APPENDIX B –SECTION 4(f)

Summary

This appendix documents the project’s compliance with Section 4(f) of the US. Department of Transportation Act. It includes Section 4(f) Evaluation for one property (the Kinsey Mansion) and *de minimis* determinations for three Section 4(f) properties. It also includes a discussion about other resources evaluated in relation to the requirements of Section 4(f). The table and figures below summarize all Section 4(f) properties and use status.

Table S1: List of Section 4(f) properties and use status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>Type of Property</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Kinsey Mansion located south of Quail Lake at 34860 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td><em>Use</em></td>
<td><em>Use</em></td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Angeles Aqueduct (which intersects SR-138 near the community of Neenach, around 300m east of Three Points Road)</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td><em>De minimis</em> impact</td>
<td><em>De minimis</em> impact</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Big Creek East-West Transmission Line that intersects SR-138 below the Bailey Substation</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td><em>De minimis</em> impact</td>
<td><em>De minimis</em> impact</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Big Creek Hydroelectric System Historic District</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td><em>De minimis</em> impact</td>
<td><em>De minimis</em> impact</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Bell Telephone and Telegraph Switching Station located southeast of Quail Lake along SR-138</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Antelope-Magunden #2 Transmission Line that intersects SR-138 just east of 140th Street West</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Transmission Line</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hungry Valley Off Road Vehicle Recreation Area (west of I-5 and SR-138 intersection)</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Neenach Wildlife Sanctuary at 210th Street, north of SR-138</td>
<td>Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Desert and Mountain Conservation Authority Natural Reserve at SR-138 (south of) and 150th Street</td>
<td>Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The conservation parcel owned by the MRCA (Mountain Recreation and Conservation Authority) at SR-138 and 212th Street, south of SR-138</td>
<td>Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 13, 14</td>
<td>The conservation parcels owned by the MRCA (Mountain Recreation and Conservation Authority) in the vicinity of the project</td>
<td>Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S1: Section 4(f) Properties in the Vicinity of the Project – Map A
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B 1 -Section 4(f) Evaluation

The environmental review, consultation, and any other action required in accordance with applicable federal laws for this project is being, or has been, carried out by Caltrans under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to 23 USC 327.

This Section 4(f) Evaluation was completed using information from the Finding of Adverse Effect for the 138 NW Corridor Project (2015), Noise Study (2015), Visual Impact Assessment (2016), Natural Environmental Study (2016), Air Quality Study (2015), and Water Quality Study (2015).

1. Introduction

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, codified in federal law at 49 United States Code (USC) 303, declares that “it is the policy of the United States Government that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.”

Section 4(f) specifies that the Secretary [of Transportation] may approve a transportation program or project . . . requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance, or land of an historic site of national, state, or local significance (as determined by the federal, state, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, area, refuge, or site) only if:

- There is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and
- The program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.

Section 4(f) further requires consultation with the Department of the Interior and, as appropriate, the involved offices of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in developing transportation projects and programs that use lands protected by Section 4(f). If historic sites are involved, then coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) is also needed.

2. Description of Proposed Project

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), propose to widen and improve approximately 36.8 miles of State Route 138 (SR-138) between the Interstate 5 (I-5) interchange and the State Route 14 (SR-14) interchange.

The existing facility is a 2-lane highway that contributes to the local circulation network and provides an alternate route for east-west traffic in northwest (NW) Los Angeles County. The NW SR-138 Corridor Improvement Project (project) would widen SR-138 and provide operational and safety
improvements. The project corridor spans east-west approximately 36.8 miles (Post Mile [PM] 0.0 to PM 36.8) in the NW portion of Los Angeles County, just south of the Kern County border.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section describes the proposed action and the project alternatives that were developed to achieve the identified purpose and need of the project while avoiding or minimizing environmental impacts. The alternatives are the No Build Alternative, Alternative 1 (Freeway/Expressway) with or without a design option for a bypass around Antelope Acres, and Alternative 2 (Expressway/Conventional Highway).

SR-138 is an undivided 2-lane highway that travels from I-5 around the south side of Quail Lake and east to SR-14. SR-138 is not a controlled-access facility; access and egress points include at-grade intersections with paved and unpaved roads and driveways. The existing roadway consists of two 12-foot lanes with variable shoulders ranging from 2- to 4-foot paved to 8 foot unpaved non-standard shoulders.

