**Sent:** Saturday, August 20, 2016 7:33 AM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Highway patrol

( CHP)
No matter how many traffic complaints I turn it because of the way the Solar Panel IDIOTS drive the 138 I can't get an officer out here during the week!
They came out on a Sunday a lot of good that did ?? Are you going to do something about that?
Did your study show that there will be a substantial increase in speed?

Sent from my iPhone

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-47
### Brock Fergusson

Response to Comment G-47
The improved highway will limit the access locations along SR-138 and will improve the intersections that connect the north-south roadways to SR-138. Access for the solar farms along the corridor will be combined into the local roadway intersections and help to control the access locations available to enter and exit the highway. The existing issue about current operations is related to enforcement and will be brought to the CHPs attention.

**G-48**

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com> |
| **Sent:** | Saturday, August 20, 2016 2:20 PM |
| **To:** | NW138 |
| **Subject:** | Feedback - NW138 [#39] |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name** * | Bernard Niesen |
| **Email (you@email.com)** * | bernard.niesen.888@my.csun.edu |
| **Phone Number** | (818) 571-3297 |
| **Select a Subject** * | I have a suggestion |
| **Comment and/or Question** * | I feel that 138 should be designated as a freeway. The most popular surface streets should have excess to this new freeway. It would be easier to construct now before population affects this project. |

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-48
### Bernard Niesen

Response to Comment G-48

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. 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.

G-49

**Edgar Gutierrez**

**From:** NW138 <NW138@metro.net>
**Sent:** Friday, August 19, 2016 9:26 AM
**To:** Hill, Natalie C@DOT (natalie.hill@dot.ca.gov)
**Cc:** Edgar Gutierrez; Panuco, Isidro
**Subject:** FW: Concerns of Alternative 1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow Up
**Due By:** Friday, August 19, 2016 5:35 PM
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**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:** Chen [mailto:chen94539@yahoo.com]
**Sent:** Friday, August 19, 2016 2:36 AM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Concerns of Alternative 1

To Whom it may concern:

We feel strongly that **Alternative 2 for the 6-lane conventional freeway or expressway makes sense for cost and future safety reasons as well as for a better traffic flow. We hope it can be modified with other possible modifications to make it quieter for neighborhood.**

Thanks

Hong-Bing Chen

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-49
### Hong-Bing Chen

Response to Comment G-49
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 is noted.

**G-50**

**Subject:** NW138 : ALTERNAIVE 2 MAKE NW138 STRAIGHT ALL THE WAY

**From:** Jennifer Li [mailto:jenniferhli@sbcglobal.net]
**Sent:** Thursday, August 18, 2016 9:47 PM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** NW138 : ALTERNAIVE 2 MAKE NW138 STRAIGHT ALL THE WAY

Mr. Kosinski,

I think it makes more sense to make it straight from SR-14 all the way to SR-5.
Reasons:

1. Save more tax dollars to avoid the loop
2. The loop will cause only more accidents and not safe for all the drivers, passengers and whole community too.

I also vote the 6-lane convention freeway with an exit at 100th street

Thanks,

Jennifer Li

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-50
**Jennifer Li**

Response to Comment G-50
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 – Antelope Acres Loop option is noted.

'G-51

**Subject:** FW: Feedback - NW138 [#38]

**From:** Wufoo [mailto:no-reply@wufoo.com]
**Sent:** Thursday, August 18, 2016 8:03 AM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Feedback - NW138 [#38]

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name** * | Cynthia Thompson |
| **Email (you@email.com)** * | cyndie_09@verizon.net |
| **Phone Number** | (661) 728-0843 |
| **Select a Subject** * | I have a suggestion |
| **Comment and/or Question** * | My husband and I are happy for this project as the safety it will provide is much needed, but ask that you use the Antelope Acres Variation Option to keep trucks away from Antelope Acres main street (Avenue D) as much as possible. OR build a bridge from 70th Street West to somewhere past 90th Street West as has been done in other areas of the Antelope Valley (Avenue H and Avenue L). Thank you! |

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-51
### Cynthia Thompson

Response to Comment G-51
Your comment in support of the overall Project and the Antelope Acres Loop option is noted.

