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Introduction

California Department of Transportation District 8 (Caltrans) proposes to widen and realign State Route 58 (SR-58) Kramer Junction Expressway from two lanes to four lanes between the Kern/San Bernardino County line and a point 12.9 miles east on SR-58. A more detailed description is included in Appendix A.

Federal and State laws, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), require the environmental and social impacts of the project be disclosed in a report or environmental document. The joint NEPA/CEQA document is called an environmental impact statement/environmental impact report (EIS/EIR), and Caltrans is the Lead Agency responsible for preparing the EIS/EIR. Scoping and public involvement are required parts of the EIS/EIR process.

“Scoping” is the process by which lead agencies solicit input from the public and interested agencies on the nature and extent of issues and impacts to be addressed in the EIS/EIR and the methods by which they will be evaluated. Scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, methods of assessment and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth, and eliminates from detailed study those issues that are not important to the decision at hand. Scoping is also an effective way to bring together and resolve the concerns of interested federal, state, and local agencies; the proponent of the action; and other interested persons, including opponents of the project. (40 C.F.R. 1501.7, 1506.6; CEQA Guidelines 15083; Department Standard Environmental Reference [SER], Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 6)

Tools used to determine the scope of an EIS/EIR include early public and inter-agency consultation, the NEPA notice of intent (NOI) and CEQA notice of preparation (NOP) that an EIS/EIR is being prepared, and scoping meetings with agencies and the public. Of these tools, only the NOI/NOP is mandatory under CEQA/NEPA.

This Scoping Report provides a description and summary of the following scoping and public involvement actions conducted to date.

- Early public and inter-agency consultation
- NOI/NOP distribution and review
- Scoping meeting

This Scoping Report also includes a summary of all the public and agency comments received by Caltrans during the NOI/NOP review period.

2002 Public Information Meeting

On January 15, 2002, Caltrans sponsored a public information meeting for the four-lane expressway project on SR-58 at Kramer Junction. The meeting was held at the Roadhouse Restaurant in Kramer Junction, San Bernardino County, California. Invitations to the meeting were sent to property owners, interested parties, and public officials. Additionally, a notice
about the upcoming meeting was published in the Mojave Desert News on December 27, 2001 and on January 10, 2002.

The purpose of the public information meeting was to provide information to the public regarding the four-lane expressway project design. Informational display boards were located around the room and Department representatives were available to explain the displays, answer questions, and receive public input.

Upon arriving, attendees were asked to sign in to maintain an attendance record. The addresses were subsequently added to the project mailing list. Each attendee received a project fact sheet and a comment card and was invited to walk around the room and view the displays. Attendees were encouraged to fill out comment cards at the meeting or submit comments by mail by January 31, 2002.

Approximately 56 people signed the attendance sheet.

A Public Information Meeting Summary Report was issued by Caltrans and the United States Department of Transportation in 2002.

2007 Scoping Process for EIS/EIR

The scoping process for the EIS/EIR included distribution of the federal Notice of Intent (NOI) and the state Notice of Preparation (NOP) to the respective federal and state offices, distribution of the scoping notice to interested and potentially interested parties, and the 2007 Scoping Meeting. The purpose of these actions was to notify the agencies and public that Caltrans is proposing a project and an environmental document is being prepared, and to offer the opportunity to obtain input from the agencies and public on the project and environmental document.

NOI/NOP Distribution

The Notice of Intent (NOI) and Notice of Preparation (NOP) formally state that an environmental impact statement (EIS), environmental impact report (EIR), or joint EIS/EIR is being prepared. This is an important step in the environmental scoping process, which is designed to solicit input to determine the range of the issues to be addressed in an EIS/EIR. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21080.4(a), responsible and trustee agencies are asked to provide in writing the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to their statutory responsibilities, as these agencies will need to use the EIS/EIR prepared by the lead agency when considering permits or other approvals for the project.
Federal law requires that a formal NOI be published in the Federal Register, while California law requires that a NOP be filed with the State Clearinghouse. On May 10, 2007, the Notice of Intent was filed in the Federal Register, Volume 72, Number 90 (see Appendix A). The NOI contained a summary of the current status of the corridor and the signalized intersection at Kramer Junction, overall transportation needs, and identified proposed alternatives. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was filed with the State Clearinghouse on May 8, 2007 and distributed to the following state and local agencies with potential interest, expertise, and/or authority over the project.

- California Department of Fish and Game Region 6
- Native American Heritage Commission
- State Lands Commission
- California Highway Patrol
- Caltrans, District 8
- Cal EPA Transportation Projects
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- Regional Water Quality Control Board 6V

The NOI/NOP review period is 30 days from receipt of the NOI/NOP, which is estimated to be May 11 to June 11, 2007. However, comments were accepted through July 20, 2007; and there will be ongoing agency input as needed during preparation of the EIS/EIR.

**Scoping Notice Distribution**

A scoping notice, which was similar to the NOI and NOP but intended for the general public and other relevant entities, was distributed to notify people of the project, invite their comments on the project and EIS/EIR process, and invite them to a public scoping meeting being held for the project on June 21, 2007. Notices for the public scoping meeting were also placed in local newspapers. The scoping meeting notices are included in Appendix B, and the scoping meeting materials are included in Appendix C.

The scoping meeting notice was mailed approximately one month prior to the June 21, 2007, meeting to a project database of approximately 4,000 individuals. The mailing list included property occupants, owners, and absentee owners within .5 mile of the project area as obtained through a database search prepared by Spectrum Mailing Lists in April 2007 based on Assessor’s Parcel Numbers and Post Office boxes. Additionally, the mailing list included elected and appointed local officials, state representatives and senators, the congressional delegation for the area, key stakeholders, neighborhood and civic organizations, property owners, and individuals who had attended previous meetings or otherwise asked to be informed about the project. The public agencies and officials noticed are included in Appendix D.

**2007 Scoping Meeting**

Although not required by CEQA or NEPA, Caltrans sponsored a public scoping meeting on June 21, 2007 (2007 Scoping Meeting), to provide an additional forum for sharing project
information, answer questions, and accept comments. The 2007 Scoping Meeting was held from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at Roadhouse Restaurant, located at 6158 SR-58, Kramer Junction, CA.

The scoping meeting was held in an open house format without a formal presentation. There were several display boards describing the project purpose and need, background, alternatives, and more; and there were several Department staff available to answer questions and discuss the project and process. Appendix C includes the display boards (C.1), photographs taken during the meeting (C.2), and the attendance sign-in sheet (C.3).

Approximately 50 people signed the attendance sheet at the Scoping Meeting. The geographic distribution of attendees is illustrated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locale</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kramer Junction/Boron area</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster/Palmdale/Littlerock area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles/Pasadena area</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mojave/Tehachapi area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylmar area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorville area/Apple Valley/Hesperia area</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following Department staff attended the 2007 Scoping Meeting.

- Paula Beauchamp, Project Manager
- Marie Petry, Environmental
- Brian Liu, Environmental
- Tim Crowley, Graphic Designer/Photographer
- Juan Lopez Torres, Spanish Translator
- Terri Kasinga, Public Information Officer
- Patrick Hally, Project Engineer
- Eric Weiss, Biological Resources
- Gwyn Alcock, Cultural Resources
The following Jones & Stokes staff attended the 2007 Scoping Meeting.

- Kate Giberson, EIS/EIR project manager

**Agency and Public Comments Received**

The scoping period was May 11, 2007, to July 20, 2007. Comments were received from when the NOI, NOP and scoping notice were distributed in early May 2007 through July 2007. Because the scoping meeting was held on June 21, 2007, which was the last day of the review period indicated in the scoping meeting notice, comments were accepted through July 20, 2007, to provide people attending the meeting with additional time.

Table 2 presents agency comments received during the NOI/NOP review period. Table 3 presents written comments received from the public and other entities in response to the project notice and scoping meeting. Appendix E contains a matrix summarizing all comments, indicating the general comment category into which each comment falls, as well as a facsimile of each written comment received. The written comments were reviewed and grouped into major categories.

**Participating and Cooperating Agencies**

The scoping process stresses early consultation with resource agencies, other state and local agencies, tribal governments, and any federal agency whose approval or funding will be required for implementation of the proposed project (Caltrans SER, Volume 1, Chapter 36).

A **cooperating agency** is any federal agency, other than a lead agency, that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact associated with a proposed project or project alternative. Coordination with cooperating agencies is initiated by sending a letter inviting them to participate in development of the environmental document. Cooperating agencies are invited to participate in early meetings to discuss issues and alternatives and to determine the scope of issues that may be associated with the proposed project.
A **participating agency** is any federal or non-federal agency (state, tribal, regional, or local government agency) that may have an interest in the proposed project. The lead agencies collectively decide what other agencies to invite to act as participating agencies in the environmental review process. Federal agencies are required to act as participating agencies unless they declare in writing that they have no jurisdiction, expertise, or pertinent information to provide, and do not intend to comment on the proposed project. Non-governmental organizations and private entities cannot serve as participating agencies.

Caltrans will coordinate with cooperating, participating, and responsible agencies throughout the environmental process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>Comment Letter Summary</th>
<th>Commenter (Contact)</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Internal Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Design features/alternatives issues | 1. **Air Quality.** The environmental document should provide a detailed discussion of ambient air conditions, NAAQS, criteria pollutant nonattainment areas, and potential AQ impacts. FHWA and Caltrans should include analysis of potential mobile source air toxics, as well as a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan for fugitive dust and diesel particulate matter. The Draft EIS should demonstrate the project is included in a conforming transportation plan and a transportation improvement program.  
2. **Water and Wetlands Resources.** Existing conditions and environmental impacts with respect to waters should be assessed at an appropriate level of detail in the environmental document. Caltrans and FHWA should explore on-site alternatives to further avoid or minimize impacts to specific waters. The lead agencies should also assess indirect and cumulative impacts to CWA Section 404 waters, and coordinate with NEPA/404 MOU signatory agencies to address agreement points early in the EIS process.  
3. **Environmental Justice.** The environmental document should identify whether the proposed project may disproportionately and adversely affect low-income and minority populations in the surrounding area and should provide appropriate mitigation for adverse impacts.  
4. **Cumulative impacts.** The environmental document should address cumulative impacts in light of reasonably foreseeable actions, including impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife communities.  
6. **Growth inducement.** | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9  
Nova Blazej, Manager, Environmental Review Office  
415-972-3846  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105 | To be considered in design.  
To be addressed in EIR/EIS. |
| Environmental process | The project site plan does not identify features that will control stormwater on-site or prevent non-point source pollutants from degrading surface or ground waters. To reduce impacts to watersheds from urban development, the principles of low impact development (LID) should be incorporated into project design. The selected route should avoid Waters of the State and design spans for all drainage areas. The project will require a NPDES General Construction Stormwater Permit and development of a SWPPP. The environmental document needs to quantify impacts to surface Waters of the State and/or Waters of the U.S., discuss need for | California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region  
Mike Plaziak, Supervising Engineering Geologist  
760-241-7404  
14440 Civic Drive, Suite 200 Victorville, CA 92392 | 14440 Civic Drive, Suite 200 Victorville, CA 92392 | To be considered in design.  
To be addressed in EIR/EIS. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>Comment Letter Summary</th>
<th>Commenter (Contact)</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Internal Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Safety issues</td>
<td>The new development at State Route 58 and Kramer Junction Expressway may increase traffic volumes on streets and intersections, and at at-grade highway-rail crossing. Project design should consider pedestrian circulation patterns/destinations with respect to the railroad ROW. Safety factors include planning for grade separations for major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade highway-crossings due to increase in traffic volumes, and appropriate fencing to prohibit trespassing onto the railroad ROW. Caltrans should arrange a meeting with CPUC’s Rail Crossing Engineering Section and BNSF Railway to discuss relevant safety issues and, if necessary, file a GO88-B request for authority to modify at-grade crossings of SR 58.</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission Rosa Munoz, PE, Utilities Engineer, Railroad Crossings Engineering Section, Consumer Protection and Safety Division 213-576-7078</td>
<td>320 West 4th Street, Suite 500 Los Angeles, CA 90013</td>
<td>Coordination with CPUC and BNSF Railway. To be considered in design. To be addressed in EIR/EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design features/alternatives issues</td>
<td>If the project crosses public lands outside of existing ROW, it is likely BLM would be a cooperating agency. Because BLM manages public lands both north and south of the existing alignment for desert tortoise recovery, the agency encourages selection of an alternative that uses the existing ROW to the extent feasible. The lead agencies should reconstruct existing fences for desert tortoises, and, as feasible, should build culverts under the roadway for use by desert tortoises and other wildlife. Given the location of desert tortoise recovery habitat relative to the proposed alignments, FHWA will need to consult with USFWS. BLM suggests combining the consultation for both the SR 58-Hinkley and SR 58-Kramer Junction projects to save time.</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management Edythe Seehafer, Environmental Coordinator, Barstow Field Office 760-252-6021</td>
<td>2601 Barstow Road Barstow, CA 92311</td>
<td>Coordination with USFWS. To be considered in design. To be addressed in EIR/EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental process</td>
<td>The environmental document should provide the following information. 1. Current or historic uses at the project site that may have resulted in a release of hazardous wastes/substances; 2. Known or potentially contaminated sites within the</td>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control Greg Holmes, Unit Chief, Southern California Cleanup</td>
<td>5796 Corporate Avenue Cypress, CA 90630</td>
<td>To be considered in design. To be addressed in EIR/EIS. To be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Category</td>
<td>Comment Letter Summary</td>
<td>Commenter (Contact)</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Internal Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternatives issues</td>
<td>3. Mechanisms to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any contaminated site and the agency responsible for regulatory oversight of site investigation and/or cleanup;</td>
<td>Operations Branch – Cypress Office (714) 484-5477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental process</td>
<td>4. Environmental investigations, sampling, and/or remediation should be conducted under a Workplan approved and overseen by the respective regulatory agency, and findings of any investigations and related sampling results should be summarized in the document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Proper investigation, sampling, and remedial actions overseen by the respective regulatory agencies, if necessary, should be conducted prior to construction; and all closure, certification, or remediation approval reports by these agencies should be included in the environmental document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. If project is within the border zone of a contaminated property, appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. If buildings, transportation-related structures, or paved surfaces are to be demolished, investigation for hazardous chemicals should be conducted prior to demolition, and proper precautions should be taken during demolition activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Project construction may require soil excavation or filling in certain areas. If soil is contaminated, it must be properly disposed, and may be subject to Land Disposal Restrictions. Sampling should also be conducted to ensure that imported backfill, if used, is free of contamination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. If necessary, a study of the site and a healthy risk assessment overseen and approved by the appropriate government agency and a qualified health risk assessor should be conducted to determine if there are, have been, or will be, any releases of hazardous materials that may pose a risk to human health or the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Any hazardous wastes generated by the proposed operations must be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. If hazardous wastes will be generated by the project, a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Category</td>
<td>Comment Letter Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTSC permit may be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If hazardous wastes will be generated by the project, the proponent should obtain a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Identification Number.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Certain hazardous waste treatment processes may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>If project plans include discharging wastewater to a storm drain, an NPDES permit from the overseeing RWQCB may be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>If soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>If the site was used for agricultural or related activities, onsite soils and groundwater might contain pesticides, agricultural chemicals, organic waste, or other related residue. Proper investigation, and remedial actions, if necessary, should be conducted under the oversight of and approved by a government agency prior to project construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>DTSC can provide guidance for cleanup oversight through an Environmental Oversight Agreement (EOA) for government agencies, or a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) for private parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Category</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Full project support             | • Project is needed for congestion relief, goods movement, accident reductions at the Kramer Junction interchange, improved access to local services, avoiding weekend and holiday backups at Kramer Junction, preventing drivers from bypassing SR 58 using desert dirt roads and access roads that cross private property, and eliminating the long curve and RR track crossing east of Boron, which is a no passing area with a long history of accidents.  
  • RR grade separation at Boron and Kramer Junction will be a major safety improvement.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Cost of project                  | • Alt B would be the most cost-effective alternative.  
  • Concerned about funding.  
  • Concerned about Caltrans’ previous waste of money on alternatives development if a new route is adopted.                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Design features/ alternatives    | • Traffic access for locals and truck access off Hwy 395 needs to be addressed by project.  
  • The turn lane and exit where WB traffic exits SR 58 to reach Boron is poorly designed and should be redesigned.  
  • Transitions should be wide enough to ease traffic; plan for future growth.  
  • Concerned about inclusion of frontage roads to allow access to roadside businesses w/o causing traffic congestion on the highway.  
  • Need access to the open desert for people, recreation, horses, bikes, etc. Suggests an overpass at Congo Rd with dirt road beneath.  
  • Concerned about soundwalls along new route.  
  • At grade RR tracks that cross existing SR 58 at the curve east of boron should be included in this project. Old (main) entrance/exit road to Boron not spoken of in this realignment. Suggests: 1) starting Alt B east of the Boron span bridge and going north and east, joining expressway to Barstow. 2) leaving SR 58 as is for surface road and joining this roadway with the old Boron (main) road at the curve with the RR crossing to leave access to local services and leave present businesses alone.  
  • Project should preserve two existing unpaved roadways as access roads to the 4-lane expressway. There is already a hard-packed/gravel dirt roadway from the Boron bridge span east to Kramer Junction with at grade utility/equipment boxes and electric utility/telephone poles are located in short distance north of this roadway on another unpaved roadway.  
  • Concerned about effects of proposed drainage facilities on adjacent properties during heavy rainstorms  
  • Concerned about which streets will be dead-ended and which will have bridges/underpasses?  
  • Wants alternative route to Boron and possibly Kramer Junction, other than SR 58.  
  • Alt B would have the lowest cost since it would not cross RR @ US 395, would be less invasive to existing businesses and homes, would be safest for motorists, would have the least impact on the Kramer Junction interchange, would avoid encroachment on Edwards AFB, would preserve the electrical substation, and would minimize the need for detours.  
  • Alt C looks would be best if there’s room for turning off onto 395 and access to businesses is retained.  
  • Alt D would require no businesses to be purchased and therefore would be less expensive.  
  • Alt C goes over 2 natural gas pipelines and Alt D goes over 3 natural gas pipelines that are 48-inch pipes.  
  • Alt D would affect two 42-inch high pressure gas lines and be right on the ROW for Mojave Pipeline.  
  • Kern River and the Mojavo Pipeline Company jointly own two 42-inch natural gas lines south of existing SR 58. Kern River also owns a metering station near existing SR 58. Alternative D would impact Kern River’s existing easements and facilities. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Category</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alts B, C, D would all impact the Southern California Edison’s transmission facilities. If relocation is needed, impacts need to be addressed in the EIR. Replacement rights will need to be assured from Caltrans to relocate SCE facilities. Timeframes need to be considered depending on materials, cost for outage and relocation of SCE facilities will be at Caltrans expense if SCE owns in fee or has prior rights. Hope the route with least impact on SCE facilities will be chosen. Encroachment costs to be Caltrans responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggests limiting project to existing SR 58, taking the pottery property and Chevron property on the north side, and adding a lane in their place. Add two more lanes from freeway to freeway, so it will be four lanes all the way. Says this should be affordable. If there’s enough money, suggests building an overpass to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementing southern alternative(s) would kill businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Four corners businesses could possibly exist with Expressway to north of Kramer Junction. Give the businesses a fair price and buy them out of your way. This would not be good, however, for Boron or for the motoring public. They will be out of stations and restaurants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Width of roadway should be wider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental process</td>
<td>• Economic impact to existing businesses needs to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EIR needs a more specific map that shows APNs of affected properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thorough archaeological and cultural studies are needed. There should be much study prior to and during the construction phase regarding the old community of Kramer because it was a 1880s railroad siding and center of much mining activity in this part of the Mojave Desert. This is a historically rich area in artifacts and local history, and must receive special attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Don’t let the environmental issues keep this project from a timely completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and safety issues</td>
<td>• Concerned about access to existing property, increased traffic, noise, and emissions, and continued provision of services, including phone service, water delivery, and emergency services if project is implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned about road closures if project is implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned about lack of privacy and distress to domestic animals if project is implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional issues as they relate to good movement and truck traffic vs. a small desert community</td>
<td>• Concerned about preservation of businesses at Four Corners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not enough water in the Kramer Junction area to support additional growth, and Edwards AFB does not want growth in their flight zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>• Needs to happen sooner, so more lives will be saved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project was started years ago, and the state should have finished it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete freeway on Kern County side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete the SR 58 freeway to Barstow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wants I-40 coast to coast. Proposes that SR 58 from Barstow to Bakersfield be changed to I-40. Go north from Bakersfield with 99 and I-40 to 46, which would become I-40 to Paso Robles, connecting to 101. This would provide relief and available routes for truckers/public to reach the coast without going through LA. This would better serve businesses and tourists. The FHWA could put gas tax to work for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned about extent of Caltrans’ involvement with local governments on master plans for land use and commercial development in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Category</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned about property values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Caltrans should use local businesses where possible. Consider using Global Resources, LLC, the aggregate plant next to Rio Tinto. Should try and employ low income families in area as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned about compensation for land being temporarily used to store equipment, supplies, vehicles, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned about imminent domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hopes this will start talks to widen 395 both north and south directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned about effects of project on wildlife and plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned for desert tortoise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A  NEPA Notice of Intent and CEQA Notice of Preparation
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NOI Submission Letter to Office of the Federal Register

NOI (Federal Register)

NOP Submitted to the California State Clearinghouse (includes Project Location, Project Description, and Environmental Checklist)

NOP Distributed by the California State Clearinghouse to Reviewing Agencies
Dear Mr. Mosley:

SUBJECT: Notice of Intent, SR-58 Freeway/Expressway Realignment Project Near Hinkley

Enclosed are three signed, original copies and one electronic version of the Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for a proposed highway project in San Bernardino County, California.