The purpose of the project is to improve mobility and operations in northwest Los Angeles County, enhance safety within the SR-38 Corridor based on current and future projected traffic conditions, and accommodate foreseeable increases in travel and goods movement within northern Los Angeles County.

The need for the proposed project is derived from foreseeable increases in travel demand that would exceed the current capacity of SR-138 and higher than average state-wide fatal accident rates at several locations.
2.1. Project Purpose and Need

The purpose of the project is to improve mobility and operations in northwest Los Angeles County; enhance safety within the SR-138 Corridor; and accommodate foreseeable increases in travel and goods movement within northern Los Angeles County.

The project is needed to improve mobility and operations on SR-138 and in NW Los Angeles County and enhance safety within the SR-138 Corridor based on current and future projected traffic conditions.

The project would accommodate foreseeable increases in travel and goods movement within northern Los Angeles County. In the coming decades, NW Los Angeles County is anticipated to experience large-scale growth and economic activity, which is projected to generate traffic volumes that would exceed the capacity of the existing facility. In addition, the existing corridor has limited passing opportunities, steeper grades with slower moving vehicles, limited or no paved shoulders, utility poles within the roadway right-of-way, unlimited access to the roadway from adjoining parcels, and a lack of intersection channelization that allows traffic to turn outside of through traffic lanes. Furthermore, fatal accident rates are much higher than the state average.
Please see Chapter 1: Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR/EIS for additional information.

2.2. Project Alternatives

There are three alternatives under the proposed project and they are the following: 1.) No Build Alternative 2.) Build Alternative 1 (Freeway / Expressway) with a design option for a Bypass around Antelope Acres, and 3.) Build Alternative 2 (Expressway / Limited Access Conventional Highway). These alternatives are described in detail below.

ALTERNATIVES

NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE

Implementation of the No-Build Alternative would maintain the existing configuration of SR-138 and would not result in improvements to the route. However, additional residential, commercial, and interregional development is anticipated to occur in Antelope Valley in the future. With Los Angeles to the southeast and Bakersfield to the northwest, this area is poised for large-scale growth, which is anticipated to result in increased traffic demands beyond the capacity of the existing system (Caltrans, 2008).

The No-Build Alternative would not accommodate the projected population growth or expected substantial increase in goods movement truck traffic in Northern Los Angeles County and the existing corridor would not be improved. As discussed in the Project Study Report/Project Development Study (PSR/PDS), the existing SR-138 corridor is projected to degrade and operate consistently at a Level of Service (LOS) E and F for 2040 conditions (Caltrans, 2008). The No-Build Alternative could result in indirect impacts on air quality, mobility, safety, and the economy within Northern Los Angeles County. There would be increased maintenance costs to maintain the route without any other improvements.

BUILD ALTERNATIVE 1 | Freeway – Expressway

Alternative 1 (Freeway/Expressway) would include a 6-lane freeway from the I-5 interchange connector ramps to County Road 300th Street West, and a 4-lane expressway from County Road 300th Street West to the SR-14 interchange generally following the existing alignment of SR-138. There would also be improvements to the I-5/SR-138 and SR-138/SR-14 freeway connections and structure over the SR-14. Study limits on I-5 are from PM 79.5 to PM 83.1 and on SR-14 the limits are from PM 73.4 to PM 74.4.

BUILD ALTERNATIVE 1 WITH DESIGN OPTION 1 Antelope Acres Bypass

Antelope Acres Bypass. There is a design option with this alternative to include a bypass route around the Antelope Acres community. This option was developed to reduce the impacts to the existing residences of Antelope Acres due to the proposed four-lane expressway along the existing alignment of SR-138. The alignment would bypass the community to the north along West Avenue C and going from west to east, the alignment would begin to deviate from the existing SR-138 near 100th Street West and continue in a northeasterly direction towards West Avenue C. After paralleling West Avenue C for approximately one mile, the alignment would
continue in a southeasterly direction back towards the existing SR-138, and eventually join the existing SR-138 near 70th Street West. The existing highway would be relinquished to the County as a local roadway between 100th Street West and 70th Street West, with additional speed reduction measures proposed to reduce cut-through traffic.