G-52

**Edgar Gutierrez**

**Subject:** FW: Feedback - NW138 [#37]

**From:** Wufoo [mailto:no-reply@wufoo.com]
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 17, 2016 9:28 AM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Feedback - NW138 [#37]

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name** * | Terry Kelling |
| **Email (you@email.com)** * | ctkel@hotmail.com |
| **Phone Number** | (661) 219-1715 |
| **Select a Subject** * | Add me to the mailing list |
| **Address** | 3836 Park Dr 811<br>Frazier Park, ca 93225-0811<br>United States |
| **Comment and/or Question** * | I would like a cd of this deir project. nw138 corridor improvement project.<br>Thank you |

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-52
### Terry Kelling

Response to Comment G-52
A digital copy of the DEIR was mailed as requested.

G-53

**Subject:** FW: 138

**From:** Dean Canfield [mailto:dnacanfield@verizon.net]
**Sent:** Sunday, August 07, 2016 4:22 PM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** 138

I am interestd to know who determines where highway improvements will be located. I think it would cost less and impede traffic less to place the improvements to hwy. 138 at or near Ave. B rather than Ave. D. I have trouble understanding the reluctance to consider Ave. B. Thank you,

Dean Canfield
dnacanfield@ieee.org

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-53
### Dean Canfield

Response to Comment G-53

Caltrans is responsible for regional highway connectivity and maintains and operates the State Highway System. With the entire project limits within Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County land use included in the recently approved Antelope Valley Area Plan, are the governing documents for this portion of North Los Angeles County. The planning efforts were comprehensive and the ultimate Antelope Valley Area Plan (AVAP) was approved. These local planning documents define and provide a blue print for planning within the current 20-year planning horizon. Land use discussions are at the local level and Caltrans is responsible for implementing and maintaining the state infrastructure identified in these plans. The SR-138 is required to be consistent with the local land use decisions and the transportation elements identified in their general plans. These improvements are consistent with the existing planning efforts. 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 AVAP 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 biological habitat.

G-54

**Subject:** FW: Subject: Our Opinion about HW 138 construction

**From:** John Wang [mailto:jchiangwang@gmail.com]
**Sent:** Saturday, August 06, 2016 5:03 PM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Subject: Our Opinion about HW 138 construction

Dear sirs/ladies,

As the one of the land owners, I strongly Agree the Second Alternates and Against the first one. That is the opiopn of our most owners. Thank you very much for the favorite decision.

John Wang and
David Wang

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-54
### John Wang and David Wang

Response to Comment G-54
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.

**G-55**

**Subject:** FW: Comment on the 138 corridor project

**From:** SanHwa Chee [mailto:schee2@hotmail.com]
**Sent:** Saturday, August 06, 2016 10:24 PM
**To:** NW138
**Cc:** SanHwa Chee
**Subject:** Comment on the 138 corridor project

Dear Sir/Madam,
After going through your documents, it appears that Alternative 2 is better than Alternative 1. The reason for this are as follows:
One of the purpose of this project is to accommodate foreseeable increases in travel and goods movement within northern Los Angeles County. However after looking at your projected average daily traffic (ADT) projection, it appears that Alternative 1 will be worst that Alternative 2 since 13 of the 15 locations surveyed resulted in higher ADT. On top of that, it cost slightly more than $100 million more for alternative 1 than alternative 2 without achieving the above mentioned purpose. In addition, based on your report, there is more emission of greenhouse gas if Alternative 1 is chosen instead of 2.

In summary, I am against Alternative 1.

Sincerely yours,
Maurice Chee

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-55
**Maurice Chee**

Response to Comment G-55
Your comment in support of Alternative 2 and opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.

G-56

**Subject:** FW: Request for technical studies

**From:** Manalili, Maria [mailto:Maria.Manalili@stantec.com]
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 10, 2016 12:42 PM
**To:** NW138
**Subject:** Request for technical studies

Hello,

I would like to request two technical documents that are referenced in the DEIR that are not available for download on the website:

1. Fehr & Peers, Northwest Corridor Traffic Analysis, August 2015
2. Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project: Transportation Analysis Report, 2015
   Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. 2015 ← (they are listed in the list of technical studies on page xvi "Transportation Analysis Report" and are referenced in Tables)

Thank you,

Maria

1

## Responses to Comment Letter G-56
**Maria Manalili**

Response to Comment G-56
Technical Studies were provided as requested.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK