



---

## Planning Commission Apr 23, 2026 - Agenda Item 3


---

**From** Linda Campbell <campbelledcprojects@gmail.com>

**Date** Sun 4/19/2026 3:48 PM

**To** David Spaur <David.Spaur@edcgov.us>; Bob Williams <Bob.Williams@edcgov.us>; Patrick Frega <Patrick.Frega@edcgov.us>; Jeff Hansen <Jeff.Hansen@edcgov.us>; Tim Costello <Tim.Costello@edcgov.us>; Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

**Cc** John Davey <jdavey@daveygroup.net>; Bill Jamaca <bjamaca@gmail.com>; BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; Rafael Martinez <Rafael.Martinez@edcgov.us>; John H. Kahling <john.kahling@edcgov.us>; matthew.smeltzer@edcgov.us <matthew.smeltzer@edcgov.us>

 1 attachment (105 KB)

Planning Commission Apr 23, 2026 - Agenda Item 3.pdf

---

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello Planning,

Please include the attached document as public comment on legistar item 26-0684

It represents input from the EDH APAC Transportation Committee on EDH projects, but since it also includes feedback across other county projects listed, I am submitting it as an individual.

Thank you,  
Linda Campbell

Planning Commission April 23, 2026 – Agenda Item 3

DOT Finding of Consistency 2026 Annual Capital Improvement Program

- **General Comments** - File C seems to reference calendar year – it would be helpful for consistency in changing or shifting funds to use Fiscal Year which runs July 1<sup>st</sup> through June 30<sup>th</sup>, which would make the shift FY26 to FY27. Alternatively, include a sub-note stating Calendar Year used in this table for clarity.
- Why did this item have no links to the legistar item for the recent BOS meeting to review, or even the July 2025 item where the CIP book was approved? Breadcrumbs are helpful to reviewers.
  
- **36105009** – Country Club Drive Ext. Tong Rd – The accounting on this item is not clear.
  - The adopted CIP Book had planned (page 66) **\$1.2M** for FY26
  - The project total is **\$21.109M**, but **\$993k** was paid in prior fiscal year, meaning **\$20,116M** remains.
  - If, as noted in Attachment C, a 3.6% increase in cost occurred, then how exactly did that result in the reported decrease of **\$312k**?
  - Was the estimated 3.6% increase only done on the remaining amount of the project? If not, then would that not incorrectly inflate the increase calculation?
- **36105049** – EDH Blvd overlay Saratoga to – Summary from CIP book “Road surface overlay on El Dorado Hills Blvd (EDHB) from Saratoga Way/Park Drive to Harvard Way. Install Class II bike lanes along portions of the project limits on EDHB. Improve pedestrian ramps to ADA standards at all intersections along EDHB. Make bicycle and pedestrian loop detection improvements at all intersections along EDHB.”
  - Reason for change says “Project is being removed from the CIP as it will be completed by the Maintenance Division of Transportation”. Is all the above from project description being completed under Maintenance Division? If not, then exactly what portion is planned for completion? Anything not completed should be reflected still in future CIP to ensure it is all covered.
  - There was a brief powerpoint made for the BOS meeting which referenced an amount of **\$356,344** from the Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds. If this is the estimated cost of resurfacing only, then it does not tie into any other numbers in the CIP Book.
  - Current Adopted CIP Book total remaining is **\$5,784 (M)** out in FY30-35 (Attachment C total states \$6,147 (M)). It covers a lot of items as provided above. Otherwise, it appears that budget is being reduced this FY, however the adopted CIP book does not align with that. **In short, the amount of \$6,147 was never**

**shown in FY25/26, so how could it be removed?** Reference Adopted CIP Book pages 21 and 74

- There is an amount in the CIP Book of **\$424K** listed in prior FY, with the definition of “Prior FY includes actual revenue and expenditures through 6/30/2024, plus amounts estimated through 6/30/2025”. That seems to reflect work already done, so it would be great to be specific on what funds exactly are being shifted with this request. The full total for this project (past and future) would be \$6,208, which also does not align with the \$6,147 referenced.
- Addition of Silva Valley Parkway at Appian Way Intersection Improvements, CIP **36105087**
  - During the Board of Supervisors meeting in March, it was asked what traffic impact analysis had been done to justify this addition, as well as the estimated cost for the project. That information has still not been made available for the Planning Commission review. Since this was not part of the primary CIP approved in July 2025, there should be some study produced since that time which would justify addition.
  - **Policy TC-1n** requires identification of a project being non-TIF to determine if discretionary road funds are used. There is no information provided showing this request is “consistent” with that policy unless that identification is made, hence further support for the TIA and estimate of exactly what intersection improvements are anticipated.
  - There was a brief powerpoint made available in the BOS meeting which referenced an estimate of **\$2,625,000** TIF Zone C. Not sure why cost estimates were not included for the PC meeting. So is this TIF or non-TIF funding?
  - Statement from Attachment A, page 2 – “Since these projects are not needed to accommodate new development, they do not meet the nexus requirements pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act and are not eligible for TIF funding. Non-TIF funded CIP projects include bike/pedestrian facilities, bridge replacement projects, and projects that address a safety concern or existing deficiency.”
    - Rafael responded to a question from Supervisor Ferrero on the reason for creation in the March, 2026 meeting that “opening the project enabled gathering of TIF” Based on the bullet above, TIF may not be used.
    - It is my understanding that if an existing deficiency has been identified by the county, thereby requiring a project, any new development would not be requested to cover the costs. This is an interesting addition now, considering the analysis for Costco did not go all the way to Green Valley Road, which is one of the gaps identified for that project DEIR.

- **36104007** – US50 Cameron Park Interchange
  - According to the Adopted CIP Book, the county has already paid **\$1,547 (M)** in prior fiscal years.
  - Similar to first Country Club item, shouldn't the 3.6% increase only apply on remaining amount of project, so as not to inflate by almost **\$56k**?
- **36107023** – South Tahoe Greenway
  - Why is there no information provided related to this increase of almost **\$2.3M**?
  - Did the scope of the project change?
  - If there are no bids yet, then what exactly is driving the "... expected increases to bid prices"?
- **ADDITIONAL QUESTION**
- **36105035** – Saratoga Way extension (Phase 2) – 4 lanes from Wilson to EDH Blvd. Project initiation 8/22/2006. \$15M estimate FY35/36-44/45
  - Why would there not be any work at all planned related to the issues and concerns brought up by citizens regarding safety of intersection? This would appear to be a more viable slate of work to begin at least some planning on.
  - This issue has been brought up multiple times over the last few years, including a special APAC community traffic meeting on September 22, 2021.

Regards,

Linda Campbell