BUILD ALTERNATIVE 2| Expressway – Conventional Highway

Alternative 2 (Expressway/Highway) would include a 6-lane freeway from the I-5 interchange connector ramps to Gorman Post Road, a 6-lane expressway from the Gorman Post Road interchange to County Road 300th Street West, a 4-lane expressway from 300th Street West to County Road 240th Street West, and a 4-lane limited access Conventional Highway from County Road 240th Street West to the SR-14 interchange, generally following the existing alignment of SR-138. There would also be improvements to the I-5/SR-138 and SR-138/SR-14 freeway connections and the structure over the SR-14. The study limits on these connectors would be the same as Alternative 1; on I-5 from PM 79.5 to PM 83.1 and on SR -14 the limits are from PM 73.4 to PM 74.4.

For Alternative 1 (with or without the Antelope Acres Bypass design option), and Alternative 2, new overcrossings would also be considered at various intersections with local roads including 60th Street West, 90th Street West, 110th Street West, 170th Street West, 190th Street West, 210th Street West, and Three Points Road to enhance traffic safety and improve local vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle circulation.

Common design features of Alternatives 1 and Alternative 2 are:

- The improvement of three non-standard curve locations on the existing alignment to 80 miles per hour (mph) design speed;
- Utility pole relocations would be required throughout the corridor and new easements would be required for maintenance access;
- Relocations of existing and proposed Southern California Edison (SCE) and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) high voltage transmission lines may be required at four or more locations;
- Improvements to both the I-5 and SR-14 interchange connections to improve the existing ramps;
- Use of existing roadway as a local frontage road in areas where the proposed alignment deviates from the existing alignment to provide local circulation or to maintain current parcel access. The existing highway would be relinquished to the County as a local roadway;
- Two existing bridges at the I-5/SR-138 separation for the SB connections (Bridge #53-1798 L and R) within the project area have non-standard vertical clearance. No improvements are proposed;
- Existing drainage system along the corridor would be modified and replaced as needed to be compatible with the proposed facility. Cross culverts with sufficient capacity would be installed at various locations to allow for passage of the 100-year storm event without overtopping the roadway;
- Alignment options that reduce impacts to Quail Lake. This includes the elimination of the standard median and use of a barrier to reduce the impacts to a historic property and hillside adjacent to Quail Lake;
• Existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be maintained and/or enhanced. The existing bicycle routes south of SR-138 and east of 245th Street West would continue to be utilized. These routes follow parallel County Roads. Between 300th Street West and 245th Street West, bicycle access would be provided by utilizing the existing SR-138 roadway which would be replaced by the proposed alignment south of the existing. Further west, the new access road proposed along the overhead utility corridor between the Cement Plant Road and 300th Street West would accommodate bicycle access. To maintain the continuity of the bike routes within the western project limits, a bicycle path is proposed along the access road between the highway and Quail Lake outside of Caltrans R/W.

• Traffic Management Plans (TMP) would be developed during final design;

• Maintenance vehicle pullout locations and other considerations would be coordinated with Caltrans Maintenance staff;

• Construction staging would require that one lane of traffic in each direction be open to the public at all times. The anticipated construction staging would allow construction of new lanes adjacent to the existing lanes (either north or south of the existing roadway), allowing traffic to continue to use the existing lanes during construction. Then traffic would be allowed to use the new lanes during the construction of the remaining lanes over the existing roadway; and

• Vegetation removal within the SR-138 corridor would likely be required to complete the project. Dust control measures would be implemented.

For more information about the project description, see the EIR/EIS, Chapter 2.

2.3 Alternatives considered but eliminated from further discussion

As part of the previous studies, the following alternatives were considered and rejected from further consideration:

• The Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative was developed to strategize improvements to the facility without major changes to the overall capacity. This alternative had improvements to the vertical and horizontal roadway alignment in areas that are currently non-standard, shoulder widening, localized intersection improvements, and additional lanes to improve safety and traffic flow at focused areas. Upgrades to signage and lighting were also evaluated to improve safety and operations.

• The TSM Alternative was studied and evaluated in all of the technical studies for the proposed project but does not meet the purpose and need of the project. As a stand-alone alternative it could not improve mobility and operations, enhance safety within the SR-138 Corridor, and accommodate foreseeable increases in travel and goods movement within northern Los Angeles County. However, it could be implemented as an early phase to Alternative 1 to improve safety and assist in the short-term goals of the overall project.