Please place this Notice of Intent in the Federal Register. The billing code is identified on the Notice.

I certify that the enclosed CD contains a true and accurate copy of the three signed paper copies of the Notice.

If you have any questions, please contact Tay Dam, Senior Project Development Engineer at (213) 605-2013.

Sincerely,

/s/ Maiser Khaled

For
Gene K. Fong
Division Administrator

Enclosures
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Highway Administration

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT: SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public of its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed widening and realignment of State Route 58 (SR-58) Kramer Junction Expressway from two to four lanes located between the Kern/San Bernardino County line and a point 12.9 miles east on SR-58 in San Bernardino County, California. This will be a gap closure project.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tay Dam, Senior Project Development Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 888 South Figueroa, Suite 1850, Los Angeles, CA 90017. Telephone: (213) 202-3954. Marie Petry, California Department of Transportation District 8, 464 W. Fourth Street, San Bernardino, CA 92401. Telephone: (909) 383-6379.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation, will prepare an EIS for the proposed widening and realignment of SR-58 Kramer Junction Expressway in San Bernardino County, California. This 13-mile long project would take place entirely within San Bernardino County and is centered on the Kramer Junction where SR-58 intersects with US-395 west of the City of Barstow. This section of SR-58 is currently a nonstandard two-lane highway between a four-lane freeway to the west and a four-lane expressway to the east. The proposed project would close this gap. The existing two-lane segment includes an at-grade signalized intersection at SR-58/US-395 (Kramer Junction), an
overhead crossing of Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad west of that intersection, and numerous uncontrolled at-grade driveway and street access points. There is also an at-grade railroad crossing on US-395 north of the SR-58/US-395 intersection that slows traffic and contributes to accidents when traffic backs up during train crossings. SR-58 is a major east-west transportation corridor with a high percentage of truck traffic transporting goods in and out of the state. The purpose of this project is to provide for increased separation of slow moving vehicles, to separate local and regional traffic, to reduce accidents, and to eliminate the convergence of SR-58 and US-395 traffic. The project would also provide congestion relief and improve traffic operations and access to local services.

A preferred alternative has not been selected at this point. One No Build (Alternative A) and three Build Alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D) will be addressed in the EIS document. All three proposed Build Alternatives would increase capacity and be reclassified from a conventional highway to an expressway. As proposed, Alternative B would be a realignment north of the existing highway. Alternative C would be generally along the existing highway alignment, and Alternative D would be a realignment south of the existing highway.

Furthermore, construction of a new freeway-to-freeway interchange where SR-58 intersects with US-395 is proposed for Alternatives B, C, and D. This new interchange would have to span the existing at-grade railroad under Alternatives B and C, but this would not be necessary under Alternative D because the new interchange is far enough south of the railroad. In addition, Alternatives B and D would include a second grade separation (overhead) structure to span the railroad further east and west, respectively, of the proposed SR-58/US-395 interchange.

The alternatives described above will be further refined through efforts conducted under the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR parts 1500-1508, and 23 CFR part 771), the 1990
Clear Air Act Amendments, section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Executive Order 12898 regarding environmental justice, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, the section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act, and other federal environmental protection laws, regulations, policies, and executive orders. The EIS will incorporate comments from the public scoping process as well as analysis in technical studies. Other alternatives suggested during scoping process would be considered during the development of the EIS. The EIS will consider any additional reasonable alternatives identified during scoping process. Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, regional and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who previously have expressed, or are known to have, an interest in this project. Location and details of the public scoping meeting for the proposed project will be advertised in local newspapers and other media and will be hosted by the California Department of Transportation, District 8.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

ISSUED ON: May 2, 2007

/s/ Maiser Khaled
Maiser Khaled
Director, Project Development & Environment
California Division
Federal Highway Administration
• Alternative 2: Realign and Widen (South). This alternative realigns and widens SR–58 from two lanes to a four-lane expressway/freeway about one-half mile south of the existing SR–58.

• Alternative 3: Widen the Existing. This alternative follows the existing SR–58 alignment or a slightly offset alignment throughout the project limits.

• Alternative 4: Realign and Widen (North). This alternative consists of a realignment of SR–58 to a four-lane expressway/freeway just north of the existing SR–58.

The alternatives described above will be further refined through efforts conducted under the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR parts 1500–1508, and 23 CFR part 771), the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Executive Order 12898 regarding environmental justice, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, the section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act, and other federal environmental protection laws, regulations, policies, and executive orders. The EIS will incorporate comments from the public scoping process as well as analysis in technical studies. Other alternatives suggested during scoping process would be considered during the development of the EIS. The EIS will consider any additional reasonable alternatives identified during scoping process.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, regional and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who previously have expressed, or are known to have, an interest in this project. Location and details of the public scoping meeting for the proposed project will be advertised in local newspapers and other media and will be hosted by the California Department of Transportation, District 8.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)


Maiser Khaled,
Director, Project Development & Environment, California Division, Federal Highway Administration.

[FR Doc. E7–8939 Filed 5–9–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: San Bernardino County, CA

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public of its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed widening and realignment of State Route 58 (SR–58) Kramer Junction Expressway from two to four lanes located between the Kern/San Bernardino County line and a point 12.9 miles east on SR–58 in San Bernardino County, California. This will be a gap closure project.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation, will prepare an EIS for the proposed widening and realignment of SR–58 Kramer Junction Expressway in San Bernardino County, California. This 13-mile long project would take place entirely within San Bernardino County and is centered on the Kramer Junction where SR–58 intersects with US–395 west of the City of Barstow. This section of SR–58 is currently a nonstandard two-lane highway between a four-lane freeway to the west and a four-lane expressway to the east. The proposed project would close this gap. The existing two-lane segment includes an at-grade signalized intersection at SR–58/US–395 (Kramer Junction), an overhead crossing of Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad west of that intersection, and numerous uncontrolled at-grade driveway and street access points. There is also an at-grade railroad crossing on US–395 north of the SR–58/US–395 intersection that slows traffic and contributes to accidents when traffic backs up during train crossings. SR–58 is a major east-west transportation corridor with a high percentage of truck traffic transporting goods in and out of the state. The purpose of this project is to provide for increased separation of slow moving vehicles, to separate local and regional traffic, to reduce accidents, and to eliminate the convergence of SR–58 and US–395 traffic. The project would also provide congestion relief and improve traffic operations and access to local services.

A preferred alternative has not been selected at this point. One No Build (Alternative A) and three Build Alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D) will be addressed in the EIS document. All three proposed Build Alternatives would increase capacity and be reclassified from a conventional highway to an expressway. As proposed, Alternative B would be a realignment south of the existing highway. Alternative C would be generally along the existing highway alignment, and Alternative D would be a realignment north of the existing highway. Furthermore, construction of a new freeway-to-freeway interchange where SR–58 intersects with US–395 is proposed for Alternatives B, C, and D. This new interchange would have to span the existing at-grade railroad under Alternatives B and C, but this would not be necessary under Alternative D because the new interchange is far enough south of the railroad. In addition, Alternatives B and D would include a second grade separation (overhead) structure to span the railroad further east and west, respectively, of the proposed SR–58/US–395 interchange.

The alternatives described above will be further refined through efforts conducted under the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR parts 1500–1508, and 23 CFR part 771), the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Executive Order 12898 regarding environmental justice, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, the section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act, and other federal environmental protection laws, regulations, policies, and executive orders. The EIS will incorporate comments from the public scoping process as well as analysis in technical studies. Other alternatives suggested during scoping process would be considered during the development of the EIS. The EIS will consider any additional reasonable alternatives identified during scoping process. Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, regional and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who previously have expressed, or are known to have, an interest in this project. Location and details of the
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Railroad Administration

Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief From the Requirements of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 236

Pursuant to Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 235 and 49 U.S.C. 20502(a), the following railroad has petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval for the discontinuance or modification of the signal system or relief from the requirements of 49 CFR part 236 as detailed below.

[Docket Number FRA–2007–27767]

Applicant: Marquette Rail, LLC, Mr. Donald J. Davis, Roadmaster, 5550 West First Street, Ludington, Michigan 49431.

Marquette Rail, LLC seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of the interlocked signal system on the Manistee River moveable bridge, Milepost CBA 113.5, on the Manistee Subdivision near Manistee, Michigan.

The proposed changes include the permanent elimination of the two controlled signals, the replacement of the power-operated switches at the derail locations with hand throw switches, and the display of permanent red signals.

The reason given for the proposed changes is to eliminate the costly upkeep and maintenance of the equipment and place a person on the site to visually inspect the operation of all equipment each time a train crosses.

Any interested party desiring to protest the granting of an application shall set forth specifically the grounds upon which the protest is made, including a concise statement of the interest of the party in the proceeding. Additionally, one copy of the protest shall be furnished to the applicant at the address listed above.

All communications concerning this proceeding should be identified by docket number FRA–2007–27762 and may be submitted by one of the following methods:

• Web site: http://dms.dot.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic site;
• Fax: 202–493–2251;
• Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–0001;
• Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Communications received within 45 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.–5 p.m.) at the above facility. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the Internet at the docket facility’s Web site at http://dms.dot.gov.

FRA wishes to inform all potential commenters that anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our docket by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT’s complete Privacy Act Statement in the Federal Register published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78) or you may visit http://dms.dot.gov.

FRA expects to be able to determine these matters without an oral hearing. However, if a specific request for an oral hearing is accompanied by a showing that the party is unable to adequately present his or her position in a written statement, an application may be set for public hearing.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 2, 2007.

Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,
Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.

[FR Doc. E7–9030 Filed 5–9–07; 8:45 am]
NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INTERESTED PARTIES

From: California Department of Transportation, District 8
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report
Reference: California Code of Regulations, Title 14, (CEQA Guidelines) Sections 15082(a), 15103, 15375

Project Title: State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

Project Location: State Route 58 (SR-58) in San Bernardino County, California, between the Kern/San Bernardino County line and a point 12.9 miles east. The project would take place entirely within San Bernardino County and is centered on Kramer Junction, where SR-58 intersects with US-395 west of the City of Barstow (Attachment A).

Project Description: The proposed project would involve widening and realignment of SR-58 Kramer Junction Expressway from two to four lanes. This will be a gap closure project (Attachment B).

This notice is to inform you that the California Department of Transportation District 8 will be the lead agency and will prepare a joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the project identified above. Your participation as a responsible agency is requested in the preparation and review of this document.

We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR/EIS prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

The project location, project description, and potential environmental effects of the proposed action are described in Attachments A, B, and C.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please direct your response to Marie Petry (Telephone 909/383-6379) at the address shown above. Please provide us with the name for a contact person in your agency.

Date 5/7/07

Signature Marie Petry

Title Senior Environmental Planner
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Kilometer Post 0.0/20.9 (Post Mile 0.0/12.9)
EA 08-347700
ATTACHMENT B: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation District 8, proposes to widen and realign State Route 58 (SR-58) Kramer Junction Expressway from two lanes to four lanes between the Kern/San Bernardino County line and a point 12.9 miles east on SR-58.

The 13-mile long project would take place entirely within San Bernardino County and is centered on Kramer Junction, where SR-58 intersects with US-395 west of the City of Barstow. This section of SR-58 is currently a nonstandard two-lane highway between a four-lane freeway to the west and a four-lane expressway to the east. The proposed project would close this gap. The existing two-lane segment includes an at-grade signalized intersection at SR-58/US-395 (Kramer Junction), an overhead crossing of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad west of that intersection, and numerous uncontrolled at-grade driveway and street access points. There is also an at-grade railroad crossing on US-395 north of the SR-58/US-395 intersection that slows traffic and contributes to accidents when traffic backs up during train crossings. SR-58 is a major east-west transportation corridor with a high percentage of truck traffic transporting goods in and out of the state. The purpose of this project is to provide for increased separation of slow moving vehicles, to separate local and regional traffic, to reduce accidents, and to eliminate the convergence of SR-58 and US-395 traffic. The project would also provide congestion relief and improve traffic operations and access to local services.

A preferred alternative has not been selected at this point. One No Build (Alternative A) and three Build Alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D) will be evaluated. All three build alternatives would increase capacity and be reclassified from a conventional highway to an expressway. Alternative B would be a realignment north of the existing highway. Alternative C would be generally along the existing highway alignment. Alternative D would be a realignment south of the existing highway.

Furthermore, construction of a new freeway-to-freeway interchange where SR-58 intersects with US-395 is proposed for Alternatives B, C, and D. This new interchange would have to span the existing at-grade railroad under Alternatives B and C, but this would not be necessary under Alternative D because the new interchange is far enough south of the railroad. In addition, Alternatives B and D would include a second grade separation (overhead) structure to span the railroad further east and west, respectively, of the proposed SR-58/US-395 interchange.
ATTACHMENT C: ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In cases where a potentially significant impact has been identified, background studies and further evaluation will be conducted to make a more conclusive determination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significantly With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | | X | | |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | X | | |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | | X | | |
### III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Required</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Required</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Mitigation Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project: | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | ☐   | ☐   | ☐   | ☑   |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | ☐   | ☐   | ☐   | ☑   |

| XI. NOISE – Would the project result in: | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | ☐   | ☑   | ☐   | ☐   |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | ☐   | ☑   | ☐   | ☐   |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ☐   | ☑   | ☐   | ☐   |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ☐   | ☑   | ☐   | ☐   |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | ☐   | ☑   | ☐   | ☐   |
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? □ □ X □ □

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? □ □ □ X □

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? □ □ □ X □

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? □ □ □ X □

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

   Fire protection? □ □ □ X □
   Police protection? □ □ □ X □
   Schools? □ □ □ X □
   Parks? □ □ □ X □
   Other public facilities? □ □ □ X □

XIV. RECREATION –

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? □ □ □ □ X

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? □ □ □ □ X
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

| | | | |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | ☐ | ☑ | | |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | |
Notice of Preparation

May 8, 2007

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
SCH# 2007051051

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Marie Petry
California Department of Transportation, District 8
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Project Analyst, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
2007051051
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Caltrans #8

NOP  Notice of Preparation

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation District 8, proposes to widen and realign State Route 58 (SR 58) Kramer Junction Expressway from two lanes to four lanes between the Kern / San Bernardino County line and a point 12.9 miles east on SR-58. The 13-mile long project would take place entirely within San Bernardino County and is centered on Krammer, Junction, where SR-58 intersects with US-395 west of the City of Barstow. This section of SR-58 is currently a nonstandard two-lane highway between a four-lane freeway to the west and a four-lane expressway to the east. The proposed project would close the gap.

Marie Petry
California Department of Transportation, District 8
(909) 383-4808
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino
CA
92401-1400

San Bernardino
Barstow

Highways
Airports
Railways
Waterways
Schools
Land Use

Resources Agency; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Native American Heritage Commission; Department of Fish and Game, Region 6; State Lands Commission; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 8; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 6 (Victorville)

05/08/2007
05/08/2007
06/06/2007

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
### Resources Agency
-nadelle gayou
- Dept. of Boating & Waterways
  - David johnson
- california coastal commission
  - elizabeth a. fuchs
- Colorado river board
  - Gerald R. Zimmerman
- Dept. of Conservation
  - Roseanne Taylor
- California energy commission
  - Paul richins
- Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection
  - Allen Robertson
- Office of Historic Preservation
  - Wayne Donaldson
- Dept. of Parks & Recreation
  - Environmental Stewardship Section
  - Reclamation Board
  - DeeDee Jones
  - Steve McAdam
- Dept. of Water Resources
  - Resources Agency
    - Nadelle Gayou
  - Conservancy
  - Water Agency
  - Fish & Game Region 1
    - Donald Koch
  - Fish & Game Region 1E
    - Laurie Hamsberger

### County: San bernardino
- Fish & Game Region 2
  - Banky Curtis
- Fish & Game Region 3
  - Robert Floerke
- Fish & Game Region 4
  - Julie Vance
- Fish & Game Region 5
  - Don Chadwick
- Fish & Game Region 6
  - Gabrina Getchel
- Fish & Game Region 6 I/M
  - Gabrina Getchel
- Fish & Game Region 8
  - Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program
- Dept. of Fish & Game M
  - George Isaac
  - Marine Region
- Other Departments
  - Food & Agriculture
    - Steve Shaffer
    - Dept. of Food and Agriculture
  - Dept. of General Services
  - Public School Construction
  - Dept. of General Services
  - Robert Sleppy
  - Environmental Services Section
  - Dept. of Health Services
  - Veronica Malloy
  - Dept. of Health/Drinking Water

### Independent Commissions, Boards
- Delta Protection Commission
  - debby eddy
- Office of Emergency Services
  - Dennis castrillo
- Governor’s Office of Planning & Research
  - State Clearinghouse
  - Native American Heritage Comm.
    - Debbie Treadway

### Business Trans & Housing
- Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics
  - Sandy hesnard
- Caltrans - Planning
  - Terri Pencovic
- California Highway Patrol
  - Shirley Kelly
  - Office of Special Projects
- Housing & Community Development
  - Lisa Nichols
  - Housing Policy Division

### Dept. of Transportation
- Caltrans, District 1
  - rex jackman
- Caltrans, District 2
  - Marcelino Gonzales
- Caltrans, District 3
  - Jeff Pulverman
- Caltrans, District 4
  - Tim Sable
- Caltrans, District 5
  - David Murray
- Caltrans, District 6
  - Marc Birmbaum
- Caltrans, District 7
  - Cheryl J. Powell

### Cal EPA
- Air Resources Board
  - Jim Lerner
  - Transportation Projects
    - Ravi Ramalingam
  - Industrial Projects
    - Mike Tollstrup
- California Integrated Waste Management Board
  - Sue O'Leary
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Regional Programs Unit
    - Division of Financial Assistance
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit
    - Division of Water Quality
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Steven Herrera
  - Division of Water Rights
- Dept. of Toxic Substances Control
  - CEQA Tracking Center
- Department of Pesticide Regulation

### SCH#
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
  - RWQCB 1
    - Caliheen Hudson
    - North Coast Region (1)
  - RWQCB 2
    - Environmental Document Coordinator
    - San Francisco Bay Region (2)
  - RWQCB 3
    - Central Coast Region (3)
  - RWQCB 4
    - Teresa Rodgers
    - Los Angeles Region (4)
  - RWQCB 5S
    - Central Valley Region (5)
  - RWQCB 5F
    - Central Valley Region (5)
    - Fresno Branch Office
  - RWQCB 5R
    - Central Valley Region (5)
    - Redding Branch Office
  - RWQCB 6
    - Lahontan Region (6)
  - RWQCB 6V
    - Lahontan Region (6)
    - Victorville Branch Office
  - RWQCB 7
    - Colorado River Basin Region (7)
  - RWQCB 8
    - Santa Ana Region (8)
  - RWQCB 9
    - San Diego Region (9)

### Other

---

Last Updated on 01/11/07
Appendix B  Scoping Notices

Contents
Scoping Meeting Notice (English and Spanish)
Newspaper Notice (English and Spanish)
WHAT'S BEING PLANNED

The California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) proposes to construct a four-lane expressway on State Route 58 in San Bernardino County, between the Kern/San Bernardino county line and a point 12.9 miles east on SR-58. This section of SR-58 is currently a nonstandard two-lane highway between a four-lane freeway to the west and a four-lane expressway to the east. The proposed project would close this gap. The existing two-lane segment includes an at-grade signalized intersection at SR-58/US-395 (Kramer Junction), an at-grade railroad crossing on US-395 north of that intersection, and numerous uncontrolled at-grade driveway and street access points. A preferred alternative has not been selected at this point. One No Build (Alternative A) and three Build Alternatives (Alternatives B, C, D) will be evaluated in an environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS). Alternative B would be a realignment north of the existing highway. Alternative C would be generally along the existing highway alignment. Alternative D would be a realignment south of the existing highway. All three build alternatives include a new freeway-to-freeway interchange where SR-58 intersects with US-0395. Under Alternatives B and C, the new interchange would span the at-grade railroad; but this would not be required under Alternative D because it is far enough south of the at-grade railroad crossing.

WHY THIS AD?

To notify you that a SCOPING MEETING is being held and to give you the opportunity to provide input on the purpose and need for the project, the alternatives being considered, and issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS, which will evaluate the effects this project may have on the environment. The scoping meeting will be an “open house” format where people can come anytime between 4:00-7:00 p.m. to obtain information and ask questions about the project and the EIR/EIS process. Representatives from Caltrans and their EIR/EIS consultant will be present. You are encouraged to provide comments at the scoping meeting or by returning the enclosed comment form. The comment period is May 11, 2007 through June 21, 2007.

WHEN AND WHERE

Date: Thursday, June 21, 2007. Time: 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Location: Roadhouse Restaurant (6158 State Route 58, Kramer Junction, CA)

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, CALTRANS will provide documentation in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities. To obtain such services, please contact the District 8 Office of Public Affairs at (909) 383-4631. TDD users may contact the California Relay Service TDD line at 1-800-835-0373 or the District 8 TTY at (909) 383-6300.

WHERE YOU COME IN

CALTRANS would like your input on the project purpose and need, project alternatives, and issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS. Please submit your comments in writing at the Scoping Meeting or mail them so they are received no later than June 21, 2007, to Marie Petry at the “Contact” address below. If you want to receive additional information about the project and EIR/EIS, you must notify Marie Petry at the address below.

CONTACT

Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch, 464 W. 4th Street, 6th floor, MS 821, San Bernardino, CA, 92401-1400; Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov. The District 8 Office of Public Affairs Office may be contacted at (909) 383-4630 or by email at www.dot.ca.gov/dist8.
Additional Project Information
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

Proposed Project. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the California Department of Transportation District 8 propose to widen and realign State Route 58 (SR-58) Kramer Junction Expressway from two lanes to four lanes between the Kern/San Bernardino County line and a point 12.9 miles east on SR-58. The 13-mile long project would take place entirely within San Bernardino County and is centered on Kramer Junction, where SR-58 intersects with US-395, west of the City of Barstow. This section of SR-58 is currently a nonstandard two-lane highway between a four-lane freeway to the west and a four-lane expressway to the east. The proposed project would close this gap. The existing two-lane segment includes an at-grade signalized intersection at SR-58/US-395 (Kramer Junction), an overhead crossing of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad west of that intersection, and numerous uncontrolled at-grade driveway and street access points. There is also an at-grade railroad crossing on US-395 north of the SR-58/US-395 intersection that slows traffic and contributes to accidents when traffic backs up during train crossings. SR-58 is a major east-west transportation corridor with a high percentage of truck traffic transporting goods in and out of the state.

A preferred alternative has not been selected at this point. One No Build (Alternative A) and three Build Alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D) will be evaluated. All three build alternatives would increase capacity and be reclassified from a conventional highway to an expressway. Alternative B would be a realignment north of the existing highway. Alternative C would be generally along the existing highway alignment. Alternative D would be a realignment south of the existing highway. Construction of a new freeway-to-freeway interchange where SR-58 intersects with US-395 is proposed for Alternatives B, C, and D. This new interchange would have to span the existing at-grade railroad under Alternatives B and C, but this would not be necessary under Alternative D because the new interchange is far enough south of the railroad. In addition, Alternatives B and D would include a second grade separation (overhead) structure to span the railroad further east and west, respectively, of the proposed SR-58/US-395 interchange.

Project Background. SR 58 was adopted into the State Highway System in 1919 and was first paved in the late 1930s. SR 58 is a major east-west transportation corridor and is part of the State Interregional Road System, providing intrastate travel between State Route 101 on the west and Interstate 15 on the east and interstate travel for transporting goods in and out of the state. State and local officials have long advocated the need to construct a four-lane roadway between the San Bernardino County line and the City of Barstow. In 1980, the 16th Senatorial District and 34th Assembly District co-authored a resolution requesting Caltrans to “expeditiously proceed” with the widening of SR 58. In the mid-1980s, a State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) designated that entire segment as a study area for a four-lane roadway. The CTC also approved funding for the first 17.5 kilometers (10 miles) of a four-lane expressway east of the county line, including Kramer Junction and most of the proposed project area. To avoid the potential community impacts to Kramer Junction, the funding was re-directed for construction of a four-lane expressway east of the proposed project area (from post mile 12.9 to 22.7), and that project was completed in the early 1990s. The proposed project would bridge the two-lane gap between the four-lane freeway ending at the Kern-San Bernardino County line (post mile 0.0) and the completed four-lane expressway beginning at post mile 12.9. In 1991, an informal public map showing was held at Kramer Junction. In 2002, a public information meeting was held at Kramer Junction to provide information regarding the four-lane expressway project design. In May 2007, FHWA and Caltrans filed federal and state notices that an environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS) is being prepared to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed project.

Project Purpose and Need. The purpose of this project is to provide for increased separation of slow moving vehicles, to separate local and regional traffic, to reduce accidents, and to eliminate the convergence of SR-58 and US-395 traffic. Identified needs for the project include the following:

1) Congestion Relief. The two-lane segment within the proposed project limits operates at a Level of Service (LOS) D and traffic projections indicate it will fall to LOS F by design year (include updated information if have and indicate years). LOS is the term used to classify traffic flow with LOS A representing free traffic flow with no delays and LOS F representing heavily congested traffic and considerable delays.

2) Accident Reduction. The injury and fatal accident rates within the project limits are almost twice that of similar highways, and the non-injury accident rate is more than twice that of similar highways.

3) Improved traffic operation. The at-grade driveways and intersections, a traffic signal, and an at-grade railroad crossing generate costly delays for the current 35% daily average of commercial truck traffic, as well as for private vehicle use.

4) Improved access to local services. Heavy congestion and at-grade connections create difficulty for traffic entering and existing roadside businesses.
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project ______________________________________________________________

Project Alternatives Under Consideration_________________________________________________________

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report _ ________________

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project_ ________________________________________________________

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain
on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email
the information to the address provided below.

Name: ________________________________________________________________________________

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: __________________________________________________________________

Street Address or PO Box: __________________________________________________________________

City, State, Zip Code: ______________________________________________________________________

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by
June 21, 2007
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

¿POR QUÉ ESTE ANUNCIO?
Para notificarles que va a haber una REUNIÓN INFORMATIVA PÚBLICA y para darles la oportunidad de proveer opiniones acerca del propósito y necesidad del proyecto, las alternativas que se están considerando, y los temas que se van a tocar en el EIR/EIS, lo cual va a evaluar los efectos que puedan tener este proyecto sobre el medioambiente. La reunión informativa tendrá el formato de una “casa abierta” en el cual la gente puede asistir a cualquier hora entre las 4:00 a 7:00 p.m. para obtener información y hacer preguntas acerca del proyecto y el proceso del EIR/EIS. Representantes de Caltrans y su consultante del EIR/EIS estarán presentes. Se les pide a ustedes sus comentarios en la reunión informativa o al entregar la forma de comentarios incluida aquí. El período para dar comentarios es del 11 de mayo, 2007 al 21 de junio, 2007.

DÓNDE Y CUÁNDO
Fecha: Jueves, 21 de junio, 2007. Horario: 4:00 p.m. a 7:00 p.m.
Lugar: Roadhouse Restaurant (6158 State Route 58, Kramer Junction, CA)

¿CUÁL ES SU PARTICIPACIÓN?
CALTRANS desea sus opiniones sobre el propósito y necesidad del proyecto, las alternativas del proyecto, y los temas que se van a tocar en el EIR/EIS. Favor de entregar sus comentarios por escrito en la Reunión Informativa o por correo para que se reciban, a más tardar, antes del 21 de junio, 2007. Atte: Marie Petry a la dirección de “Contactos” notada abajo. Si usted desea recibir información adicional sobre el proyecto y el EIR/EIS, debería de notificar a Marie Petry, a la dirección notada abajo.

CONTACTOS
Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch, 464 W. 4th Street, 6th floor, MS 821, San Bernardino, CA, 92401-1400; Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov. Se puede poner en contacto con la Oficina de Asuntos Públicos del Distrito 8 al (909) 383-4630 o por correo electrónico al www.dot.ca.gov/dist8.
This page is intentionally blank.
Información Adicional acerca del Proyecto
Proyecto Superestación Kramer Junction en la Ruta Estatal 58


En este momento una alternativa preferida no ha sido seleccionada. Van a ser evaluadas una Alternativa de No Construir (Alternativa A) y tres Alternativas de Construcción (Alternativas B, C, y D). Las tres alternativas de construcción aumentarían la capacidad y la carretera sería reclasificada de carretera convencional a una supercarretera. La Alternativa B sería una realineación al norte de la carretera actualmente en existencia. La Alternativa C sería generalmente por la alineación de la carretera actualmente en existencia. La Alternativa D sería una realineación al sur de la carretera actualmente en existencia. Para las Alternativas B, C, y D se propone construir un nuevo cruce de autopista-a-autopista donde SR-58 cruza con US-395. Bajo las Alternativas B y C este nuevo cruce tendría que pasar por el cruce de ferrocarril al nivel actualmente en existencia; pero no sería necesario bajo la Alternativa D porque el nuevo cruce está bastante al sur de la vía férrea. Adicionalmente, las Alternativas B y D incluirían una estructura de separación de segundo grado (elevada) para cruzar la vía férrea más al este y al oeste, respectivamente, del cruce propuesto de SR-58/US-395.

Historia del Proyecto. SR 58 fue adoptada al Sistema de Carreteras Estatales en el 1919 y fue pavimentada por primera vez al final de los años 1930. SR 58 es un corredor principal del este-oeste y es parte del Sistema de Caminos Inter-regionales del Estado, proveyendo movimiento dentro del estado entre la Ruta Estatal 101 al oeste y la Interstateal 15 al este, y movimiento interestatal para transportar cargas dentro y fuera del estado. Oficiales locales y del estado han abogado durante mucho tiempo la necesidad de construir un camino de cuatro carriles entre la línea del Condado de San Bernardino y la Cuidad de Barstow. En 1980, el Distrito del Senado 16, y el Distrito de la Asamblea 34 colaboraron al escribir una resolución pidiendo a Caltrans que procedieran expeditamente con la ampliación de la SR 58. En medio de los años 1980, un Plan Para Mejorar la Transportación en el Estado (STIP) fue adoptado por la Comisión de Transportación de California (CTC) designando ese segmento en su totalidad como un área de estudio para un camino de cuatro carriles. La CTC también aprobó fondos para los primeros 17.5 kilómetros (10 millas) de una supercarretera de cuatro carriles al este de la línea del condado, incluyendo Kramer Junction y la mayoría del área del proyecto propuesto. Para evitar impactos potenciales a la comunidad de Kramer Junction, los fondos fueron re-dirigidos para la construcción de una supercarretera de cuatro carriles al este del área del proyecto propuesto (desde la milla de poste 12.9 a 22.7), y ese proyecto se concluyó al principio de los años 1990. El proyecto propuesto abarcaría el segmento de dos carriles entre la autopista de cuatro carriles que se termina en la línea de los condados Kern-San Bernardino (milla de poste 0.0) y la supercarretera de cuatro carriles que fue completada y la cual empieza en la milla de poste 12.9. En 1991, una reunión informal para mostrar un mapa público se llevó a cabo en Kramer Junction. En 2002, se llevó a cabo en Kramer Junction una reunión informativa pública para proveer información acerca del diseño del proyecto de la supercarretera de cuatro carriles. En mayo 2007, FHWA y Caltrans sometieron avisos federales y estatales que un reporte sobre el impacto al medioambiente/declaración del impacto al medioambiente (EIR/EIS) se estaba preparando para evaluar los efectos potenciales al medioambiente causados por el proyecto propuesto.

Propósito y Necesidad del Proyecto. El propósito del proyecto es proveer un aumento de separación entre vehículos que se mueven a baja velocidad, para separar el tráfico local y regional, para reducir el número de accidentes, y para eliminar la congestión de tráfico de la SR-58 y la US-395. Necesidades identificadas para el proyecto incluyen lo siguiente.

1) Aliviar Congestionamiento. El segmento de dos carriles dentro de los límites del proyecto propuesto se opera al Nivel de Servicio (LOS) D y proyecciones del tráfico indican que caerá al LOS F para el año del diseño (incluyendo información adicional corriente y los años indicados). LOS es el término que se usa para clasificar el flujo de tráfico con LOS A representando tráfico con flujo libre y sin demoras y LOS F representando tráfico pesado y congestionado con demoras considerables.

2) Reducción de Accidentes. Las tasas de accidentes con lesiones o fatalidades dentro del límite del proyecto son casi el doble de las tasas en carreteras similares, y la tasa de accidentes sin lesiones es más del doble de la tasa en carreteras similares.

3) Mejorar la Operación del Tráfico. Los caminos particulares al nivel y los cruces, un semáforo, y un cruce de ferrocarril al nivel generan demoras costosas para los camiones comerciales que actualmente representan un promedio de 35% del tráfico diario, igual como para los vehículos de uso privado.

4) Mejor Acceso a Servicios Locales. Congestión pesada y conexiones al nivel crearán dificultades para el tráfico que entra y sale de los negocios al lado de la carretera.
Sus Comentarios  Fecha _____________
(Adjunte papel extra si necesita más lugar para sus comentarios)

Propósito y Necesidad del Proyecto


Alternativas del Proyecto Bajo Consideración


Temas/Áreas de Recurso Que Serán Tocados en la Declaración/Reporte del Impacto al Medioambiente


Otros Temas/Preocupaciones Acerca del Proyecto


Su Información
Apunte claramente en letras de molde su nombre, su interés o afiliación, y su dirección si nos ha proveído comentarios o si quiere seguir recibiendo por correo información adicional acerca del proyecto y el EIR/EIS. Devuelva esta forma o envíenos la información por correo electrónico a la dirección notada abajo.

Nombre: ____________________________________________________________________________
Agencia/Afiliación/Interés: ____________________________________________________________________________
Dirección o Apartado Postal: ____________________________________________________________________________
Cuidad, Estado, Código Postal: ____________________________________________________________________________

Envíe a: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Los comentarios deben de ser recibidos antes del 21 de junio, 2007
Newspaper Notice (English and Spanish)

Scoping Meeting Notices were placed in the following local newspapers.

- Press Dispatch (Sunday combination newspaper for the Desert Dispatch and Daily Press)—English and Spanish notices
- Mojave Desert News (weekly paper)—English and Spanish notices
- El Mojave (weekly Spanish language newspaper)—Spanish notice
The California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) proposes to construct a 4-lane expressway on SR-58 in San Bernardino County, between the Kern/San Bernardino county line and a point 12.9 miles east on SR-58. This section of SR-58 is currently a nonstandard two-lane highway between a four-lane freeway to the west and a four-lane expressway to the east. The proposed project would close this gap. Three alignments are being considered: one along the existing SR-58, one north of the existing SR-58, and one south of the existing SR-58. All three alignments would include a new interchange where SR-58 intersects with US-395.

**Location:** Roadhouse Restaurant (6158 State Route 58, Kramer Junction, CA)

The public SCOPING MEETING will be an “open house” format where people can come anytime between 4:00-7:00 p.m. to get more information and ask questions about the project and the environmental review process. Representatives from Caltrans and their environmental consultant will be present.

Individuals who require special accommodation (American Sign Language interpreters, language interpreters, accessible seating, documentation in alternative formats, etc) should contact Caltrans District 8 Office of Public Affairs at (909) 383-4631. TDD users may contact the California Relay Service TDD line at 1-800-835-0373 or the District 8 TTY at (909) 383-6300. A Spanish translator will be present.

Caltrans would like your input on the need for the project, alternatives being considered, and issues to be addressed in the environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS) that will identify potential project effects on the environment. Please provide comments at the Scoping Meeting or by mailing comments to Marie Petry (see “Contact” address below) no later than June 21, 2007.

Marie Petry, Caltrans District 8 Environmental Studies Branch, 464 W. 4th Street, 6th floor, MS 821, San Bernardino, CA, 92401-1400. Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov. The Caltrans Office of Public Affairs may be contacted at (909) 383-4630 or by email at www.caltrans8.info.
**REUNIÓN INFORMATIVA PÚBLICA**
21 de junio, 2007, 4:00-7:00 p.m.
Proyecto Supercarretera Kramer Junction en la Ruta Estatal 58
Reporte del impacto al medioambiente/Declaración del impacto al medioambiente

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROYECTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REUNIÓN INFORMATIVA PÚBLICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lugar: Roadhouse Restaurant (6158 State Route 58, Kramer Junction, CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La REUNIÓN INFORMATIVA PÚBLICA tendrá un formato de “casa abierta” donde la gente puede ir y venir cuando quieran entre las horas de 4:00-7:00 p.m. para obtener más información y hacer preguntas acerca del proyecto y el proceso de evaluar el efecto sobre el medioambiente. Representantes de Caltrans y su consultante medioambiental estarán presentes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuos que requieren acomodación especial (Intérpretes del lenguaje por señas, intérpretes de otros idiomas, asientos accesibles, documentación en formatos alternativos, etc.) deberían ponerse en contacto con la Oficina de Asuntos Públicos del Distrito 8 (Caltrans District 8 Office of Public Affairs) al (909) 383-4631. Usuarios de TDD se pueden poner en contacto con la línea del California Relay Service TDD al 1-800-835-0373 o el Distrito 8 TTY al (909) 383-6300. Va haber intérprete del inglés/español.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUS COMENTARIOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans desea sus comentarios sobre la necesidad del proyecto, las alternativas que están bajo consideración, y los temas que se van a tocar en el reporte del impacto al medioambiente/declaración del impacto al medioambiente (EIR/EIS) que identificarán posibles efectos del proyecto sobre el medioambiente. Favor de proveer comentarios en la Reunión Informativa Pública o al enviar por correo sus comentarios a Marie Petry (vea la dirección del “Contacto” abajo) antes del 21 de junio, 2007.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix C  Scoping Meeting Materials
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State Route 58
Kramer Junction Expressway Project

WELCOME
Please Sign In
Public Scoping & Informational Meeting: Open House

Why Are We Here Tonight?
• To present the project to the public.
• To answer your questions.
• To get your comments on the purpose and need, alternatives and associated environmental studies of the project.

Please View Our Displays and Ask Questions

State Route 58
Kramer Junction Expressway Project
06:30 PM – 8:30 PM

Project Description
The proposed project will upgrade SR-58 to an access controlled 4 lane divided expressway, from Kern County Line to 7.5 miles east of SR-395 in San Bernardino County, California.

Four Alternatives Being Considered:
• No Build
• Realignment north of existing highway
• Realignment along existing highway
• Realignment south of existing highway

Costs:
The estimated cost of the proposed project is $47 million.

Purpose
• To provide congestion relief.
• Improve the safe operation of State Route 58.
• Improve existing traffic operations.
• Improve the access to local services.

Need
• The existing two-lane segment does not provide adequate capacity to meet the demand of existing and future traffic volumes.
• This segment of State Route 58 has accident rates more than twice the state average.
• The at-grade driveways and intersections, a traffic signal, and an at-grade railroad crossing generate costly delays for commercial truck traffic as well as for private vehicle use.
• dryer businesses and at-grade connections create difficulty for serving existing roadside businesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>How did you hear about the meeting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adina Sico</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>P.O. Box 91472, LA, CA 90067</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adinasico@sbcglobal.net">adinasico@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad, Meeting notice/mailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Hayes</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>1971 N. Rodman Dr., #104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Chan</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>816 San Angelo Ave, Montebello, CA 90640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicksom Chan</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Sam 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Missildone</td>
<td>Kern County Fire Dept</td>
<td>26965 Cote, Boron, CA 93516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:markmissildone@gmail.com">markmissildone@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad, Meeting notice/mailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Restallman</td>
<td>Kern County Fire Dept</td>
<td>26965 Cote, Boron, CA 93516</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad, Meeting notice/mailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla Brown</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>24205 Sage Ave, Boron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlin Brown</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>24003 Sage Ave, Boron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Olson</td>
<td>Mojave Pipeline</td>
<td>5401 E. Brundage, Palm Springs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wayneolson@gmail.com">wayneolson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad, Meeting notice/mailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neidy Pinuela</td>
<td>CALTRANS 12W</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1405, Apple Valley, CA 92307</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad, Meeting notice/mailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Liman</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hadlow</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>3248 E. Hwy 58, Con</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RobertHadlow@caltrans.gov">RobertHadlow@caltrans.gov</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad, Meeting notice/mailer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadhouse Restaurant
6158 State Route 58, Kramer Junction

Scoping Meeting
June 21, 2007, 4:00-7:00 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>How did you hear about the meeting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mere Chapman</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>2225 E. Tahquitz Ave</td>
<td>Mere Chapman @ AOC.com</td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Pase</td>
<td>ILR Rep.</td>
<td>7004 Carmichael St</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ConniePase@yahoo.com">ConniePase@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Altsiner</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>11684 Ash St</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ShellyAltsiner@yahoo.com">ShellyAltsiner@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Jackson</td>
<td>South Cal Ed.</td>
<td>12353 Hesperia Rd, Victorville, CA 92395</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nancy.jacksont@soc.com">nancy.jacksont@soc.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Y. Chang</td>
<td></td>
<td>278 S. Roosevelt Ave, Pasadena, CA 91107</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kenychang@soc.com">kenychang@soc.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Chang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.chang@soc.com">karen.chang@soc.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Walling</td>
<td>Supv.</td>
<td>1725 Hwy 58 to Mojave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JamesWalling@soc.com">JamesWalling@soc.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Smokk</td>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>300 E. Mt. View, Barstow, CA 92311</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GregSmokk@soc.com">GregSmokk@soc.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul + Debora Violette</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>3402 Genoa Pk., Palm Dale, CA 93551</td>
<td><a href="mailto:PaulViolette@soc.com">PaulViolette@soc.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Roque</td>
<td>Caltrans Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:MichelleRoque@soc.com">MichelleRoque@soc.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadhouse Restaurant  
6158 State Route 58, Kramer Junction  
Scoping Meeting  
June 21, 2007, 4:00-7:00 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>How did you hear about the meeting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph W. Baker</td>
<td>The Baker Company</td>
<td>200 W. Amargosa St, 2710</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joseph.Baker@compaq.com">Joseph.Baker@compaq.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Baker</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>1209 S. Marengo Ave, Alhambra, CA 91803</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Nicole.Baker@verizon.com">Nicole.Baker@verizon.com</a></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Bort</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>41463 Corinna Rd, Boron, CA 93516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jack.Baker@robcreek.com">Jack.Baker@robcreek.com</a></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Bakke</td>
<td>Carlton Global Resources</td>
<td>P.O. Box 483, Boron, CA 93513</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ben.Bakke@robcreek.com">Ben.Bakke@robcreek.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal Bakke</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>12590 Sugar St, Boron</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Natal.Bakke@robcreek.com">Natal.Bakke@robcreek.com</a></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Cathcart</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>37337 Anderson Pl, Boron</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gail.Cathcart@robcreek.com">Gail.Cathcart@robcreek.com</a></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Marks</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>3721 Plateau Place, Escondido, CA 92325</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Milton.Marks@robcreek.com">Milton.Marks@robcreek.com</a></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Gery</td>
<td></td>
<td>46037 N. 125th St. E, Lancaster, CA 93535</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dan.Gery@robcreek.com">Dan.Gery@robcreek.com</a></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadhouse Restaurant  
6158 State Route 58, Kramer Junction  
Scoping Meeting  
June 21, 2007, 4:00-7:00 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>How did you hear about the meeting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Lidman</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>4821 King Cir.</td>
<td>njlj@exitstrategy</td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Lawrence</td>
<td>Realtor</td>
<td>P.O. Box 59</td>
<td><a href="mailto:theare@sbcglobal.net">theare@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Meeting notice/mailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliz Baghdikian</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>P.O. Box 18371</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Paine</td>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>1599 E Shaw</td>
<td>gapi096e.com</td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joey Cotton</td>
<td>Mayor, Bank</td>
<td>37096 T-M-T Rd 192</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Day</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>12556 Suga Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald D. Bray</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4031</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Pratt</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>926 4th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Potter</td>
<td>Property Owners</td>
<td>5825 Pour 58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Elias</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>17218 Mif. Ave, Tushee CIR 93750</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alger Allent</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>18305 Norris Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadhouse Restaurant  
6158 State Route 58, Kramer Junction  
Scoping Meeting  
June 21, 2007, 4:00-7:00 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>How did you hear about the meeting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorne Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>B51 Lane Dr. Born</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob McGivnis</td>
<td></td>
<td>453 Ave A, Barstow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Moen</td>
<td>Senator Roy Ashburn</td>
<td>19405 Lookout Place, Tehachapi, CA 93561</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rex.moen@sen.ca.gov">rex.moen@sen.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Meeting notice/mailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>6153 Main Ave, Bakersfield, CA 93516</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadhouse Restaurant
6158 State Route 58, Kramer Junction
Scoping Meeting
June 21, 2007, 4:00-7:00 p.m.
## Appendix D
### Agencies and Public Officials Noticed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>Ryan Brodderick</td>
<td>1416 Ninth Street</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008 W Ave M-14, Suite G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palmdale, CA 93551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th</td>
<td>Assemblyman</td>
<td>Lester Snow</td>
<td>1416 Ninth Street</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ave, Suite 470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victorville, CA 92392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td>Congressman</td>
<td>Brad Jenkins</td>
<td>2707 K Street, Suite 1</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95816-5113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150 Brookside Ave., #J-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redlands, CA 92374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
<td>John Fowler</td>
<td>Milford Wayne Donaldson</td>
<td>1416 Ninth Str Rm 1442-7</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 Pennsylvania Ave, NW, Suite 803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Management District - Mojave Desert</td>
<td>Eldon Heaston</td>
<td>CA Office of Historic Preservation</td>
<td>1416 Ninth Str Rm 1442-7</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14306 Park Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victorville, CA 92392-2310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Air Resources Board</td>
<td>Catherine Witherspoon</td>
<td>CA Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>320 West 4th St., Suite 500</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 I Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Curt Taucher</td>
<td>CA Regional Water Quality Control Board-Lahonton (Region 6)</td>
<td>Robert S. Dodds, Assistant Executive Officer</td>
<td>Victorville, CA 92392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3602 Inland Empire Blvd., Suite C-220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14440 Civic Dr., Suite 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario, CA 91764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Department of Water Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416 Ninth Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Native Plant Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2707 K Street, Suite 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95816-5113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Office of Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416 Ninth Str Rm 1442-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416 Ninth Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416 Ninth Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Transportation Commission</td>
<td>John Barna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120 N St Rm 2221 MS-52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Agencies and Public Officials Noticed

CA Wildlife Federation
Randy Walker, President
921 11th Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA  95814

California City
Chief of Police
21470 Applewood Dr.
Boron, CA  93516

California City
City Manager
21000 Hacienda Blvd.
Boron, CA  93516

City of Adelanto
11600 Air Expressway
Adelanto, CA  92301

City of Barstow Community Development
Department, Planning Division
Mike Massimini, Associate City Planner
220-A E. Mountain View St
Barstow, CA  92311

City of Barstow, City Council
681 N. 1st Ave
Barstow, CA  92311

City of Barstow, Community Development
Department, Planning Division
Mike Massimini, Associate City Planner
220-A E. Mountain View St
Barstow, CA  92311

City of San Bernardino
300 North D Street
San Bernardino, CA  92418

City of Victorville
14343 Civic Dr.
Victorville, CA  92393

County of San Bernardino, Department of
Public Works
825 East 3rd St.
San Bernardino, CA  92415-0835

Federal Railroad Administration, Office of
R&D
Dr. Magdy El-Sibaie, Acting Director,
1120 Vermont Ave. NW MS-20
Washington, DC  20590

Kern County Fire Dept
Station 17,
26965 Cote Street
Boron, CA  93516

Kern County Library
Boron Branch,
26967 20 Mule Team Rd
Boron, CA  93516

Kern County Planning Department
Ted James, Director
2700 M Street, Suite 100
Bakersfield, CA  93301-2370

Kern County Sheriff Station
Boron Sub,
1771 Highway 58
Mojave, CA  93501

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management
District
310 W. Mountain View St.
Barstow, CA  92311

Native American Heritage Commission
Larry Myers, Executive Secretary
915 Capitol Mall, Rm. 364
Sacramento, CA  95814

SANBAG
Tony Grasso, Executive Director
1170 W. 3rd Street
San Bernardino, CA  92410-1715
Appendix D. Agencies and Public Officials Noticed

San Bernandino County, Land Use Services
Department, Planning Division
Julie Ryneser Rock, Director
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor
San Bernadino, CA  92415-0182

San Bernadino County, Dept. of Transportation
Roger Hatheway, Transportation Planner
3rd St., SB
San Bernadino, CA  92410

State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning & Research
Cynthia Bryant, Director of Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth St Rm 100
Sacramento, CA  95814

State Water Resources Control Board
Esteban Almanza, Deputy Director
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA  95814

U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
Carl J. Artman, Asst. Secretary for Indian Affairs
1849 C Street NW MS-4160
Washington, DC  20240

U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Mike Pool, State Director
2800 Cottage Way Suite W-1834
Sacramento, CA  95825-1886

U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Roxie Trost, Field Manager
2601 Barstow Rd;
Barstow, CA  92311

U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Barstow Office
Casey Burns,
2601 Barstow Rd.
Barstow, CA  92311

U.S. Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency
Dale E. Bonner, Secretary
980 9th Street, Suite 2450
Sacramento, CA  95814-2719

U.S. Department of Defense
95 ABW/PA,
1 S. Rosamund Blvd.
Edwards AFB, CA  93524

U.S. Department of Defense, Edwards AFB
Dennis Shoffner, Chief of Community Relations
1 S. Rosamond Blvd.
Edwards AFB, CA  93524

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Federal Activities (Mail Code 2252-A),
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC  20460

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Asst. Manager
2800 Cottage Way Suite W-2605
Sacramento, CA  95825

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2493 Portola Rd., Suite B
Ventura, CA  93003

U.S. Government, Transportation Dept. of FAA
501 Southwest Mockingbird Hill Drive
Boron, CA  93516
Contents

Comment Card (English and Spanish)

Summary of Scoping Comments

Comments
SCOPING COMMENTS

Purpose and Need for the Project ______________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Project Alternatives Under Consideration_________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report _____________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project_ ________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain
on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email
the information to the address provided below.

Name: ____________________________________________________________________________
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: ______________________________________________________________
Street Address or PO Box: ____________________________________________________________
City, State, Zip Code: ________________________________________________________________

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by July 20, 2007
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sus Comentarios</th>
<th>Fecha___________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propósito y Necesidad del Proyecto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternativas del Proyecto Bajo Consideración</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temas/Áreas de Recurso Que Serán Tocados en la Declaración/Reporte del Impacto al Medioambiente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otros Temas/Preocupaciones Acerca del Proyecto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Su Información**

Apunte claramente en letras de molde su nombre, su interés o afiliación, y su dirección si nos ha proveído comentarios o si quiere seguir recibiendo por correo información adicional acerca del proyecto y el EIR/EIS. Devuelva esta forma o envíenos la información por correo electrónico a la dirección notada abajo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencia/Afiliación/Interés:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirección o Apartado Postal:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuidad, Estado, Código Postal:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Envíe a:** California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Los comentarios deben de ser recibidos antes del 20 de julio, 2007
Summary of Scoping Comments
SR 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

This summary includes a brief synopsis of all comments received, grouped into common categories. Agency comments are included at the end of the summary.

NOTE: Remove names if document is published or posted publicly.

Purpose and Need

- Lives in Boron and has seen traffic backed from Kramer Junction to county line many times (Charles Bell)
- Accidents caused by the S turn and where traffic crosses tracks on a curve are reason enough to construct project (Glen Lasley)
- Need because accidents and traffic backed for hours (Shirley Johnson)
- Too many accidents on the 2-lane stretch; project must be done (Lorraine Ryan-Bell)
- Project needed for safety (transition from 4 to 2 lanes is dangerous), backup at Kramer Junction (Deric English)
- Tremendous death toll and holiday/weekend back-up 6-miles long (Ed Sauser)
- To ease traffic and congestion at intersections (Denis Braly)
- Agrees with stated purpose and need (congestion relief, accident reduction, improved traffic operations, and improved access to local services – all necessary) (James Rumsey)
- Agrees with stated purpose and need (Robbie Jean Kibel)
- Much needed and traveled route; wants all the way to I-15 complete (Vinod N and Utra Nair)
- Long overdue, fatalities are very high in this area (James Meadows)
- Agrees project is needed and shouldn’t be delayed (Christine Rich)
- Project needed for safety concerns, to expedite traffic and reduce unnecessary congestion at Kramer Junction (Barbara Mattas)
- Agree. Too many people have been killed and the congestion is ridiculous (Helen Umsted)
- Agrees and supports project (Jennifer Colunga)
- Agrees. Family is appalled at the carnage this section of highway has caused over years, and they fear entering/exiting property due to speed and density of traffic. (Kenneth Todd Gunn)
- Traffic safety and expediting commercial cargo (Gwenneth Howard Sloat)
- Congestion relief, accident reductions, allows access to local services, eliminates the long curve and RR track crossing east of Boron which is a no passing area with a long history of accidents (James Wise)
- Need to do something. Traffic backs up from Kramer Junction clear past the RR overpass Boron spur on SR 58 when there’s a 3-day weekend. On any
given weekend it’s hard to get gas at intersection. Many people have died between county-line and Kramer Junction. (Blanche Dobbs)

- Existing road is dangerous; motorists still cross double yellow line to pass (Frank Gonazales)
- “I have lived in Boron over 30 years and the biggest pain I got on Kramer Junction is my son was killed he was 28 yrs old on Mother’s Day…..” (Violeta Fourdyce)
- Traffic (John and Jill Price)
- Project is urgently needed; far too many fatalities. This is a major goods corridor. The RR grade separation at Boron and Kramer Junction will be a major safety improvement. The 5-mile plus backups at Kramer Junction every 3-day weekend causes increased road rage. (Rex Moen)
- Needed very much! (Bob McGinnis)
- It’s long overdue and much needed for the traffic. The “s” curve and the traffic light at Kramer Junction are a danger to locals and travelers (Ben Bakke)
- Say there is rarely a traffic backup out here, except on occasional weekends and holidays. Most days, traffic moves along slowly. (Karen Caillier)
- Number of traffic issues have taken place on this heavily traveled roadway (Bob McGinnis)
- Project needs to be implemented to reduce traffic delays and accidents. The sooner, the better. I am for it 100%. (Paul Ng)

Alternatives

- Prefers Alt D because should be lower cost since don’t need cross RR @ US 395, because appears to be less invasive to existing businesses and homes, and because need for detour will be minimized (Charles Bell)
- Prefers Alt B and stay north of the tracks (Glen Lasley)
- Prefers Alt D (Balakhaneh Mansour)
- Wants overpass over the railroad track; Alt C would be OK (Shirley Johnson)
- Alt B best for truckers and travelers; Alt C and D would still have problems of oncoming traffic (Ream/Beazell)
- Prefers B and C (Antonio Cobacha)
- Alt D seems most logical because it would require no businesses to be purchased and therefore would be less expensive (Ed Sauser)
- Alt B most practical and efficient to build (William Hicks)
- Alt B would have the least abatement and free flowing (Denis Braly)
- Supports Alt B (north alt) and (mistakenly?) states that Alt C would still have an at-grade RR crossing in curve area where Old Boron Rd meets SR 58 (James Rumsey)
- Alt D (Jonathan Sund)
- Supports Alt B, C or D (Robbie Jean Kibel)
- Alt B, C, or D look OK. Caltrans should decide best route (Vinod N and Utra Nair)
• BLM will likely prefer the alternative that uses the existing alignment given they manage the land for desert tortoise recovery (BLM).
• Alt B so that we can retain the old road between Boron and Kramer Junction so I wouldn’t have to drive west from my land to get on SR 58 (Lindsay Ross)
• Alt D because it could bring highway closer to his property and possibly increase value (John Lemieux)
• Alt D (James Meadows)
• Alt B seems most effective for tax payers (McHenry Cooke)
• Alt B first choice, Alt C second choice (Helen Umsted)
• Alt B (strongly opposed to Alt A and C) (Kenneth Todd Gunn)
• Alt D more cost effective since south of RR (Gwenneth Howard Sloat)
• Alt B first choice, Alt C probably not feasible (Leslie Wise)
• Alt B (James Wise)
• Alt C looks best if there’s room for turning off onto 395 and the businesses; Alt B second choice (Blanche Dobbs)
• Alt B (Frank Gonzales)
• Alt B (north route) is preferred because it avoids encroachment on Edwards AFB, the electrical substation, and the businesses at Kramer Junction. (Rex Moen)
• Alt B (north route) seems to meet the majority of the needs (Bob McGinnis)
• Alt B (north route) is the best because least amount of impact on people living in the area and on the businesses. (James Welling)
• Alt B because Alt D goes over 3 natural gas pipelines that are 48-inch pipes and Alt C goes over 2 natural gas pipelines. Also see attachment for another alternative north of B
• Suggests limiting project to existing SR 58, taking the pottery property and Chevron property on the north side, and adding a lane in their place. Add two more lanes from freeway to freeway, so it will be four lanes all the way. Says this should be affordable. If there’s enough money, suggests building an overpass to the west. (Karen Caillier)
• Implementing southern alternative(s) would kill businesses. (Karen Caillier)
• Four corners businesses could possibly exist with Expressway to north of Kramer Junction. Give the businesses a fair price and buy them out of your way. This would not be good, however, for Boron or for the motoring public. They will be out of stations and restaurants. (Karen Caillier)
• Prefers Alternative #2. (Bob McGinnis)
• The route through the middle would seem out of the question. (James Darr)
• The southern route would be devastating to the economy of the whole intersection. (James Darr)
• The northern route would most likely have the least impact on the intersection. (James Darr)
• Prefers Alternative B, then Alternative D, and lastly, Alternative C. (Paul Ng)
• Alternative C would affect businesses. (Paul Ng)
• Alternative B is best alternative due to the fact that the S curve is the smoothest among all of the alternatives. Moving the existing SR 58 northerly
will be safer for motorists and fewer existing homes will be affected.
Moreover, existing businesses at the intersection will not be affected. (Paul Ng)

- Alternative D is the second best alternative, but S-curve is less smooth than Alternative B.
- Alternative C is least desirable alternative due to the fact that most businesses would be affected. Need more businesses at Kramer Junction to boost the area and generate more traffic and people so that economy in the area can grow. (Paul Ng)

Technical Issues/Resources Addressed in EIS/EIR

Cultural /Historical:
- Thorough archaeological and cultural studies are needed. There should be much study prior to and during the construction phase regarding the old community of Kramer because it was a 1880s railroad siding and center of much mining activity in this part of the Mojave Desert. This is a historical rich area in artifacts, local history, and must receive special attention. (Deric English)

Hazardous Materials:
- 6-7-07 letter from CA DTSC with several specific comments for EIR/EIS analysis

Biological Resources:
- Concerned for desert tortoise (Dennis Mogerman)
- BLM wants any existing desert tortoise fences reconstructed, and appropriate culverts for use of desert tortoise and other wildlife constructed as feasible beneath the roadway. FHWA will need to consult with USFWS on this project. (BLM)
- Concerned about impacts on wildlife. Has seen numerous species in area (Bruce and Barbara Baker)

Water Quality:
- CA RWQCB letter states that the project requires development of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and a NPDES General Construction Stormwater Permit. The proposal does not provide specific info on how impacts to surface waters of the State and/or Waters of the US will be mitigated. The route should avoid waters of the state and design spans for all drainage areas.

Air Quality:
- Concerned about emissions close to their house (Kenneth Todd Gunn)

Noise:
- Concerned about noise at existing property. (Paul Ng)
Socioeconomic:
- The negative econ impact of traffic delays for goods movement will be corrected with this project (Rex Moen)
- Economic impact to existing businesses needs to be addressed; Caltrans should use local businesses where possible. Consider using Global Resources, LLC, the aggregate plant next to Rio Tinto (Ben Bakke)
- With Alt B, businesses would be affected by the northbound traffic turning east prior to the business district (about 60% do so) (Leslie Wise)

Traffic:
- Traffic access for locals and truck access off Hwy 395 for current leads needs to be addressed (Ben Bakke)
- Concerned about property access. (Paul Ng)

Utilities:
- Keep PG&E posted (Gregg Parker)
- Looks like Alt D would affect two 42-inch high pressure gas lines and be right on the ROW for Mojave Pipeline (Wayne Olson)
- Kern River and the Mojave Pipeline Company jointly own two 42-inch natural gas lines south of existing SR 58. Kern River also owns a metering station near existing SR 58. Alternative D would impact Kern River’s existing easements and facilities. (Douglas Gibbons)
- Appears Alts B, C, D will all impact the Southern California Edison’s transmission facilities. If relocation is needed, impacts need to be addressed in the EIR. Replacement rights will need to be assured from Caltrans to relocate SCE facilities. Timeframes need to be considered depending on materials, cost for outage and relocation of SCE facilities will be at Caltrans expense if SCE owns in fee or has prior rights. Hope the route with least impact on SCE facilities will be chosen. Encroachment costs to be Caltrans responsibility (Nancy Jackson, Joseph D’Amato, Chad Packard)

Schedule
- Main concerns should be schedule (Charles Bell)
- Project is long overdue (Glen Lasley)
- Must be done – don’t wait for more lives to be lost (Lorraine Ryan-Bell)
- He’s received several mailings/letters since 2002 and asks why are we still on step 1? (James Rumsey)
- The sooner the state fixes SR 58 the sooner more lives will be saved (one of deadliest roads in southern California. It was started years ago, and the state should have finished it. (Lillie Bluff)
- Way over due (James Wise)

Costs/Funding
- Keep costs down (Charles Bell)
- How is the project being funded (Dale Weaver)
Miscellaneous Comments/Questions

- should try and employ low income families in area as much as possible (Charles Bell)
- Is project only going to be in SB County and not on the Kern County side? It should go all the way (Shirley Johnson)
- Thank you. It’s about time this takes place (Shirley Johnson)
- Need any and all types of businesses in town (Ream/Beazel)
- The turn lane and exit where WB traffic exits SR 58 to reach Boron is poorly designed and should be redesigned (Deric English)
- Complete the SR 58 freeway to Barstow (William Hicks)
- How will it affect my land? (Donald Gray)
- Will there be walls along the route? (Denis Braly)
- Should use two existing unpaved roadways as access roads to the 4-lane expressway. There is already a hard-packed/gravel dirt roadway from the Boron bridge span east to Kramer Junction with at grade utility/equipment boxes and electric utility/telephone poles are located in short distance north of this roadway on another unpaved roadway. (James Rumsey)
- Why are we still looking for environmental database and approval? This was to be done in 2003. Why are the ag grade RR tracks that cross existing SR 58 at the curve east of boron not included in this project? Why is the old (main) entrance/exit road to Boron not spoken of in this realignment? He suggests: 1) start Alt B east of the Boron span bridge and go north and east, and join expressway to Barstow, 2) leave SR 58 as is fo surface road and join this roadway with the old Boron (main) road at the curve with the RR crossing to leave cood access to local services and leave present businesses along. (James Rumsey)
- Will we have to keep Four Corners in business with the people that already own it or are we going to have a Mexican Tiajuana Four Corners or an Iraq Four Corners or some other government is more than willing to do. We as United States citizens not me bend over backwards to prove there not prejudice and selling their own nation and roll into slavery? (Jonathan Sund)
- Transitions should be wide enough to ease traffic; plan for future growth (Christine Rich)
- Financial impact on local people and businesses needs to be considered (McHenry Cole)
- Wants I-40 coast to coast. Proposes that SR 58 from Barstow to Bakersfield be changed to I-40. Go north from Bakersfield with 99 and I-40 to 46, which would become I-40 to Paso Robles, connecting to 101. This would provide relief and available routes for truckers/public to reach the coast without going through LA. This would better serve businesses and tourists. The FHWA could put gas tax to work for us. (Art Griffin)
- List of questions including (Dennis Mogerman)
  - How will my property be affected?
  - Will there be soundwalls?
  - What is the elevation of the roadway near my property?
  - How will drainage facilities affect my property and would flooding occur during heavy rainstorms?
o What streets will be dead-ended and which will have bridges/underpasses?
o Will there be frontage roads?
o What is the difference between “expressway” and “freeway”?
o Does Caltrans work with local governments on master plans for land use and commercial development in the area?
o Can I get copies of policies on the acquisitions of property for state highways?
o Is money now available or is this just another study; please define “expeditiously”

- List of questions including (George Ahlers)
  o Want to see detailed map
  o Is parcel #049811020000 impacted by one of the alternatives/
  o What is the relative elevation of the roadway near my property: above grade on columns, above grade on an embankment, at grade, below grade, below grade so that bridges for existing streets are at grade?
o Will there be soundwalls?
o How will drainage facilities affect my property? Would flooding during heavy rainstorms occur?
o What streets will be dead-ended and which will have bridges or underpasses?
o Will there be frontage roads to allow access to roadside businesses w/o causing traffic congestion on the highway?
o What is the difference between an expressway, a freeway, and a highway?
o Does Caltrans/FHWA work with local govs on master plans for land use and commercial development in the area?
o Wants copies of policies on the acquisition of property for state highways.
o Is money now available or is this just another study?
o Please define “expeditiously”.

- Preserve businesses at Four Corners (Blanche Dobbs)
- Concerned about property value (Antonio Cobacha)
- How will this project impact my property? (on list to receive map) (Barbara Mattas)
- Will my land be affected by any of the alternatives? (on list to receive map) Will homes and industry be built around the area? (Kathleen Alvendia)
- Wants alternative route to Boron and possibly Kramer Junction, other than SR 58 (Kenneth Todd Gunn)
- If animals, plans and trees need to be relocated, feel free to use their land (Deanne Brea)
- They own the land where the equipment will be sitting. Will they receive payment for use of their property? (Joseph N and Madaleine Betchner)
- Will billboards be made available? (Domingo Gutierrez, owns Domingo’s Mexican Restaurant in Boron)
- Consider effect on businesses and is concerned about road closures (Frank Gonzales)
- SR 58 should be designated as an interested freeway, not an expressway, from Barstow to I-5 because this is a major east/west corridor needed for national
defense and emergency crisis. The amount of goods movement dictates that cross traffic and RR grade crossings are hazardous. (Rex Moen)

- Don’t let the environmental review process cloud the need for a safe route (Bob McGinnis)
- Address “truck route” (Bob McGinnis)
- Don’t let the environmental keep the project from a timely completion. (Bob McGinnis)
- Width of roadway should be wider. (Bob McGinnis)
- The date of completion/start should be advanced. (Bob McGinnis)
- Is my property a subsidiary or will it be used? If my property is affected, will eminent domain be an issue? Will people be paid current market value? (Connie Noss)
- Would like to put a sign advertising the “Relax Inn Motel” on the freeway (Jack Patel)
- Need access to the open desert for people, recreation, horses, bikes, etc without going around and leaving trailer trucks in the desert. Suggests an overpass at Congo Rd with dirt road beneath. (Robert Hyden)
- With new road, the access to the open areas with motorcycles, jeeps, horses is restricted unless there is an overpass (Bill Bumgardner)
- Hopes this will start talks to widen 395 both north and south directions (Ben Bakke)
- At considerable expense, Caltrans has surveyed this route and done environmental studies such as drilling for contamination and concerns for the desert tortoise. Concerned about previous waste of money if new route is adopted. (James Darr)

**Information Requests**

**Map** (request more specific map that shows the alignment over APN).

- Dan Kane
- Balakhaneh Mansour (APN 491-211-06), Farmington/US 395
- Wayne Hollaway
- Donald Gray
- Dan Attaberry
- Barbara Yates
- Barbara Mattas
- James Kastris
- Max Frizzle
- Kathleen Alvendia
- Walter Hausser
- Dennis Mogerman
- Alan Kennedy (wants a big one, like at the scoping meeting)
- Bob McGinnis
- George Ahlers
Mailing list
- Dennis Mogerman
- Robert Nelson
- Victor Valencia
- Tri Cao
- Byron Cole
- Mindy McDonnell

Agency Comments
- CA DTSC (6-7-07 letter). Several (17) specific comments for EIR/EIS analysis (summarized below; refer to letter for complete comment).
  - EIR should identify current/historic uses at project site that may have released hazardous chemicals
  - EIR should identify known or potentially contaminated sites in project area. Several databases provided in letter
  - EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation/remediation for any site that may be contaminated
  - All env investigations, sampling or remediation for the site should be conducted under a Workplan approved/overseen by a regulatory agency with jurisdiction
  - Proper investigation, sampling and remedial actions should be conducted at site prior to new development/construction.
  - If property adjacent to site is contaminated with haz chemicals, the project area is in the “border zone” and appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction.
  - If buildings or other related highway transportation structures, asphalt or concrete-paved surface areas are to be demolished, an investigation should be conducted for the presence of other related hazardous chemicals.
  - If excavated soils are contaminated, it must be disposed properly.
  - Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during construction.
  - If it is determined that haz wastes will be generated, they must be managed in accordance with California Hazardous Waste Control Law.
  - If it is determined that haz wastes will be generated, they must be stored, treated, disposed properly.
  - If it is determined that haz wastes will be generated, the facility should obtain a US EPA ID #.
  - Certain haz waste treatment processes may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency.
  - If the project plans include discharging wastewater to a storm drain, a NPDES permit from RWQCB may be required.
  - If soil/groundwater contamination occurs during construction, construction/demolition must be halted and appropriate measures implemented.
  - If the site was used for agricultural or related activities, onsite soils and groundwater might be contaminated.
Envirostor (formerly CalSites) is a database primarily used by DTSC and is accessible through their website.

- **CA PUC (6-1-07 letter).** Letter states they are concerned that the new development may increase traffic volumes on streets, at intersections, and at at-grade highway/railway crossings, including pedestrian circulation patterns/destinations with respect to railroad ROW. Safety factors to consider include: planning for grade separations for major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade highway/rail crossings due to increase traffic volumes, and appropriate fencing to limit the access of trespassers onto railroad ROW. The city of Coachella should arrange a meeting with the Commission’s Rail Crossings Engineering Section and BNSF Railway to discuss relevant safety issues. (appears to be form letter)

- **CA RWQCB (June 1, 2007 letter).** The project requires development of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and a NPDES General Construction Stormwater Permit. The proposal does not provide specific info on how impacts to surface waters of the State and/or Waters of the US will be mitigated. The route should avoid waters of the state and design spans for all drainage areas.

- **BLM (June 4, 2007 email).** Add BLM to list of interested agencies and possibly cooperating agencies. Once the alignment alts and ROW width is identified, BLM will need to review to determine impact on public lands. BLM will likely prefer the alternative that uses the existing alignment given they manage the land for desert tortoise recovery. They would want any existing desert tortoise fences reconstructed, and appropriate culverts for use of desert tortoise and other wildlife constructed as feasible beneath the roadway. FHWA will need to consult with USFWS on this project.

- **U.S. EPA (6-7-07 letter).** Specific comments for EIR/EIS analysis (summarized below; refer to letter for complete comment).
  - **Air Quality.** The environmental document should provide a detailed discussion of ambient air conditions, NAAQS, criteria pollutant nonattainment areas, and potential AQ impacts. FHWA and Caltrans should include analysis of potential mobile source air toxics, as well as a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan for fugitive dust and diesel particulate matter. The Draft EIS should demonstrate the project is included in a conforming transportation plan and a transportation improvement program.
  - **Water and Wetlands Resources.** Existing conditions and environmental impacts with respect to waters should be assessed at an appropriate level of detail in the environmental document. Caltrans and FHWA should explore on-site alternatives to further avoid or minimize impacts to specific waters. The lead agencies should also assess indirect and cumulative impacts to CWA Section 404 waters, and coordinate with
NEPA/404 MOU signatory agencies to address agreement points early in the EIS process.

- Environmental Justice. The environmental document should identify whether the proposed project may disproportionately and adversely affect low-income and minority populations in the surrounding area and should provide appropriate mitigation for adverse impacts.
- Cumulative impacts. The environmental document should address cumulative impacts in light of reasonably foreseeable actions, including impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife communities.
- Growth inducement.
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments

(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project: I live in Boren and have seen traffic backed up from Boren west to county line many times.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration: I am looking at alternative D, without railroad project at Kramer. Cost to property owners also this alternative is less impact to existing businesses & homes. The need for detours will be minimized, rerouting road can be used.

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report: The room concern should be money good time completion (traffic bed).

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project: Low income families living in Boren and surrounding areas. If construction should try to employ as many people.

Your Information

Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Charles R Bills

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: PO Box 404

City, State, Zip Code: Boren, CA 93526

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8

Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch

464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

I APPRECIATE ANY INFORMATION ON FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: THOMAS COVLAN

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 289 LOWELL ST.

City, State, Zip Code: REDWOOD CITY, CALIF. 94062

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
*Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
A alternative looks to be the best for the truckers and residents.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
C alternative you still would have problems with oncoming traffic.

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report
D alternative would have on coming traffic.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project
We need businesses in town and all types of businesses.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: C Ream / Annice Beagel

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 11815 Nancy Ave

City, State, Zip Code: Font CA 93516

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

FUNDING FOR THIS PROJECT?

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: 
Agency/ Affiliation/ Interest: 
Street Address or PO Box: 
City, State, Zip Code: 

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Date

Purpose and Need for the Project

[Blank lines]

Alternatives Under Consideration

[Blank lines]

The Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

[Blank lines]

Conclusion

If you wish to remain anonymous, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain anonymous to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email it to the address provided below.

KEN ENGLERT

Name/Affiliation/Interest: AREA PROPERTY OWNER

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007

Street Address or PO Box: 1263 WARNER AVE
City, State, Zip Code: LOS ANGELES, CA 90024
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Date 5-18-07

Purpose and Need for the Project

The existing 2-lane corridor is dangerous. Motorists still continuing to cross dble. yellow lines to pass in "no-passing" sections.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

I LIKE ALTERNATIVE (B)

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

AFFECT ON BUSINESSES

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

CONCERN ABOUT CLOSURES.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: FRANK GONZALEZ

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: FREQUENT PATRON OF ESTABLISHED BUSINESSES

Street Address or PO Box: 12236 EL MIRAGE ST

City, State, Zip Code: BORON CA 93514

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments ___________________________________________ Date 5/19/2007
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Informed

Purpose and Need for the Project ___________________________________________

Project Alternatives Under Consideration __________________________________

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report __________________________________

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project ____________________________________

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below:

Name: BYRON COLE - BYRONC0LE@TGE.E.OG

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Property Owner 17.5 Acres APN: 0498-141-38

Street Address or PO Box: 3747-57 Vista Camarada

City, State, Zip Code: OCEANSIDE, CA 92057

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
Please keep me on your info list. Note signature for my email.
I am attaching a copy of your form.

byroncole@ieee.org  "eclectic polymath"
Phone 760-757-7239  Oceanside, CA
Pager 760-613-7239; FAX 413-480-5637

Now that's room service! Choose from over 150,000 hotels in 45,000 destinations on Yahoo! Travel to find your fit.

http://farechase.yahoo.com/promo-generic-14795097 COPY 003.png
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project: Expansion

Project Alternatives Under Consideration: (D) Alternative


Other Issues/Concerns About the Project: How would affect other project that is the project please see if this parcel affected 491-211-06 Farmingtom and State Hwy 395

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: BALAKHANEH MAHDI
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: LANDOWNER IN AREA
Street Address or PO Box: 17202 LYNN ST.
City, State, Zip Code: H.Beach, CA 92649

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
Yes, we need this Expressway. Accidents, traffic backed up for this. Are you planning to start the Expressway on the Lassen County side? It should go all the way.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
A highway overpass, one railroad track, would be great.

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report
C would be okay.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project
Thank you. I like this plan, the place to take place.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Shirley L. Johnson
Agency/Affiliation/Interest:
Street Address or PO Box: 21194 20 mile Team Rd Apt A.
City, State, Zip Code: Boron, CA 93516. Email: bignop560@ptnet.net

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

________________________

NO COMMENT.

Edward J. Echevarria
525 S. Greenwood Ave. #33
Montebello, Cal. 90640

LONG BEACH C.

21 MAY 2007 PM 7 T

Name: ________________________________
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: ________________________________
Street Address or PO Box: ________________________________
City, State, Zip Code: ________________________________

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Date 5-21-07

Purpose and Need for the Project
I have lived in Boron over 30 years and the biggest pain was when Kramer Junction 58 led to my son was killed he was 28 years old 2001 on Mother's Day. A day I'll never forget i'll never stop crying for my 3 sons on the road on the San Bernardino Hills and real bad I drive them.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: VIOLETA FORDYCE
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: please fix the roads so no one will die
Street Address or PO Box: P.O. BOX 640
City, State, Zip Code: Bakersfield, CAL 93506

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]
# SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need for the Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Alternatives Under Consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Issues/Concerns About the Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Your Information

Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: **GLEN LASLEY**

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: **CONCERNED CITIZEN**

Street Address or PO Box: **13360 GILBERT ST**

City, State, Zip Code: **N. EDWARDS, CA 93523**

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
-San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

*Comments due by June 21, 2007*
05/21/2007

Marie Petry  
Environmental Studies Branch  
464 West 4th Street  
6th Floor MS 821  
San Bernardino, CA 92401-4630

To: The Environmental Group,

This Proposed freeway project is LONG overdue. Just by the number of accidents caused by the S turn where the freeway ends from the west and the large number caused by having to cross the railroad tracks on a curve should be reason enough to construct this highway. In my estimation it would be much better to construct alternative B, realign with the existing freeway to the north. Stay north of the railroad tracks. The only reason for using alternative C would be to accommodate the businesses at Kramer Junction. To this I say no, do not cater to them. When Interstate 40 replaced the old route 66 in New Mexico they completely bypassed the cities like Gallup, and made a smooth flow of the curves required, but now the businesses built out by the freeway, including Wal-Mart. Let the businesses move, do not cater to pressure by the businesses at Kramer.

The travelers to Vegas and the truck industry will have a much quicker and safer trip thru this area when this freeway is competed.

Sincerely,

Glen Lasley  
13360 Gilbert St.  
North Edwards, CA 93523

[Signature]
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

TH PROJECT sounds good and
we have no conflict. We do have a small
farm on the land where your equipment will be sitting.
Are you going to build a fence for the equipment while you are on our property.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: JOSEPH N+MADALINE BETCHNER
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: TAX # 049835 002000 + Lot 3 TRACT 8217 w/25
Street Address or PO Box: 1945 N ROCK RD, APT 2784
City, State, Zip Code: WICHITA, KS 67206 PHONE: 316-652-9394

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
Business owner in Boron. I get a lot of traffic off of Hwy 58. Will billboards be made available?

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project
I would like to be kept informed of additional information regarding this project.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Domingo Gutierrez
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Domingo's MX. Restaurant
Street Address or PO Box: 27096 T.M.T. Road
City, State, Zip Code: Boron, CA 93516

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
Between Boron & Barstow on 58 there are way too many accidents. Traffic is always backed up at Boron on the weekends & holidays.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
I like this plan and I think it would work.

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Jennifer Colunga
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Boron Library
Street Address or PO Box: 26967 20 Mule Trm. Rd
City, State, Zip Code: Boron, CA 93516

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Purpose and Need for the Project:
Sounds like project is needed for safety concerns, to expedite traffic and reduce unnecessary congestion at the major intersection.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration:

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report:
I would like to know if the resource for this project includes any of my property.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project:
Personal concern: How will this project impact my personal property? My property is located off the road and I want to know if the project will require using any of my property.

Your Information:
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Barbara L. Mattus
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Land owner
Street Address or PO Box: 5832 E. Fairmount St.
City, State, Zip Code: Tucson, AZ 85712-4226

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
TRAFFIC SAFETY AND EXPEDITING COMMERCIAL CARGO.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
ALTERNATIVE "D" MORE COST EFFECTIVE BY BEING SOUTH OF RAILROAD

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report
NO CONCERNS WITH INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO ME TODAY

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project
NONE

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: GLENNETH HOWARD SLOAT
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: WE OWN SACRES SOUTH OF PROJECT
Street Address or PO Box: 617 MAYFIELD ST.
City, State, Zip Code: LAS VEGAS, NV. 89107

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 8:1
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: David D. Shin

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 3260 Condor Ridge Road

City, State, Zip Code: Yorba Linda, CA 92886

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: JOSE GUTIERREZ GLORIA GUTIERREZ

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 24116 Santa Fe

City, State, Zip Code: Hinkley, CA 92347

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project:

If possible, please send a clear
picture of the project from the Kern Co. border to the
Kramer Junction if 395. Thank you.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain
on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email
the information to the address provided below.

Name: WALTER E. HAUSser

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: OWNER OF LAND IN THIS AREA

Street Address or PO Box: 1196 - MONTICELLO RD.

City, State, Zip Code: LAFAYETTE, CA 94549

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Alan Ayuzi

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 10254 Pine Wood Ave

City, State, Zip Code: Fajnana, CA, 91042

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
ALTERN B THE BEST
ALTERN C PROBABLY NOT FEASIBLE

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report
ALTERN A. BUSINESSES WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THE NORTH BOUND TRAFFIC TURNING EAST PRIOR TO THE BUSINESS DISTRICT (ABOUT 60%) AXED.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Leslie C. Wise
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: BORON RESIDENT
Street Address or PO Box: 25642 Cherry Hill Dr
City, State, Zip Code: BORON, CALIF 93516

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
the information to the address provided below.

Name: Joseph J. S瞳ol TRUST
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: property owner (ten acres)
Street Address or PO Box: 2388 E. 1700 S.
City, State, Zip Code: SLC UT 84108

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Gary & Dorothy Kushner
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Property owner S.E. of Kramer Junction
Street Address or PO Box: 6,114 W 76TH ST
City, State, Zip Code: Los Angeles CA 90045

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Warren C. and Verma E. Godwin-Austen
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: We own land in the area.
Street Address or PO Box: 2702 Worthington Ave
City, State, Zip Code: Bakersfield, CA 93308-1543

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: NUMERIANO R. TOMAS

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 83 EL CORAZON CT.

City, State, Zip Code: HENDERSON, NV 89074

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
Could you please provide a map showing the proposed road in relation to my property described below. Thank you very much.

Parcel 1.

The North Half of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, of Section 27, Township 11 North, Range 7 West, S. B. B. M.

(For identification purposes known as 1 1/2 Acres #251)

Parcel 2.

The South Half of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, of Section 27, Township 11 North, Range 7 West, S. B. B. M.

(For identification purposes known as 1 1/2 Acres #230)

Get on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: JAMES J. KASTRIS

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: PROPERTY OWNER

Street Address or PO Box: 9418 DELANCEY DR.

City, State, Zip Code: VIENNA, VA. 22182 - 3409

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8

Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch

464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821

San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]
**SCOPING COMMENTS**

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project  
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose and Need for the Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Alternatives Under Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Issues/Concerns About the Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Your Information**

Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: **KARNA MESE**

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: **3432 MARY ANN ST.**

City, State, Zip Code: **LA CRESCENT, CA 92119**

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8  
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch  
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821  
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400  
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

**Comments due by June 21, 2007**
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

I own parcel
No. 0498-121-10-000, legal description W 1/2 E 1/2 NW 1/4 NE 1/4
SEC 27 T61N R7W 10AC

Will my land be affected by any of the Alternatives B, C, or D?

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Will homes or industrial be built around the area?

Your Information

- Pls. include me on your mailing list.

Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Kathleen Alvendia, Trustee of the Alvendia Trust

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 227 W. CALIFORNIA AVE

City, State, Zip Code: SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
As a national transfer, I come across things that could be improved for the benefit of those on the road more than once. I am responding to your article on widening Hwy 58.

I propose Hwy 58 from Barstow to Bakersfield be changed to I-40. Go north from Bakersfield with 99 & I-40 to 46. 46 to become I-40 to Paso Robles connecting with 101. This in turn would

The Federal Hiway Administration Could Put Gas Tax To Work For Us. As Well As I-40 Access To The Coast Instead Of Just San Francisco L.A. & San Diego. I-40, Coast To Coast Sound’s Good To Me. Please Consider.

Thank You

[Signature]
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project: It is very urgent that this project be completed because it has been on the drawing board for the last 19 years and with the surge in traffic accidents and fatalities.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration: [Sign below alternatives]

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report: [Blank]

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project: There is an undisturbed cemetery where the Route 58 crosses the Antelope Valley to be protected and undisturbed, even during construction.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or e-mail the information to the address provided below.

Name: [Sign below]
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: [Sign below]
Street Address or PO Box: 2422 SAGE AVENUE
City, State, Zip Code: BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA 93516

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]
Purpose and Need for the Project:

Too many people have been killed on Hwy 58 between Benton Siding and Hwy 395. Also, the congestion in this area is ridiculous on the 3-day weekends.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration:

C would be my first choice;

my second choice

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report:

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project:

Your Information:

Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Helen D. Vinten
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: 26634 Jessie St.
Street Address or PO Box: BORON CA 93516
City, State, Zip Code:

Return to:

Comments due by
June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: 

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: 

Street Address or PO Box: 

City, State, Zip Code: 

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W, 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
OUR FAMILY & FRIENDS ARE APHALED AT THE CARNAGE. THIS SECTION OF HIGHWAY 149
CAUSED OVER THE YEARS, WE FEAR ENTERING OR
LEAVING OUR PROPERTY DUE TO THE DENSITY &
SPEED OF TRAFFIC ON THIS OUR ACCESS

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
WE ARE ADAMANTLY IN FAVOR OF ALTERNATIVE B. WE ARE STRONGLY
OPPOSED TO A & C. WE WOULD NEED MORE
INFORMATION TO CONSIDER D

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report
WE WOULD
PREFER A SOLUTION THAT WOULD GIVE US A
ROUTE TO BORON & POSSIBLY KRAMER
JUNCTION, OTHER THAN HWY. 149 (POSSIBLY THE
CURRENT TWO LANE).

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project
WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE
NEW FOUR LANE SECTION AS FAR FROM OUR
HOUSE AS POSSIBLE DUE TO AUTO EMISSIONS.
IF WE CANT GET A PAVED ALTERNATIVE ROUTE
TO BORON (OLD HIGHWAY) WE WOULD LIKE
EASY ACCESS TO AN OVERPASS WITH ON RAMPS TO 58

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain
on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email
the information to the address provided below.

Name: KENNETH TODD GUNN (REPRESENTING GUNN
TRUST & OWNERSHIP OF 15 ACRES & BUILDINGS)
Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 545 MOSS AVE
City, State, Zip Code: PASO ROBLES, CALIF. 93440

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by
June 21, 2007
Purpose and Need for the Project:

- Conjunction relief
- Accident reduction
- Allows access to local services
- Eliminates the long curve & R.R. Track crossing just east of Boron which is a "no passing" area with a long history of accidents.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration:

Project Alternative "B" would be the best in my opinion.

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report:

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project:

Long-time in coming, way past due.

Your Information:

Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: JAMES WISE

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: NONE - Resident of Boron

Street Address or PO Box: 27218 Jerome St

City, State, Zip Code: Boron, Calif. 93516

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Date: 5-25-07

Purpose and Need for the Project
The traffic backed up from Hwy 395 crossing Clear Pass the Trail Road overpass "Baron Spur" on Hwy 58. Every time there is a 3-day holiday, on any given weekend it is hard to get out to the Kern River because of the congestion. Also so many people have had Fatal Accidents between Hwy 395 and the Kern River and Hwy 395. Please Do Something.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

" Looks like there is room for turning off onto 395 and the business at 4 corners."
"Would be my 2nd choice."

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project
We need the business at 4 corners. We should not bypass them or cut them off.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Blanche A Dobbs
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Local Resident
Street Address or PO Box: 12615 Sugar St
City, State, Zip Code: Bakersfield, CA 93316

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
The sooner the state fixes the highway 58 project the more lives will be saved the area between Kramers Junction and the end of the 58 four lane freeway just east of Boron is one of the deadliest roads in So Ca. when it was started years ago the state should have finished it. Lillie M Bluff 24136 Sage Boron, Ca  EMail lilliebs@hotmail.com

---

Catch suspicious messages before you open them—with Windows Live Hotmail.
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Date: 5-26-07

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: MARY M. MOHR
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: OWNS SEVERAL ACRES IN MURROCO AREA ET AL
Street Address or PO Box: 15358 AVENIDA RORITAS
City, State, Zip Code: SAN DIEGO, CA 92128
E-Mail: ALEXANDER955@WEBTV.NET

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by
June 21, 2007
FROM THE DESK OF:
MAX M. FRIZZELL
P.O. Box 190 • Minden, NV 89423
(775) 265-5082

May 26, 2007

Calif. Dept. of Transportation, District 8
ATTN: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1700

Dear Ms. Petry:

I own property in the vicinity of the State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project, more specifically identified as APN 498-251-32, 44, 46, 47 and 298-231-17.

I would appreciate if you would send me a plat showing the relationship of my properties to the entire project.

Thank you.

Sincerely, Max M. Frizzell
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

I would be in favor of Alternative 3 as it would bring the highway closer to my property possibly increasing its value.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: John Lemieux

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 23275 Lawson Rd.
City, State, Zip Code: Corona, CA 92883

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration  ALTERNATIVE D

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name:  JONATHAN ELI SUND

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box:  PO Box 273

City, State, Zip Code:  Banning, Calif. 92220

Return to:  California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn:  Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email:  Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by  June 21, 2007
Purpose and Need for the Project

As the area grows I believe the expansion is needed. Please do not wait until it is overly easy to get started.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Make transitions that are wide enough for ease of traffic, clogging etc.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Are you planning now for future growth? Let's include what the area may be like 15-25 years from now.

Your Information

Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Christine Rich

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Prop. over Boron

Street Address or PO Box: 1407 El Mirador Dr

City, State, Zip Code: Fullerton, CA 92835

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8

Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
LONG OVERDUE, FATALITIES ARE VERY HIGH IN THIS ZONE. I PURPOSE ALTERNATIVE "D" WITH NO OTHER RR OVERPASS END.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
D only

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report
No Comment

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project
No Project Concerns long overdue! Turn-out with proper garbage disposal this area is highly considered a dumping ground. Weekend dirt bike/motorcycle issue.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: James H. Meadows
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: clean-up contractor Bonded Ins.
Street Address or PO Box: 12959 Boron Av. Boron, CA.
City, State, Zip Code: Boron, CA 93516

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by
June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

* IT APPEARS TO ME A NEED TO CONSTRUCT A FOUR-LANE EXPRESSWAY ON STATE ROUTE 58 IN SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY AS STATED IN THE 3 PAGE I RECEIVED FROM YOU ON MAY 22, 2007. I WOULD FAVOR AS OF NOW THIS OR A JUNCTION EXPRESSWAY PROJECT.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: RUBEN JEBN KIBEL

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: * I OWN TWO LOTS IN SAN BERNARDINO CO. (SEE)

Street Address or P.O. Box: 1103 CATHEDRAL CIRCLE

City, State, Zip Code: MASON, AL 35758

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project: TO EASE TRAFFIC AND CONGESTION AT INTERSECTIONS

Project Alternatives Under Consideration: USING "B" PLAN FOR EXTENSION - THE USE OF A BARRIER & FREE FLOWING

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report:

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project: WILL THERE BE WALLS ALONG THE ROUTE?

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: __________________________

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Parcel 40492521060000

Street Address or PO Box:  Mr. Denis Braly
PO Box 6498
Farmington, NM 87499-6498

City, State, Zip Code: __________________________

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
Please keep me informed on the process by which alternatives will be considered and environmental considerations.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Dennit Moyerman
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: I own road front property on 58 near Kramer
Street Address or PO Box: 12405 Venice Blvd #169
City, State, Zip Code: Los Angeles, CA 90064

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
Plan D seems the most cost effective for the tax payers.

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Financial
Impact on local people and businesses at Kramer Junction should be taken into consideration.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Matthew Cooke
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Long term resident of the area
Street Address or PO Box: 38490 N. Mt. View Rd.
City, State, Zip Code: Hinkley, CA 92347

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
Hello: Some writing was answered to your inquiry regarding the SR58/Kearny Junction Expressway Project. Apologies for not using your Comment Form; I did not realize your return address was on the back side of the form. I had made notes/written on written it so small that it felt it to be unreadable—so unable here to state my comments as free and concise as possible. Sorry.

[Handwritten note: I disagree with your reasoning. Page 2: Congestion Relief accident reduction, expanding existing facilities, and improving access to local services—all necessary.]

[Handwritten note: Alternate C (Kearny SR58) still has an at-grade railroad crossing in the curve area where the Old Road Boron (entertainment) meets SR 58. This would still be a problem. As for Alternate D (south of SR58) the curve at-grade rail crossing would still be a problem. Alternative B (north of SR58) would not have this curve railroad crossing problem. This new expressway could be built north of the curve crossing and north of any at-grade railroad tracks. The problem note: Alternate B could be built North of the railroad crossing and tracks from the Boron Spur Bridge to the-]
issue/permission to address). The railroad service should be considered. There is NO need to use the Above Curve Alternative B. It eliminates the railroad situation. There is already a hard-packed/graded dirt roadway from the bridge over the railroad tracks.

This roadway has at-grade utility/equipment boxes and electric utility/telephone poles are located a short distance north of this roadway. Another (Ungraded Roadway) could be used in a 4-lane expressway-to-access roads or an/exit median strip or with a little work.

Alternative B: going North above the railroad tracks and the crossing. This eliminates the need for bridge spans and other area problems. This means less expensive construction cost...

Note: I again wish to apologize to you for sending this handwritten letter in the place of your formal letter.

I would like to receive (from you) any further feedback and/or documentation in regards to all possible alternatives. I have received mail-outs/letters/documents in the years...

Open to Public 2009 Why are we still on Step 1 (above)?
your inquiry regards project scope. my colleague did not realize the size of the proposed project. i am sure that we, as a team, can work out the necessary details. thank you again.

so far, alternative B (north west) would not have the curve-railroad crossing problem. this new expressway could be built to north of the curve crossing and north of any at grade railroad tracks. problem note: alternative B' could be built north of the railroad crossing tracks from the boone span bridge to the...
Dan Ottoberry
4033 Jo-Mullein Rd
Borax CA 93516

Better map
larger more detail
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Krame
Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you want to be on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project. Please provide comments or if the information to the address provided below.