• A six-lane freeway proposal from I-5 to SR-14 was previously considered based upon the findings from travel demand forecasts completed as part of this study. However, research suggests that a six-lane facility is not required east of 300th Street West, and such findings are consistent with what was previously studied and recommended as part of the 2004
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NCCHCS Study and subsequent 2008 PSR (PDS). The Freeway was also not warranted east of 300th Street West as limiting the access to interchange locations would require significant interchange construction to provide freeway access along the entire corridor. An expressway type facility provided the flexibility of providing access without having to construct full freeway interchange access and was more consistent with the types of access required east of 300th Street West. This option was removed from future consideration.

- An alignment option was requested through stakeholder meetings to go to the north of Quail Lake. Although this would provide more room for the full six-lane divided facility, it had significant environmental issues. This alternative was shown to cross sensitive habitat and considered undesirable from an environmental impact standpoint. It would have major impacts to the Quail Lake drainage shed along the northern portion of the lake. Furthermore, its configuration posed access challenges for property owners such as the State Department of Water Resources to Quail Lake and the California Aqueduct System. Crossing the aqueduct would require a very large and costly structure similar to the one that was built for the existing Cement Plant Road. For these reasons, this alternative was removed from further consideration.

- During the PSR (PDS) alignment studies, an alternative to move the road further south around Quail Lake was considered. This was an attempt to avoid impacting a historic resource (Kinsey Mansion) immediately adjacent to Quail Lake. This alternative required significant earthwork and impacted the existing hillside just south of the lake. The impacts and costs for this alignment option was too significant to consider further. For this reason, this alternative was removed from further consideration.

- Alignment along the Ridge Route was studied briefly in the PSR (PDS) as well as during the initial review of possible alignments of this current study. The Ridge Route is a very physically constrained alignment that runs along mountainous terrain and has significant limitation when compared to the current alignment of the existing SR-138. Major earthwork would be needed to provide a similar high capacity alignment alternative. Significant alignment design exceptions would be required and these would be considered inferior to the existing alignment due to cost, impacts, and limited access to the facility. Due to these impacts and associated challenges, this alignment alternative was also removed from further consideration.

- The Median Rail Alternative was also considered at one point which included passenger rail service along the SR-138 corridor between I-5 and SR-14. The Median Rail Alternative would be incorporated into the Build Alternative 1 between SR-14 and 300th Street West by preserving an 86-foot wide median for future roadway widening or passenger rail service. However, between 300th Street West and I-5, this Median Rail Alternative was eliminated and a narrower 22-foot wide median was proposed instead to avoid impacting the West Branch of the California Aqueduct, as well as preventing a full take of a historic structure and extensive grading along the hillsides south of Quail Lake.

- The Full- Viaduct Option over the south side of Quail Lake was considered specifically to avoid the use of the historic mansion as Section 4(f) property. It is also a variation of Build Alternatives 1 and 2. In this option the proposed alignment would be placed north of the existing
SR-138. This would require the proposed build alternatives to be placed on two separate 58 feet wide mile-long viaduct structures spaced 40 feet from each other over the south side of Quail Lake. By placing the roadway on mile-long viaducts, this alignment configuration presents major longitudinal and cost impacts. This alternative’s estimated construction cost would be an additional $165 million and would have the potential to permanently impact wetlands along the south side of the lake. Additionally, this alternative would require additional right-of-way (ROW) acquisition from the Department of Water Resources (DWR), which is not anticipated to be accepted by the DWR. This alternative, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration due to the multiple factors outlined above.

- The Half-Viaduct Option north of the existing highway is a variation of Build Alternatives 1 and 2 and partially over Quail Lake. This option was considered specifically to minimize the impact to the historic mansion while reducing the impact on Quail Lake and its surrounding wetland as would happen with the Full-Viaduct Option. At the Quail Lake location, this alignment would use the existing highway for the eastbound travel lanes and widen the westbound travel lanes. Such a configuration would require the westbound travel lanes to be placed on a mile-long viaduct structure over the south side of the lake. This alternative would cost an additional $80 million to construct and impact a total of more than 5 acres of wetland. Furthermore, the alignment would also eliminate DWR’s current access along the lake frontage and would hamper their maintenance operations and overall access to the lake and aqueduct. This alternative would require Department of Water Resources (DWR) right of way along and on Quail Lake which is not expected to be accepted by DWR. In addition, this alternative would require relocation of overhead utilities from the north to the south side of the road in front of the Kinsey Mansion. Such an undertaking would require an access easements that could be combined with the Kinsey Mansion access driveway and would be south of the existing highway and on the Kinsey Mansion parcel. Because of the multiple factors outlined above this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

2. **Description of Section 4(f) Properties**

The Section 4(f) property being evaluated in this document is the historic Kinsey Mansion. The Kinsey Mansion is privately owned and is located south of Quail Lake at 34860 Lancaster Road within the APE. The property faces north overlooking a vast front lawn and consists of ornamentation and statues, a white picket fence, and views of Quail Lake. Access to the property is from a personal driveway with two-point access to SR-138, secured behind fencing and gates.

The Kinsey Mansion was found eligible for inclusion on the National Register at the local level of significance under Criterion C with a period of significance equal to its construction date of 1946. The Kinsey Mansion is eligible under Criterion C because it is as an excellent high-style example of Neoclassical architecture in Los Angeles County. In addition, the Kinsey Mansion retains sufficient integrity to convey that significance. SHPO has concurred on the eligibility for the National Register of this property.

Contributing elements to the Kinsey Mansion include its massing, Georgian-style pediment over the door, Chinese Chippendale railing on the roofline façade, side wing, full-façade porch, and classical columns along the porch façade. In addition, the mansion is a rare example of Neoclassical
architecture in the desert area of Los Angeles County. The large front yard that includes decorations, lawn ornamentation, statues, and other iconic features contributes to the feeling and setting of the mansion. Contributing elements to the significance of the Kinsey Mansion property include the mansion building at the southern end of the property and the front lawn bounded by a driveway on both the eastern and western ends of the lawn and a white picket fence on the northern end, adjacent to SR-138 (Figure 2). Non-contributing elements include the detached garage in the rear of the property and the two smaller residential buildings east of the mansion, but within the same parcel and property. These buildings are not related in construction dates or architectural influences. For more information about this property please see the Cultural Section of the DEIS/EIR.

Figure 2: Kinsey Mansion

3. Impacts on Section 4(f) Property

Land incorporation/Section 4(f) use:

Build Alternatives 1 and 2 each propose to construct a new alignment for SR-138 which would impact the front lawn of the Kinsey Mansion property. The State of California would purchase approximately 4 acres from this historic property as transportation ROW. The main building and side building would not be impacted. However, many of the Mansion’s Neoclassical eclectic design-defining features such as the white picket fence and large half-circle private driveway, as well as the iconic lawn ornamentation would be cleared. Therefore, under both of these Build alternatives, land from this historic property would be permanently incorporated into the proposed transportation facility-SR 138
(Figure 3). This would constitute a use under Section 4(f) and would result in an adverse effect on the Kinsey Mansion under Section 106.

Figure 3: Relationship between Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and the historic Kinsey Mansion
(Alt. 1 and Alt. 2 overlap each other at this location)

*Under the No Build Alternative:* The Kinsey Mansion would remain fully intact with views of Quail Lake. There would be no adverse effect to the Kinsey Mansion with this alternative. Therefore, there would be no use of this property under Section 4(f).

**Accessibility**

Under Build Alternatives 1 and 2, the original access to the property directly from SR-138 would be eliminated. The project proposes to provide access to the house by placing a frontage driveway along Caltrans ROW to the Gorman Post Road interchange.

Under the No Build Alternative, no new alignment, features or construction activities are proposed at this location. No change or impact to mansion access would occur.
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**Visual**

*Under Build Alternatives 1 and 2:*

Residents of the mansion would experience a visual impact. Due to the physical widening of SR-138, the white picket fence would be removed and approximately half of the mansion's front yard would be taken. A low retaining wall would be installed to hold back the slope and a frontage road would be created to provide access for residents of the mansion. Several mature non-native trees would be removed and would provide a greater view of Quail Lake and the new highway corridor. The presence and view of the highway would be increased both through proximity and increased size of the facility, as well as the loss of trees blocking that portion of the view. For viewers, motorists, and other travelers along the newly constructed corridor, the view of the mansion would be altered with the removal of trees, removal or relocation of some lawn ornaments or artifacts, and closer proximity of the eastbound highway lanes to the mansion itself. The mansion would be seen in a smaller yard, but set off by being apparently raised up on the retaining wall - the height would not be changed, but there would be a psychological or optical effect. Although the mansion would be closer to eastbound traffic, this effect of being raised up by the retaining wall would serve as a kind of mitigation trading one type of distance for another. Overall the visual impact at this location is moderate. It should also be noted that the modified setting of the mansion would be sufficient to convey the character defining features of the historic resource, therefore the visual changes would not contribute to an adverse effect under Section 106.