Name: Joan Jones Patrick
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Property owner
Street Address or PO Box: P.O. Box 2700
City, State, Zip Code: Calif City, CA 92504

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
MUCH NEEDED - IMPERIAL
LIKE TO SEE SB ALL THE WAY TO I-15

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
ALL LOOKS OK.
CALTRANS DECIDE THE BEST ROUTE

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report
NONE

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project
NONE

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: UNDO N · UTARA NAIR
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: AHAP (PROPERTY OWNER IN THE AREA)
Street Address or PO Box: P.O. Box 2805
City, State, Zip Code: HELendale, CA 92342

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by
June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
Complete Hwy 58 Freeway to Barstow

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
B - Most practical and efficient to build

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: William D. Hicks
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Land Owner
Street Address or PO Box: 7647 Sunnylakes Ave
City, State, Zip Code: Winnetka, CA 91306

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

HOW WILL IT AFFECT MY

Project Alternatives Under Consideration


Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project


Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: DONALD W. GRAY

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 31 - 16400 SAYBROOK LN.

City, State, Zip Code: HUNTINGTON BEACH CA. 92649

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
ROSCOMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
Death toll in teenagedrus.
Holiday and weekend traffic is backed
up to miles on 58, both east and west.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration
ALTERNATIVE D would seem
most logical.

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report
ALTERNATIVE D would require no business to be purchased, thereby being less expensive. Savings could be used at vicinity end of freeway.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Ed SAUSER
Agency/Affiliation/Interest:
Street Address or PO Box: P.O. Box 327
City, State, Zip Code: BERON, CA 92596

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Dorothy J. Pearce, Co-trustee
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: APN 770 0498-161-05 35, 0498-251-39
Street Address or PO Box: 7721 Swara
City, State, Zip Code: Downey, CA 90240

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dol.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Antonio CoBach
Agency/Affiliation/Interest:
Street Address or PO Box: 8471 Avenida Aniquua
City, State, Zip Code: Spring Valley, CA 91977-6202

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
June 13, 2007

Marie Petry,

I recently received a letter from the Environmental Studies Branch of the California Department of Transportation, District 8, outlining an upcoming meeting at Kramer Junction, California. This meeting will focus on the multiple choices associated with the future freeway plans within District 8.

I am unable to attend this meeting, but I would like to offer comments and concerns associated with this expressway project.

I believe this project is long overdue, especially considering the dangerous route that now exists where Highway 58 transitions from the two lane road to the freeway near the county line, and the long delays associated with the “clogged arteries” at the 58 and 395 highways. The turn lane and exit where westbound traffic exits Highway 58 to reach Boron is a poor design and I hope it is re-designed. Basically, we are much safer any time we can go from two lane highways to multiple lane freeways.

Lastly, and almost as important, I hope there is much study conducted prior to and during the construction phase in regards to the old community of Kramer. As I’m sure you know, this was an 1880s railroad siding and center of much mining activity in this part of the Mojave Desert. This is a historically rich area in artifacts, local history, and must receive the special consideration it deserves. Thorough archaeological and cultural studies must be undertaken to preserve this most unique heritage.

Thanks for your time and consideration. Should you require any volunteers for this endeavor, I would be willing to participate.

Respectfully,

Deric English
24261 Sage Avenue
Boron, CA 93516
englishdjcn@yahoo.com
760762-6208

MINING RELIC COLLECTOR
-Preserving Our Mining Heritage-

Deric A. English
Buy, Trade & Sell
Mining Tools, Books, Paper, Union Items, Mining Photos, Tokens, Randsburg, Calico, Mojave, Ghost Town, 20 Mule Team, etc.

24261 Sage Ave Boron, CA 93516
(760)762-6208 englishdjcn@yahoo.com
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
TOO MANY ACCIDENTS ON THE TWO LANE STRETCH OF HWY 58 (EAST & WEST) FROM BORON TO HINKLEY!

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project
MUST BE DONE! DON'T "WAIT" FOR MORE LIVES TO BE LOST!

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: LORRAINE RYAN-BELL
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: 
Street Address or PO Box: 27154 ANDERSON ST. BORON, CA 93516-1604
City, State, Zip Code: 

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dol.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project
1 1/2 miles Wg 395
1/2 mile Wg 38

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Un fortunately we are unable to
attenda nce 8 6 - 31 - 07 6 - 14 - 07

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. Lina & Sally Coleman
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: (Not Front & Patty Colesoon per envelope)
Street Address or PO Box: 1931 Post Chelsea Place
City, State, Zip Code: Newport Beach, CA 92660

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project: Having lived in Bakersfield all of my life after the freeway was constructed there have been hundreds of fatalities on this stretch of road. The construction of the freeway is long overdue. Over the past 5 years since the no passing stripes have been added it has come down on accidents.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration: I believe Alternative D is the best solution. Since the government already owns a portion of the land, it seems feasible that it would be less costly.

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report: You can't hurt anything out there.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project: If the freeway is not constructed, you should place "K" rail in the center of lanes from SB line to Kramer Jct. to further reduce fatalities.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Ed Sauser

Agency/Affiliation/Interest: 

Street Address or PO Box: PO Box 581

City, State, Zip Code: Boron CA 93596

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8

Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch

464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
Purpose and Need for the Project

Traffic is terrible. Can take us 20 minutes or more to exit our road east or west bound. Accidents are many.

Congestion needs to be relieved. There can be up to a 10 mile backup on weekends and more on holidays.

People will go off on desert dirt roads and go onto private property to go around traffic. Thus this cause traffic jams and other accidents.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

We would consider the sale of our property if either northern routes are decided. We will be to close to the traffic and noise. We moved to the area to be off the road and would become to close to it. Plus we need emergency services due to the fact that handicapped and disabled individuals live at the residence full time. Plus we feel our privacy will be violated. Animals are kept for activity to keep active and feel the noise would cause them distress.

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report
We are concerned about the no access value to our property. It would make us go almost 5 miles out of our way to access our property on any given day. Our road is accessed by Hwy 58. Will this be protected? At this time we maintain our own road for the 1 mile length. Who would maintain it or would it stay the same?

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Wild life in the area are many. We have seen bobcat, coyote, chipmunk, tortoise, quail, cottontail, jack rabbit, roadrunners, hawks, as well as migrating birds as well as trantulas through out the year. We are also concerned about the services we are provided such as propane delivery, phone service, water delivery and emergency services. We have been informed emergency services could take almost twice as long due to having to go out of normal access. We were informed by emergency services they will not go down utility access roads to provide service. The wild life have come to accept us as we do not interfere with their normal migration. They stop and water and rest at our property. Some of the wildlife even reside on our property during their migration. Are concerned about their well being in the event since they due envolve us in their migration.

During spring wild flowers grow wild and concerned about their loss as they are needed for the desert eco system.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: Bruce and Barbara Baker ________________________
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: ____________________________
Street Address or PO Box: 41463 Corneso Road
City, State, Zip Code: Boron, California 93516
E-mail: bnbbaker_rockcreekranch@verizon.net

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

Comments due by July 20, 2007
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]
SCOPING COMMENTS

State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments (Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project

RARELY IS THERE TRAFFIC BACKUP OUT HERE OCCASIONALLY ON WEEKENDS OR HOLIDAYS, UNLIKE THE CITY AREAS OF SAN BERNARDINO OR VICTORVILLE WHERE THERE IS A TRAFFIC JAM DAILY. MOST DAYS (350) TRAFFIC MOVES ALONG SMOOTHLY. I SEE IT EVERY DAY, I'M HERE 350 OF THEM.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

GO ON EXISTING 58, TAKE THE PUTTY PROPERTY OF CHEVRON PROPERTY ON NO. SIDE, ADD ONE LANE WHERE CHEVRON PROPERTY EXISTS. THERE ARE 4 NOW, ADD TWO MORE LANES FROM FRUIT TO FRUIT. IT IS NOW 2 LANES, IT WILL BE FOUR ALL THE WAY. THIS SHOULD BE AFFORDABLE. IF ENOUGH MONEY, OVER PASS RAILROAD TO WEST, THIS WOULD HOLD THIS AREA FOR ADDITIONAL ISSUES/RESOURCE AREAS TO BE ADDRESSED IN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/REPORT FOR 100 YEARS.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

GOING SOUTH WOULD KILL OUR BUSINESS: THERE IS NOT ENOUGH WATER IN OUR AREA TO HAVE ADDITIONAL GROWTH. EDWARD AFB DOES NOT WANT GROWTH IN THEIR FLIGHT ZONE. WE COULD POSSIBLY EXIST WITH EXPRESSWAY TO NORTH OF 58. GIVE THE BUSINESSES A FAIR PRICE, AND BUY US OUT OF YOUR WAY. THIS IS NOT GOOD FOR BORON, OR THE MOTORING PUBLIC. THEY WILL BE OUT OF BUSINESS AND RESTAURANTS!

Your Information

Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: KAREN CALMIER
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: FOUR CORNERS SERVICES
Street Address or PO Box: 6158 HWY. 58
City, State, Zip Code: BORON, CA, 93516

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
June 2017

On May 30th, 2017, I mailed to you a copy of your SESE Highway inquiry/comments as you requested (to arrive before June 18th, 2017). Also included was a hand-drawn map in regards to extending SESE. I sent an (SASE) self-addressed stamped envelope with the request that you place (in the SASE) a note stating that you had received my letter/and comments. I have received...[I have read/certified/signed/received, and seven/found the Mailman filling in the Post Office form Data fragment].

That is the reason I could not (envelope) to people...you will/try to write a note saying that you received my letter/and comments. And then, just to drop the SASE in my mailbox (at the post office) if so now, Jan. 30th, 2022. And then, a response from you...if you would have sent the SESE back to me. I was prepared to send you more information (including some pictures/photos/professional maps). And an original copy of the surveyor's map from 1941, which had handwritten written comments in regards to the composition of the ground/grade level and under surface layers before. I have maps of the entire region (above/below) the railroad tracks that cross over SESE at the curve east of Boron. I have taken pictures (photos) of the (foot) (hand-pick) gravel roads that lead from the Boron open bridge east to Kincaid Corner. With
me in Telephone poles And Equipment.

utility loco's shown. I have spent a lot of time on the Board, as seen. And I knew my information might have been some help to you at your bureau 1-2 1 meeting. Sorry I had to miss it due to physical problems. I had hoped that you might send to me any important information you felt I should use from this meeting.

Oh well, if someone can not maintain a date, how could anyone expect to receive any further communication or information?

Please note: I do not expect nothing further from you, I do not expect anything from you. Do not send me any forms, questionaries or comment requests.

I don't need you, you don't need me.

Please enjoy your life and don't let my words upset you.

Ps: The equipment facility has B.L.N. Marked traces.
June 25, 2007

I wish to voice my opinion as to the various routes for realignment of Hwy 58 in the vicinity of Kramer Jct.

I have participated in all the public meetings that were held at Kramer Jct. from about the year 2000 to date.

I have a financial interest in the outcome.

The route through the middle would seem out of the question. The southern route would be devastating to the economy of the whole intersection. The northern route would most likely have the least impact on the intersection.

The Cal Trans had published a paper around year 2002 stating that the northern route was adopted. At considerable expense Cal Trans has surveyed this route and done environmental studies such as drilling for contamination and concerns for the desert tortoise. Having been present on a daily basis at the Jct. I have not noticed any change that would cause the route to be changed. I am sure that the traffic has remained in the same general proportion as before. No new business have located that would alter this original determination. I am very concerned about the previous waste of money if a new route is adopted.

I am always available for comment and would like to be kept appraised of the route adoption process.

James Darr
40716 Hwy 395
Boron, Ca. 93516

Office (760) 762-5220
Fax (760) 762-8957
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Date 6-26-07)

(Purpose and Need for the Project)

Number of traffic issues that have taken place on this heavily traveled roadway

(*) Alternative # 2: My choice

Project Alternatives Under Consideration

Maps should have been on a flat table so as to get more people around the area of interest

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report

Don't let the environmental issues keep the project from a timely completion

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project

Width of roadway should be advanced.

I thought the displays at the '10 owners meeting' were informative than at the '07 meeting

Your Information

Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email the information to the address provided below.

Name: [Signature]

Agency/Affiliation/Interest:

Street Address or PO Box: 4303 A

City, State, Zip Code: [Signature]

Return to: California Department of Transportation, District 8

Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch

464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821

San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by July 20, 2007
SCOPING COMMENTS
State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Your Comments
(Attach extra paper if you need more room for your comments)

Purpose and Need for the Project: This project needs to be implemented
to reduce traffic delays and accidents. The sooner the better. I am for it 100%.

Project Alternatives Under Consideration: The best alternative would be "B", then
"D", lastly "C".

Issues/Resource Areas to be Addressed in Environmental Impact Statement/Report:
The existing property & property access.

Other Issues/Concerns About the Project: Because we are being affected if
Alternative "C" is implemented, I would not like to see the business being affected.

Your Information
Clearly print your name, your interest or affiliation, and address if you provided comments or if you want to remain
on the mailing list to receive additional information about the project and the EIR/EIS. Return this form or email
the information to the address provided below.

Name: Paul NY, APN 0498-232-15
Agency/Affiliation/Interest: Would like to remain on the list
Street Address or PO Box: 1259 S. Marango Ave
City, State, Zip Code: Alhambra, CA 91803

Return to:
California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 621
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400
[Email: Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov]

Comments due by June 21, 2007
Paul Ng  
1209 S. Marengo Ave  
Alhambra, CA 91803  

June 27, 2007  

Attention: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch  
California Department of Transportation, District 8  
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821  
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400  

In my opinion, the best Alternative fix for the SR58 is the Alternative B due to the fact the S curve in this alternative is the smoothest one among all. By moving the existing SR58 northerly, it will be safer for motorists and at the same time fewer existing homes in that area will be affected; moreover, the existing business in the intersection will not be affected. I think this the best option.  

The second best Alternative would be the Alternative D. This is also a great option, but the S curve will be less smooth that Alternative B option.  

The last Alternative would be Alternative C due to the fact most businesses would be affected which I would not like to see. We need more businesses in Kramer Junction to boost the area and generate more traffic and people so that the economy in the area can growth.  

My major concern, and that of my neighbor, with this project implementation is the access to our existing properties. We are located at Corneso Road ¾ miles northerly from SR58. Is this road going to be closed? Is Caltrans or the San Benardino County going to create a new access/road to our properties? Since that the SR58 is moving next to our properties; as a result, the noise level will be increased are we going to be compensated for that and how much? I want to make sure that my property is not land locked!!!  

I would appreciate that you provide me with the answer to the above concern. Thank you.  

Sincerely,  

[Signature]  

Paul Ng  
APN# 0498-232-15  
Cell (626) 297-7608  
Email: png582001@yahoo.com
June 27, 2007

California Department of Transportation, District 8
Attn: Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 821
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

Re: Scoping Comments for State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

Ms. Petry:

On May 30, 2007, Kern River Gas Transmission Company ("Kern River"), a subsidiary of MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company, received a request for comments from your agency regarding the proposed State Route 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project. Kern River has reviewed the information you provided about the project and is submitting the following comments for your consideration as part of the Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") that is being prepared for this project.

Kern River and the Mojave Pipeline Company ("Mojave"), a subsidiary of El Paso Natural Gas Company, jointly own two 42 inch high-pressure interstate natural gas transmission pipelines known as the Common Line immediately south of the existing State Route 58. Mojave operates this system and it currently delivers more than 1.5 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day to delivery points in California—enough to serve more than 9.5 million residential natural gas customers per day. Kern River also owns and operates the 24 inch High Desert Lateral and its associated metering station that provides natural gas to the High Desert Power Plant near Victorville, California. In addition to these facilities, Pacific Gas and Electric Company and Southern California Gas Company operate delivery interconnections from the Kern River system to receive natural gas from the Common Line within the Kern River meter station area (see attached figures).

Kern River is dedicated to providing a reliable, safe and environmentally sensitive means of transporting natural gas. From the information provided in the scoping notification letter it appears that Alternative D would impact Kern River’s existing easements and facilities. Ensuring the continued safe operation and maintenance of company facilities including preserving the rights of existing easements is a priority of Kern River. To accomplish this, Kern River implements a strict right of way encroachment program.
Any right of way encroachment must be coordinated and approved by Kern River prior to any activities on the right of way. I have enclosed Kern River’s Developer’s Handbook which outlines standards and procedures that must be followed when working on the Kern River right of way. Please take a moment to familiarize yourself with this handbook and its information. It would be advisable to contact the Mojave Pipeline Operating Company to identify their encroachment requirements and specifications. Contact information for this company is as follows:

Mojave Pipeline Operating Company
c/o: James Wheeler, Bakersfield Area Manager
5401 Brundage Lane
Bakersfield, CA 93307-2960
Phone: 1-661-363-4035

Kern River has concerns that implementing this alternative would seriously impact the company’s facilities and ability to fulfill its contractual delivery obligations. The responsibility to compensate Kern River for financial losses and the costs associated with relocation of existing facilities due to the proposed project would fall upon the project proponent; these costs will be significant.

If you have any questions or concerns with this letter please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Douglas Gibbons
Land Representative

cc: Dave Dahl, James Wheeler, Project File
Kramer Junction Expressway Alternatives
San Bernardino County, CA

Figure 2

June 7, 2007
Kern River
Here you go. Thanks for writing back.
Laurence Maller
W.A. Thomas Co.
Estimator/Project Manager
(925) 228-9600 x17
(fax) 228-6932
2356 Pacheco Bl.
Martinez, CA 94553

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Diana Roberts
To: Laurence@wathomas.net
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2008 2:26 PM
Subject: Caltrans District 8 Kramer Junction project

You recently requested information about the proposed Caltrans District 8 Kramer Junction project. My company is working with Caltrans to complete the environmental documentation, and we are also assisting them with responding to requests for information.

If you will provide me your mailing address, I will add you to our database of interested parties. We plan to send out an information packet quite soon.

Thank you,
Diana Roberts
Jones & Stokes
Associate Consultant
2841 Junction Avenue, Suite 114 • San Jose, CA 95134
P: 408.434.2244 ext. 2204 • F: 408.434.2240
droberts@jsanet.com • www.jonesandstokes.com

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail
From: Marie Petry [mailto:marie_petry@dot.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2008 5:08 PM
To: Kate Giberson
Cc: Terri Kasinga
Subject: Fw: please handle - thanks

Kate - Could you please make contact with Laurence and add him to the mailing list. Thank you.

Marie J. Petry
Office Chief, Environmental Studies/Support B
Phone (909) 383-6379
Fax (909) 383-6494
marie_petry@dot.ca.gov

----- Forwarded by Marie Petry/D08/Caltrans/CAGov on 02/21/2008 05:04 PM -----

Hi Terri:

I forwarded your comments to Marie Petry, as her unit has the Kramer Junction project. Thanks.

Irene Dominguez
Environmental Planner/Support A
(909) 388-7068 fax (909) 383-6494
464 W. 4th Street, 6th Floor, MS 823
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

----- Forwarded by Irene Dominguez/D08/Caltrans/CAGov on 02/20/2008 07:35 AM -----

Terri Kasinga/D08/Caltrans/CAGov To
02/20/2008 07:36 AM

To
02/15/2008 10:30

Page 1
Caltrans is here to get you there!

Terri Kasinga
Public Information Officer
Caltrans - District 8
Phone (909) 383-6799
Fax (909) 383-6822
----- Forwarded by Terri Kasinga/D08/Caltrans/CAGov on 02/15/2008 10:30 AM
-----
laurence@wathomas.net ()
02/14/2008 03:49 PM
d8.public.affairs@dot.ca.gov To
SR-58 Kramer Junction Comments cc

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (laurence@wathomas.net) on Thursday, February 14, 2008 at 15:49:54

comments: Do you have a mailing list for updates to this project? Please add my address to it. Thank you!
Submit 2: Send E-mail

Page 2
From: Kate Giberson  
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 12:22 PM  
To: Diana Roberts  
Subject: SR 58 Kramer - mailing/info request

-----Original Message-----
From: Marie Petry [mailto:marie_petry@dot.ca.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 10:53 AM  
To: Kate Giberson  
Subject: Fw: Kramer Junction

Kate - Please send Mr. Collins the information requested, including the schedule and projects information, also add him to the mailing list. Thank you.

Marie J. Petry  
Office Chief, Environmental Studies/Support B  
Phone (909) 383 - 6379  
Fax (909) 383-6494  
marie_petry@dot.ca.gov

----- Forwarded by Marie Petry/D08/Caltrans/CAGov on 02/26/2008 10:49 AM -----

paul.collins@us.mcd.com  
02/26/2008 10:27 AM  
marie_petry@dot.ca.gov  
cc  
Kraemer Junction

Marie- Good speaking with you. As mentioned please add me to any email and/or mailing lists for future information relating to improvement plans for Kraemer Junction. See address below.

Additionally, I would appreciate any information relating to the build/no-build options currently being considered. A diagram/illustration of the potential realignment would better allow us to evaluate impact to a McDonald's restaurant. Again we are investigating a site at Kraemer Junction and would like to best understand what highway improvement options that are being considered.

Thanks again,

Paul Collins  
Area Real Estate Manager  
McDonald's USA, LLC  
3800 Kilroy Airport Way, Suite 200  
Long Beach, CA 90806  
Main: (562) 753-2001
The information contained in this e-mail and any accompanying documents is confidential, may be privileged, and is intended solely for the person and/or entity to whom it is addressed (i.e. those identified in the "To" and "cc" box). They are the property of McDonald's Corporation. Unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or copying of this communication, or any part thereof, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please return the e-mail and attachments to the sender and delete the e-mail and attachments and any copy from your system. McDonald's thanks you for your cooperation.
From: Kate Giberson
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 1:15 PM
To: Diana Roberts
Subject: FW: please respond - thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: Marie Petry [mailto:marie_petry@dot.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 12:59 PM
To: Kate Giberson
Subject: RE: please respond - thanks

I have another person to add to the mailing list. SoCal Business Broker, Oscar Nasiri, 22033 Clarendon St. #101, Woodland Hills, CA 91367. Thank you.

Marie J. Petry
Office Chief, Environmental Studies/Support B Phone (909) 383 - 6379 Fax (909) 383-6494 marie_petry@dot.ca.gov
From: Ramon Pagtalunan [Ramon.Pagtalunan@varian.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2008 3:59 PM
To: Diana Roberts
Subject: Re: your request for information about Caltrans SR-58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

Ok it's
1635 Sequoia Blvd
Tracy, CA 95376

Thx,
Ramon

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Diana Roberts <DRoberts@jsanet.com>
To: Ramon Pagtalunan
Subject: your request for information about Caltrans SR-58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

Thank you for your inquiry regarding the Caltrans SR-58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project. We would be glad to send you an information packet if you would provide your U.S. mailing address.

Diana Roberts
Jones & Stokes
Associate Consultant
2841 Junction Avenue, Suite 114 • San Jose, CA 95134
P: 408.434.2244 ext. 2204 • F: 408.434.2240
droberts@jsanet.com <mailto:droberts@jsanet.com> • www.jonesandstokes.com
<http://www.jonesandstokes.com/>

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail
--- Original Message ---
From: Marie Petry [mailto:marie_petry@dot.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 9:32 AM
To: Kate Giberson
Subject: Fw: please respond - thanks

Kate - Could you please send Mr. Pagtalunan the information requested and add him to the mailing list. Thank you.

Marie J. Petry  
Office Chief, Environmental Studies/Support B  
Phone (909) 383 - 6379  
Fax (909) 383-6494  
marie_petry@dot.ca.gov

---

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (ramon.pagtalunan@varian.com) on Monday, February 25, 2008 at 19:00:33
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
comments: Dear,

Just wondering what the time line is for the Kramer project? Has the construction begun? Who can I contact about any other future plan(s) around Kramer junction? I'm interested because I have a piece of land a mile east of the junction.

Best Regards,
Ramon Pagtalunan
Submit2: Send E-mail
Baker info req 3-26-08

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Marie Petry [mailto:marie_petry@dot.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2008 6:36 PM
To: Kate Giberson
Subject: Fw: SR 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

Kate - Please mail Ms. Baker the latest mail out. Thank you.

Marie J. Petry
Office Chief, Environmental Studies/Support B
Phone (909) 383-6379
Fax (909) 383-6494
marie_petry@dot.ca.gov

----- Forwarded by Marie Petry/D08/Caltrans/CAGov on 03/24/2008 06:34 PM-----

"BARBARA BAKER"
<bnbbaker_rockcre
ekranch@verizon.net> <Marie_Petry@dot.ca.gov> To
03/24/2008 05:56 PM cc
SR 58 Kramer Junction Expressway Project

Dear Ms. Petry,

My husband and I are interested in what is going on with the highway project for SR58. We had Men out on the 18 of March. As well as the 19th. They were scoping the area in front of our home. We are the north home on Corresno. (0498232170000)

We are interested in finding the outcome of where the plans are at this time. We would appreciate your response.

Thank you,
Bruce and Barbara Baker
760-762-5216

I am using the free version of SPAMfighter for private users. It has removed 634 spam emails to date. Paying users do not have this message in their emails. Try SPAMfighter for free now!
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Community input sought in Highway 58 project

By AARON AUPPERLEE
July 3, 2007 - 5:17PM

With Caltrans improvement projects on the block for State Route 58 in both Hinkley and Kramer Junction, the affected communities have spoken up with concerns, suggestions and, in some instances, completely different plans.

Caltrans held two scoping meetings, one in Hinkley and one in Kramer Junction, at the end of June to present preliminary projects for the widening of Highway 58 through the two areas. The Kramer Junction meeting occurred two days before five people died in a collision in the area. More than 100 people attended the meeting in Hinkley, surprising even Boniface Udotor, the office chief of the California Department of Transportation’s Environmental Branch.

“It was interesting,” Udotor said. “I didn’t think we’d have such a welcoming reception.”

Udotor said he presented different alternatives to the widening and re-routing of Highway 58 through Hinkley, answered questions and gave those in attendance a chance to draw their own solutions on a blank map of the area. The project currently has four alternatives.

• Alternative one: Keep Highway 58 as is
• Alternative two: Widen Highway 58 to four lanes and move the highway about one-half mile south
• Alternative three: Widen the existing Highway 58
• Alternative four: Widen Highway 58 to four lanes and move the highway about one-half mile north

“Some people wanted it out of Hinkley, especially business owners,” he said.

Steve Hawkins, who lives in Hinkley near Highway 58, attended the Hinkley meeting. He said there were a lot of questions and not a lot of answers from the Caltrans representatives. Some of the alternatives, he said, did not make much sense.

“I don’t see any logic in it,” he said.

The best alternative, according to Hawkins, would be to re-route part of Highway 58 to the south on Fairview Road. However, this alternative will not please everyone.

“I know one person who’s not going to be happy,” Hawkins said. “It goes right through his property.”

Although some may not like the alternatives, Brian Crawford, a Hinkley resident, said few would disagree that something needs to happen to Highway 58. He said the road is unsafe. Hawkins agrees.

“To go across the highway, it is almost impossible,” he said.

According to the California Highway Patrol, a number of traffic collisions have occurred on
the stretch of Highway 58 through Hinkley. Last year, 20 collisions resulting in one fatality and eight injuries happened. Four of the 20 collisions were because of someone driving under the influence, CHP Officer Greg Smoak said.

As of June 2007, 10 collisions have occurred, no fatalities and three injuries. Four were the result of DUls.

Caltrans lists safety as a primary reason for improving the roadway. A document provided by Caltrans stated that Highway 58 is currently overwhelmed by traffic and “extra big trucks” and that traffic on the highway is expected to more than double by 2003.

Smoak welcomes the improvements to Highway 58 but said real safety begins with the many drivers who take to roadway.

“With any road improvement, it is going to help, but you still have those with severe drive habits who will continually break the law,” he said. “People are in too big of a hurry. They’re either speeding or passing when it’s unsafe.”

Udotor said more meetings will be held about the Hinkley project, and he does not expect construction to begin for some time.
Council will vote on new police chief

FROM STAFF REPORTS
May 21, 2007 - 7:18AM
BARSTOW - The City Council will decide tonight whether to give the OK to a contract for Lt. Dianne Burns, whom City Manager Hector Rodriguez has recommended for Barstow's new chief of police.

Burns, who now works with a gang task force in Las Angeles, must get the City Council's approval and pass a background check and physical exam before joining Barstow's force. According to the contract, she would begin on June 18.

Councilmember Joe Gomez said Friday that he plans to vote in favor of approving Burns' contract. Other Council members said on Friday they had not had time to review materials from the city and thus had not yet made a decision.

The Council's 7:30 p.m. meeting will also include a public hearing on a proposed hike in development sewer connection fees, the introduction of Public Works manager Todd Edwards and a staff report on the community Fourth of July celebration. Also, the Council will consider reducing the temporary event permit fee cost to $25 for non-profit groups and $75 for other applicants.

Main Street reconstruction begins next week

Reconstruction on West Main Street from Avenue L to Sandstone Court will begin on May 29, which will cause some lane closure and possible side street closures. Turning restrictions, detours and speed reductions may be needed as well. This may affect access to some local businesses.

"The City's contractor will attempt to maintain access to the businesses, but there will be times that when driveway closures will be essential to complete the contracted work," according to a city press release.

The project's expected completion date is June 22. For more information about the project, call Domingo Gonzales at 255-5156.

Ashburn pushes redistricting, term limits bill

Sen. Roy Ashburn, R-Bakersfield, is pushing legislation that would change the redistricting process, term limits and campaign reporting requirements.

Senate Constitutional Amendment 9 passed the Senate Committee on Elections, Reapportionment and Constitutional Amendments this week, according to a press release. The measure will go before the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 29.

If passed, the effects of SCA 9 would include:

- A requirement to report contributions during the final 30 days of the legislative session to the Fair Political Practices Commission;
- Withholding legislative pay during budget stalemates;
- The online posting of "report cards" for each member of the legislature with the number of hearings and meetings attended;
- Annual hearings on the oversight of state government;
- The creation of a citizens' commission to draw district boundaries
- A revision of term limits to allow a maximum of 12 years in the Assembly and/or the Senate.

Widening of Highway 58 proposed

There will be a come-and-go scoping meeting concerning the possibility of widening State Highway 58 from 4 to 7 p.m. Thursday, June 21 at the Roadhouse Restaurant at Kramer Junction.

Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration have proposed widening the two-lane portion of the highway to four lanes. The change would affect about 13 miles of highway near the Kern County line.

Written comments on the proposal will be accepted at the scoping meeting and through June 21. Comments can be mailed to Marie Petry, Environmental Studies Branch, 464 W. 4th Street, 6th floor, MS 821, San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400.
Highway safety concerns
By JEFFREY E. MITCHELL/Staff Writer

ADELANTO — As investigators continued sifting through the charred wreckage of Friday’s crash that killed five young people on Highway 395, local officials on Monday renewed their call for the state to take action to improve safety on the heavily traveled two-lane highway.

While they acknowledge the old road’s design may have nothing to do with latest deadly crash, the fact that now more than 40 people have died on Highway 395 between Palmdale Road and Highway 58 since 1997 troubles them deeply.

“We need to wait to determine exactly what caused this tragedy, but I think that it’s pretty obvious that Highway 395 needs to be redesigned and made safer,” Adelanto Mayor Tristan Pelayes said. “Given the speeds the people are driving and the amount of traffic this road is now handling, two lanes are inherently dangerous.”

The 7:06 p.m. crash occurred when a southbound 1988 Chevrolet pickup crossed the highway’s center line at Adelanto Road and collided head-on with a northbound semi-truck.

Four males and a female traveling inside the pickup were instantly killed. Over the weekend, two of the victims were identified as Peggy Cowlisahw and Nolan Flesher. San Bernardino County Coroner’s officials were still working late Monday to identify the remaining three victims, whose bodies were burned after the vehicles caught fire. The truck driver, identified as Timothy Cassady, 57, of Redding was not injured.

Road improvements proposed

While seemingly resisting the idea of widening or adding passing lanes to the highway for many years, representatives of the California Department of Transportation said Monday they have recently added two proposals to build passing lanes on the thoroughfare.

Ivy Estrada, a Caltrans spokeswoman, said she could not provide details as to how or why the passing lane projects were added to the agency’s 2004 budget, but said the agency does try to listen carefully to input from citizens and elected officials.

The Caltrans proposal calls for the state Legislature to choose between one of two passing lane projects:

• Project 1 calls for the construction of two passing lanes in each direction on the highway from State Route 18 to Kramer Junction. This project would run 15.7 miles in length and would cost an
estimated $17.7 million.

- Project 2 calls for the construction of single passing lanes on the highway from just north of Shadow Mountain Road to Kramer Junction. This project would run 9.1 miles in length and would cost $7.5 million.

Estrada said that should the state Legislature select one of the projects, the decision would initiate several months of design and environmental studies. She declined to estimate when actual construction might start or how long it would take.

The grieving continues

As the families of the most recent five people to die on Highway 395 slowly come to grips with their losses, Victorville Mayor Mike Rothschild said his city along with his colleagues in Adelanto will continue to press Caltrans and other state officials to make the thoroughfare safer.

Rothschild on Monday said he welcomed Caltrans’ most recent lane passing proposals.

“I think it is a sign that they understand that we have a very serious problem,” Rothschild said. “In the meantime, I hope people will slow down, drive with their headlights on and show a little more courtesy to one another out there.”

Jeffrey E. Mitchell can be reached at jeff_mitchell@link.freedom.com or 955-5358.

Return to Desert Dispatch
New interchanges in SANBAG five-year plan
Freeways: Roads project will also widen highway 395.

EMILY BERG/Staff Writer

VICTORVILLE — The San Bernardino Associated Governments board of directors gave its approval to $256 million for transportation projects for the next five years.

The project list includes preliminary work to widen Highway 395 and new Interstate 15 interchanges at La Mesa and Nisqualli roads as well as at Eucalyptus Street. The California Transportation Commission still needs to approve the projects in December before any work can begin.

SANBAG approved $4 million to fund the five-year process of environmental studies to widen Highway 395 from Kramer Junction to Interstate 15. It will also pay for part of a study to determine if the roadway can be realigned, said Cheryl Donahue, spokesperson for SANBAG.

The plan is to make it four lanes and possibly realign it to eliminate some of the hills and curves, Donahue said.

Critical areas of the roadway pass through Victorville, Hesperia, Adelanto and some unincorporated areas, Donahue said.

“That’s kind of the high priority area through there,” she said.

The cost of the total project is about $14 million. SANBAG will contribute $4 million, Caltrans $4 million and Kern, Inyo and Mono counties will contribute the remaining $6 million, Donahue said.

A new interchange across Interstate 15 at Nisqualli Road on the east and La Mesa Road on the west is in the plans as well. The interchange would be located between the Palm Dale and Bear Valley roads.

“We are anticipating this interchange because it’s a greatly needed alternative to Bear Valley Road, which is highly congested,” she said.

The interchange would ease traffic traveling east and west as well as improve access to the Mall of Victor Valley, Donahue said.

SANBAG will cover 40 percent of the cost and the city of Victorville will fund the remaining 60 percent, Donahue said.

Another interchange could go in at Eucalyptus as a joint project between the cities of Victorville and Hesperia.

The existing interchange at Old Highway 58 in Barstow is also scheduled for reconstruction work.
The total cost of the three interchanges is $40 million.

The funding is provided by the 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program.

Traffic is a growing concern for San Bernardino County residents, said SANBAG officials.

Traffic congestion ranked third in the Inland Empire Annual Survey conducted in the winter of 2000. It had risen from fourth place the previous year. The survey ranks the concerns of 1,000 county residents.

Return to Desert Dispatch
Installation of safety improvements to cause delays on Highway 395

By MIKE CRUZ/Staff Writer

ADELANTO — Motorists will face minor delays on Highway 395 starting Monday morning, as work crews install improvements designated under the highway's Safety Corridor status, California Department of Transportation officials said.

Crews are scheduled to install rumble strips into the center median on Highway 395, said Terri Kasinga, Caltrans spokeswoman. Rumble strips are grooves carved into the asphalt that alert a motorist with a loud thumping noise when a vehicle leaves the lane, she said.

"It eliminates passing," Kasinga said. "There will be a no passing zone out there in that area. And that is to ensure that people stay in their lane, and they don't try to pass."

Caltrans crews will work on the project from 7 a.m. to about 4 p.m. for about three weeks. Lane closures will be necessary, but traffic delays will be minor, Kasinga said. California Highway Patrol officers and flagmen will be on hand to control traffic.

The installation of rumble strips will cost $167,000, Kasinga said, and they will officially run from 7.3 miles north of the Palmdale Road and Highway 395 interchange to 13 miles south of the Highway 58 interchange, she said.

The Victor Valley's portion of Highway 395 was designated a safety corridor by the state Office of Traffic Safety on June 8. OTS officials granted the CHP at least $348,000 to help carry out safety improvements.

The grant will provide funding for a public safety awareness campaign, better signage and more officers patrolling Highway 395 from Interstate 15 to Highway 58 at Kramer Junction, officials said.

While funding won't officially kick-in until spring 2005, the CHP will begin meeting with officials from sheriff's stations in Adelanto and Victorville and other Highway 395 Task Force members later this month to begin putting plans together.

"It's going to be enforcement for unsafe passing and speed," said Capt. Dave Navarro, commander of the CHP's Victorville station.

While commuters will see more officers on the highway, plans also include significant public education and media notification about safety improvements.
Mike Cruz can be reached at mike_cruz@link.freedom.com or 951-6276.
Driving east on State Route 58 through Kern County isn’t so bad, that is until you cross the San Bernardino County line just east of Boron. Masses of trucks and cars must squeeze from four lanes of traffic down to two lanes. Drivers must negotiate a twisty, undulating stretch of road. Why this highway hasn’t been widened to four lanes is incredible, since 58 is considered the third busiest truck corridor in all of California.

In 1995, there were 49 fatalities east and west of Kramer Junction and over a hundred recorded injuries. After 12 years, the number of accident related injuries no doubt has increased. On any given Sunday afternoon, westbound traffic on 58, east of Kramer Junction, is backed-up for miles as the road intersects with Highway 395. It’s not uncommon to see frustrated motorists who are caught in these traffic jams taking risks by driving their vehicles off 58 and into the desert to find that bumpy dirt road paralleling the railroad tracks in an effort to get around this bottleneck. The San Bernardino Association of Governments, who determines road priorities in this county, has actual videos of these massive traffic jams.

The San Bernardino Association of Governments earmarked 130 million of Proposition 1B funding to fix the two lane stretch of 58 that bypasses Hinkley, but the California Transportation Commission vetoed this proposal in favor of other priorities for 2007. Motorists who have driven this section of Highway 58 know the road conditions through Hinkley, and passing anybody on this road is nearly suicidal until the road widens at Lenwood.

Help is needed to bring attention to driving conditions on Highway 58. Please express your concerns by writing a letter to Mr. Will Kempton, California Transportation Commission, 1120 N St., Room 2221, Sacramento, CA 95814.

—Dennis Tope
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