Mitigation measures include treating the retaining wall with a rustic rock finish and installation of fencing visually similar to the original fencing, as well as planting trees in the front yard per coordination with the property owner. These measures would reduce the impact of the proposed changes and could increase the visual vividness of the resource.

Under the *No build Alternative,* no new alignment, features or construction activities are proposed at this location. No change or impact in the view of or from the Mansion would occur.

**Noise**

*Under Build Alternatives 1 and 2:* Based on the results from the Noise Study Report, the noise level is expected to increase by 12.3 dBA at the Kinsey Mansion. A soundwall was considered for noise abatement at the edge of shoulder along eastbound SR-138, between Gorman Post Road and Cement Plant Road in front of the historic Kinsey Mansion. However, feasible and reasonable analysis for this sound wall concludes that this sound wall is not reasonable to construct. Therefore, this sound wall would not be included in the project based on 23CFR772;

*Under the No build Alternative:* There would be no increase in noise level at this location. Therefore, no noise impact to the mansion would be expected.

**Air Quality**

The Air Quality Impact Study concludes that no federal violation would result from the implementation of these alternatives; therefore, there would be no adverse permanent air quality impacts to the Kinsey Mansion.
During construction, a short-term worsening of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions generated by site preparation, excavation, grading, hauling, and other activities related to construction. Emissions from construction equipment are also anticipated. However, measures AQ-1 to AQ-6 (see Section 3.6, Construction Impact, Air Quality, of the EIR/EIS for more details) would substantially reduce the short-term air quality impacts during construction of these alternatives, ensuring compliance with air quality regulations and minimizing air quality impacts to the mansion during project construction.

**Vegetation and Water Quality**

The results of the Biological studies show that some trees and vegetation on the mansion property would be removed as part of project construction. Such vegetation includes developed scrub oak chaparral, rubber rabbitbrush scrub, non-native species and ornamental trees. Some of the vegetation provide foraging habitat for select species of birds and raptors, which include sensitive species. However, there is very low potential for these species to occur within the impacted area and the proposed clearing and removal limits would not destroy or modify designated critical habitat.

Due to the foraging habitat provided by these plant communities, Caltrans would provide a qualified biologist on-site to implement avoidance and minimization measures during construction. See the Measures to Minimize Harms Section below for more information about these measures.

No water quality impacts to the mansion would be expected as the result of the project.

### 4. Avoidance Alternatives

Alternatives to the use of Section 4(f) property have been evaluated. These alternatives are discussed below.

#### 4.1. Alternatives that would not require the use of any section 4(f) property

According to the FHWA’s Section 4(f) Policy Paper, an avoidance alternative is an alternative that would avoid any use of Section 4(f) property. Below is the discussion of the alternatives that would not require the use of any Section 4(f) property.

23 CFR 774.17 set forth six factors to consider when determining whether an alternative is prudent. 23 CFR 774.17 (3) specifies that an alternative is not prudent if:

(i) It compromises the project to a degree that it is unreasonable to proceed with the project in light of its stated purpose and need;
(ii) It results in unacceptable safety or operational problems;
(iii) After reasonable mitigation, it still causes:
   (A) Severe social, economic, or environmental impacts;
   (B) Severe disruption to established communities;
   (C) Severe disproportionate impacts to minority or low income populations; or
   (D) Severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes;
(iv) It results in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of an extraordinary magnitude;
(v) It causes other unique problems or unusual factors; or
(vi) It involves multiple factors in paragraphs (3)(i) through (3)(v) of this definition, that while individually minor, cumulatively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude.

No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would maintain the existing configuration of SR-138. It would not involve any improvements to SR-138. The No-Build Alternative would not accommodate the projected population growth or expected substantial increases in goods movement truck traffic in Northern Los Angeles County. Unnecessary vehicle and truck trips would continue through urbanized areas and congested urban freeways in the Los Angeles basin. Existing operational and safety design features of the corridor would not be improved. No regional transportation system accessibility would be achieved. Thus the No-Build Alternative would not meet the purpose and need of the project based on (3)(i) and (3)(ii). Therefore the No Build Project is not feasible and prudent.

Transportation System Management Alternative

A stand-alone Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative would include improvements to the vertical and horizontal roadway alignment in areas that are currently non-standard, shoulder widening, intersection improvements, and additional lanes to improve safety and traffic flow at focused areas. Upgrades to signage and lighting were also evaluated to improve safety and operations. Limited relocation of utility poles and other subsurface utilities is anticipated at the proposed curve correction area. Minor utility relocation and adjustment may be required throughout the corridor. The existing drainage system would be modified to be compatible with the proposed shoulder widening and lane additions at intersections.

This alternative would avoid all Section 4(f) properties. It would not involve the use of the historic Kinsey Mansion, Los Angeles Aqueduct, or transmission lines.

However, as discussed below this alternative would not fully meet the purpose and need of the project. As a stand-alone alternative it could not improve mobility and operations, enhance safety within the SR-138 Corridor, and accommodate foreseeable increases in travel and goods movement within northern Los Angeles County.

- **Mobility:** The TSM Alternative would only partially address the need for improved mobility within the corridor because vehicular traffic would still travel on a 2-way rural highway with nonstandard roadway features. Under current conditions, motorists’ mobility would be challenged by speed limit changes, traffic signal- and stop-controlled intersections, and direct-access points (e.g., driveways and local roadways) that impede traffic flow.

- **Level of Service and Congestion:** The TSM Alternative would not adequately address systemic conditions that would contribute to future traffic congestion.
• Safety: The TSM Alternative would not address the need for improved safety and reliability across the entire corridor. The current accident rates would continue at the localized “hot-spots”.

• Regional Transportation System Accessibility: The TSM Alternative would not achieve a high level of accessibility to the regional transportation system because it would rely on the existing limited route across the region.

Based on the 23 CFR 774.17, the TSM Alternative would: i/ Compromises the project so that it is unreasonable given the purpose and need, and ii/ Results in unacceptable safety or operational problems. Therefore, the TSM Alternative would not be feasible and prudent.

Any other build alternatives would encroach into existing Section 4(f) property such as the historic Los Angeles Aqueduct and would require permanent ROW acquisition for transportation purposes. This would be considered a Section 4(f) use. Therefore, there is no other feasible and prudent avoidance alternative for the project.

4.2. Alternative options that would avoid the use of individual Kinsey Mansion property

FHWA’s Section 4(f) Policy paper specifies that “even if all of the alternatives use a Section 4(f) property, there is still a duty to try to avoid the individual Section 4(f) properties within each alternative.” The Policy Paper also states that “If Section 4(f) avoidance alternatives were eliminated during the earlier phases of project development for reasons unrelated to Section 4(f) impacts or a failure to meet the project purpose and need, they may need to be reconsidered in the Section 4(f) process. In addition, it is often necessary to develop and analyze new alternatives, or new variations of alternatives rejected for non-Section 4(f) reasons during the earlier phases.”

Design Options to avoid Individual Section 4(f) - The historic Kinsey Mansion were therefore considered. Below is the summary of this consideration.

Two project design options that were previously rejected were reconsidered. In addition, a new option was considered in an attempt to avoid using the individual historic mansion. The three alternative options are the following: 1.) Alternative Option North of the Quail Lake 2.) Alternative Option South of the Kinsey Mansion and 3.) Full Viaduct Alternative Option over the south side of Quail Lake.

Alternative Option North of Quail Lake

This option (Figure 4) was considered during the early planning (PID stage) and was rejected from further consideration. It was reconsidered in an attempt to avoid the use of the historic mansion under Section 4(f). This option is a variation of Alternative 1 and 2. Under this option, the six-lane facility is moved to the Northside of Quail Lake. There would be a structure crossing the California Aqueduct north of the lake.

Although this option would provide more room for the full six-lane divided facility, it has environmental issues. Major impacts to the Quail Lake watershed along the northern portion of the lake have been identified, as well as access challenges for affected surrounding properties which include Quail Lake and California Aqueduct. Furthermore, such a design poses an engineering
challenge as the placement of a roadway adjacent to the Lake and the crossing through the California Aqueduct would require a very large, costly structure similar to the one that was built for the Cement Plant Road. Such large physical features crossing sensitive habitat would impede wildlife movement. These would be severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other federal statutes and would involve paragraphs (iii) (A) and (D) of 23 CFR 774.17 (3), which specify that (iii) After reasonable mitigation, it still causes:

(A) Severe social, economic, or environmental impacts;
(D) Severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes;

Furthermore, this alternative would cost an additional $44 million to construct and would require significant mitigation to lessen the environmental impacts. This would involve paragraph (iv) of 23 CFR 774.17 (3) which specifies that:

(iv) It results in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of an extraordinary magnitude;

This alternative, therefore, was considered not feasible and prudent, and eliminated from further consideration based on 23 CFR 774.17 (3) (vi) as it involves multiple factors in 23 CFR 774.17 (3)(i) through (3)(v), that cumulatively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude.

Alternative Option South of Kinsey Mansion

This option (Figure 4) was considered during the early planning (PID stage) and was rejected for further consideration. It is reconsidered in an attempt to avoid the use of the historic mansion under Section 4(f). This option is a variation of Alternative 1 and 2 in which the six-lane facility is moved further to the south to avoid the Kinsey Mansion and Quail Lake altogether.

The hillside south of the lake is designated as Significant Ecological Area per Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. The construction of a new roadway and associated drainages along this hillside would create a barrier to wildlife movement, jeopardize slope stability, disturb groundwater quality, and threaten the health of the surrounding wetlands. These would involve paragraphs (iii) (A) and (D) of 23 CFR 774.17 (3), which specify that (iii) After reasonable mitigation, it still causes:

(A) Severe social, economic, or environmental impacts;
(D) Severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes;

Furthermore, from an engineering standpoint, the existing topography presents significant vertical alignment challenges for this option to be considered. In order to provide longitudinal grades equal or less than the allowed maximum of 6%, the proposed cutting and filling of the hillside would extend more than 50 feet in height. Such a proposed vertical alignment would result in significant earthwork and would cost an additional $20 million to construct and would be required to provide considerable environmental mitigation measures. This would involve paragraphs (iv) and (v) of 23 CFR 774.17 (3) which state:

(iv) It results in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of an extraordinary magnitude;
(v) It causes other unique problems or unusual factors;

This alternative, therefore, was considered not feasible and prudent, and eliminated from further consideration based on 23 CFR 774.17 (3) (vi) as it involves multiple factors in 23 CFR 774.17 (3)(i) through (3)(v), that cumulatively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude.
Full Viaduct Alternative Option over the south side of Quail Lake

This option (Figure 4) was considered specifically to avoid the use of the historic mansion as the Section 4(f) property. It is also a variation of the Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Under this option, eastbound and westbound travel lanes would be placed on two separate 58-foot wide mile-long viaduct structures over the south side of Quail Lake spaced 40 feet from each other.

This alignment configuration however presents major longitudinal impacts to Quail Lake and thus would cause a unique problem. This narrow corridor between Kinsey Mansion and Quail Lake is a wetland and placing the roadway on mile-long viaducts would encroach upon this sensitive habitat. Permanent ROW acquisition would be required from the Department of Water Resources, and considering the biological sensitivity of the land, it is very unlikely they would permit land for this specific configuration. This would involve paragraph (v) of 23 CFR 774.17 (3) which is that (v) It causes other unique problems or unusual factors; In addition, it is estimated that the mile-long viaducts would cost an additional $165 million to construct and pose a high risk of endangering existing wetland health. These would involve paragraphs (iii) (A) and (D) and paragraph (iv) of 23 CFR 774.17 (3), which are:

(iii) After reasonable mitigation, it still causes:
   (A) Severe social, economic, or environmental impacts;
   (D) Severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes;

(iv) It results in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of an extraordinary magnitude;

This alternative, therefore, was considered not feasible and prudent and eliminated from further consideration based on 23 CFR 774.17 and (3) (vi) as it involves multiple factors in 23 CFR 774.17 (3)(i) through (3)(v), that cumulatively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude.