

CAMERON PARK DRIVE INTERCHANGE MATRIX CRITERIA DEFINITIONS

72361 Cameron Park Drive Interchange Project

DEFINITIONS:

CRITERIA GROUP 1: LOS Cameron Park Drive and Coach Lane

A. Level of Service PM Peak Hour in 2015

Level of Service (A is operationally good, F is operationally poor) in the afternoon (PM) peak hour of traffic, usually 4 pm to 5:30 pm in the year 2015.

B. Level of Service PM Peak Hour in 2025

Level of Service (A is operationally good, F is operationally poor) in the afternoon (PM) peak hour of traffic, usually 4 pm to 5:30 pm in the year 2025.

C. Level of Service PM Peak Hour in 2035

Level of Service (A is operationally good, F is operationally poor) in the afternoon (PM) peak hour of traffic, usually 4 pm to 5:30 pm in the year 2035.

D. Level of Service Comparator (Control Project) PSR ALT. 2

This criterion is mainly for projects that were not studied as part of the original PSR-PDS Report for the Cameron Park Drive Interchange dated Oct.-Nov. 2008. The “control project”, PSR Alt. 2 from the PSR-PDS, is used as a comparison of Level of Service (LOS) at the Cameron Park Drive and Coach Lane intersection. This is supposed to help the decision maker compare how one project may be better than another as to how it handles traffic at the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Coach Lane. Although subjective, the decision maker can roughly see how a project comparison is made compared to a PSR-PDS fully studied alternative project.

Grading: Better – Worse – Equal:

Better - Project is most likely to be better than PSR Alternative 2 at the Cameron Park and Coach Lane intersection.

Worse - Project is most likely to be worse than PSR Alternative 2 at the Cameron Park and Coach Lane intersection.

Equal - Project is most likely to be equal to PSR Alternative 2 at the Cameron Park and Coach Lane intersection.

CRITERIA GROUP 2: Other Technical Impacts

A. Requires Acquiring Businesses/Residences:

Project or portions/phases of Project would require that the County acquire businesses and residences through fee title acquisitions or eminent domain.

Grading: Yes – No – Likely

B. No. Lanes on Cameron Park Drive under Hwy 50:

The number of added lanes required on Cameron Park Drive at Project completion (ultimate build-out) under the Highway 50 overcrossing.

Grading: Number of lanes

C. Replace the Hwy 50 Bridges over Cameron Park Drive:

Will the Project require the existing Hwy 50 Overcrossing Bridges at Cameron Park Drive to be replaced?

Grading: Yes – No – Later:

Yes - Project would require the Hwy 50 Overcrossing Bridges be replaced.

No - Project would not require the Hwy 50 Overcrossing Bridges to be replaced.

Later - Project would require the Hwy 50 Overcrossing Bridges be replaced in a future phase or a later time when needed.

D. Restricted Lefts from Coach onto Cameron Park Drive:

Would the Project restrict left hand turning movements from Coach Lane onto northbound Cameron Park Drive? Traffic heading easterly on Coach Lane then turning left (northerly) on to Cameron Park Drive.

Grading: Yes – No – Maybe:

Yes - Project would require restricted lefts from Coach Lane onto Cameron Park Drive.

No - Project would not require restricted lefts from Coach Lane onto Cameron Park Drive.

Maybe - Project may require restricted lefts from Coach Lane onto Cameron Park Drive to operate properly.

E. Assumes High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) and Auxiliary Lanes:

Ultimate Project build-out and traffic considerations assume that the Hwy 50 HOV and Auxiliary Lanes are also built.

Grading: Yes – No:

F. Includes Widening Ramps:

Project includes widening the eastbound (EB) and westbound (WB) on and off ramps at the existing Cameron Park Interchange with HOV and Auxiliary Lanes.

Grading: Yes – No – Partially:

Yes - Project would require widening and lengthening the existing EB and WB on and off ramps with HOV and Auxiliary Lanes.

No - Project would not require widening and lengthening the existing EB and WB on and off ramps.

Partially - Project may require some ramp widening and lengthening but HOV and Auxiliary lanes are not included.

G. Includes 72367 - Cameron Park Drive widening:

Project includes widening the existing Cameron Park Drive roadway under the existing Hwy 50 overcrossing to Robin Lane.

Grading: Yes – No – Partially - Maybe:

Yes - Project would require widening of Cameron Park Drive under the bridges and to Robin Lane.

No - Project would not require widening of Cameron Park Drive under the bridges and to Robin Lane.

Partially - Project will require some widening of Cameron Park Drive under the bridges and to Robin Lane.

Maybe - Project may require widening of Cameron Park Drive under the bridges and to Robin Lane.

H. Includes 71365 – Palmer/Wild Chaparral Connection:

Project includes constructing a new road connection between Palmer Drive and Wild Chaparral. This connection is on the north side of Hwy 50 between the Ponderosa Interchange and the Cameron Park Interchange. It would serve as a frontage road/parallel capacity roadway for Hwy 50 and the local and regional El Dorado County public. This connection is not anticipated to significantly better the LOS or traffic issues at the Cameron Park Interchange.

Grading: Yes – No:

Yes - Project includes the Palmer/Wild Chaparral connection.

No - Project does not include the Palmer/Wild Chaparral connection.

I. Caltrans Approval or Willingness of Acceptance:

Will Caltrans be receptive to our proposed Project? Will Caltrans approve the Project or their willingness to approve the Project that affects their access control, geometrics or their Hwy 50?

Grading: Yes – No – Possibly:

Yes – Caltrans would be receptive to approval of the proposed Project.

No - Caltrans would not be receptive to approval of the proposed Project.

Possibly – Caltrans possibly would be receptive to the proposed Project.

J. Negative Impacts to Other Interchanges (Ponderosa or Cambridge):

Will the Project negatively affect, or cause an effect, on other adjacent interchanges, namely the Ponderosa and Cambridge Interchanges?

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would impact Cambridge or Ponderosa Interchange as to traffic.

No - Project would not impact Cambridge or Ponderosa Interchange as to traffic.

Possible – Project could possibly impact Cambridge or the Ponderosa Interchange as to traffic.

CRITERIA GROUP 3: Negative Economic Impacts

A. Residential Property Tax (Impacts to County):

Will the Project cause the loss of County residential property tax in the Cameron Park Interchange area? Will the Project take right-of-way or property that causes the County to lose County residential property tax due to the loss of residential property?

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would require right-of-way takes on residences that would lessen the County's residential property tax income. A yes would mean approximately

four residences or more that would be a loss to County property tax income; loss could be approximately \$18,000 per year or more in lost revenue.

No - Project would not require right-of-way takes on residences.

Possible - Project may require right-of-way takes on residences that would lessen the County's property tax income.

B. Business Property Tax (Impacts to County):

Will the Project cause the loss of County business property tax in the Cameron Park Interchange area? Will the Project take right-of-way or property that causes the County to lose County property tax due to the loss of a business without it being able to relocate or be rebuilt (the loss of usable property)?

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would require right-of-way takes on businesses that would lessen the County's business property tax income. A yes would mean approximately four businesses or more that would be a loss to County property tax income. The loss could be approximately \$60,000 per year or more in lost revenue.

No - Project would not require right-of-way takes on businesses.

Possible - Project may require right-of-way takes on businesses that would lessen the County's business property tax income.

C. Sales Tax (Impacts to County):

Will the Project cause the loss of County sales tax in the Cameron Park Interchange area? Will the Project take right-of-way or property that causes the County to lose a business and its sales tax without it being able to relocate or be rebuilt (the loss of usable business property)?

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would require right-of-way takes on businesses that would lessen the County's sales tax income. A yes would mean approximately four businesses or more that would be a loss to County sales tax income. The loss would be approximately \$320,000 per year or more in lost revenue.

No - Project would not require right-of-way takes on businesses.

Possible - Project may require right-of-way takes on businesses that would lessen the County's sales tax income.

D. Lost Employment (> 10 Jobs is High):

Will the Project cause the loss of jobs in the Cameron Park Interchange area? Will the Project take right-of-way or property that causes the business to close its doors and not be able to relocate in El Dorado County or Cameron Park? One to four job losses is a "Low" impact, five to nine jobs lost is a "Medium" impact, and greater than ten jobs is a "High" impact.

Grading: Low – Medium – High:

Low – One to four job losses is a "Low" impact.

Medium - Five to nine jobs lost is a "Medium" impact.

High - Greater than ten jobs is a "High" impact.

CRITERIA GROUP 4: Economic Development

A. Encourages Employment Generation:

Project encourages jobs and positive economic growth in the Cameron Park area?

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would encourage positive economic growth/employment generation in the Cameron Park area.

No - Project would not encourage positive economic growth/employment generation in the Cameron Park area; economic growth/employment generation would stay relatively stagnant.

Possible - Project may encourage more positive economic growth/employment generation in the Cameron Park area.

B. Encourages New or Rejuvenating Business Development Opportunities:

Project encourages new economic growth and rejuvenates or encourages existing development to grow or re-tool their business opportunities.

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would encourage new economic growth and rejuvenating business development opportunities.

No - Project would not necessarily encourage new economic growth and rejuvenating business development opportunities; new or rejuvenating business development would stay relatively stagnant.

Possible - Project may encourage new economic growth and may rejuvenate business development opportunities.

C. Encourages Community Investment / Reinvestment:

Project encourages new businesses to grow and invest and causes existing businesses to reinvest into their businesses and community. This in turn would cause the community to invest into the Cameron Park area and opens opportunities for local community programs and urban/rural development/grants.

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would encourage businesses to grow and invest and thusly would cause the community to invest into the Cameron Park.

No - Project would not encourage businesses to grow and invest and thusly the community would not invest into Cameron Park.

Possible - Project may encourage businesses to grow and invest and thusly would cause the community to invest into Cameron Park.

D. Encourages Parcel Development (Parcel Assembly):

Project encourages economic growth and commercial/industrial land parcel assembly for development in the immediate Cameron Park Drive Interchange area.

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would encourage parcel development (parcel assembly) in the immediate Cameron Park Drive Interchange area.

No - Project would not encourage parcel development (parcel assembly) in the immediate Cameron Park Drive Interchange area; development would stay relatively stagnant.

Possible - Project may encourage parcel development (parcel assembly) in the immediate Cameron Park Drive Interchange area.

E. Encourages Better Traffic Flow and Access to Existing Businesses:

Project encourages better traffic flow for local and regional County populations and for through traffic to and from Hwy 50. Provides better traffic flow to Cameron Park businesses overall.

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would encourage better traffic flow and access to existing businesses.

No - Project would not encourage better traffic flow and access to existing businesses.

Possible - Project may encourage better traffic flow and access to existing businesses.

F. Helps Complete the Planning Vision of Cameron Park:

The Project aides the Cameron Park Vision Committee and the community in achieving their planning goal for Cameron Park for the next twenty (20) years.

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would help the planning vision of Cameron Park.

No - Project would not help the planning vision of Cameron Park; Cameron Park vision would stay relatively stagnant.

Possible - Project may help the planning vision of Cameron Park.

G. Funding Leverage with Alternative Economic Development Sources (EDA) for the Project or Community:

Will the Project aid the County or the Cameron Park community in securing alternative funding for the Project or community? Will the Project leverage other funding (state or federal grants) to pay for the Project or leverage state or federal funding for regional funding for the community after the Project is done? Funding leverage could be alternative transportation redevelopment (pedestrian and bicycle funding). The cost of the Project is mostly borne by the County via local taxes or Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Program fees, or State/ Federal (FHA) funding. Grants may provide some funding but it is not anticipated to be a major contributor. The State or Federal government may cost share with the County, which could be a sizable match (five to thirty percent). After the Project is completed, the community may be able to secure local grants for the Cameron Park Community. This creates a win-win for the community/development/public and the traffic situation.

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would encourage funding leverage with State and Federal agencies for the Project or the community.

No - Project would not encourage funding leverage with State and Federal agencies for the Project or the community.

Possible - Project may encourage funding leverage with State and Federal agencies for the Project or the community.

H. Retail Differentiation/Cohesion from other County Business Locations (Other Interchange Regions):

Does the Project complement and benefit the County and Cameron Park Community Plan in its business development goals? Is the Project different but complimentary to the El Dorado Hills, Bass Lake/Silver Springs, Ponderosa Road/Mother Lode Road, Missouri Flat business areas and Camino/Pollock Pines business interchanges?? Is the Project conducive to the type of business development wanted and needed in the County and Cameron Park Community?

Grading: Yes – No – Possible:

Yes – Project would encourage retail differentiation/cohesion from other County business locations (interchanges).

No - Project would not encourage retail differentiation/cohesion from other County business locations (interchanges); Cameron Park would stay relatively stagnate as to growth.

Possible - Project may encourage retail differentiation/cohesion from other County business locations (interchanges).

I. Time of Project Impact to Existing Businesses During Construction:

The amount of time the Project is to take to construct and its affect on the existing businesses.

Grading: Low – Medium – High:

Low – 0 to 0.75 years is a “Low” impact.

Medium - A 0.75 to 1.5 years construction time with direct traffic impacts is a “Medium” impact.

High – Greater than 1.5 years to construct with direct impacts to traffic flow to existing businesses is a “High” impact.

CRITERIA GROUP 5: Local/Regional Concerns

A. Air Quality (AB32 compliance requirements):

The Project will consider reducing greenhouse gasses (GHG) by adding alternative modes of transportation and traffic flow. Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for El Dorado County and El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) is keeper of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Grading: Yes – No – N/A - Possible:

Yes – Project would encourage the lowering of GHGs.

No - Project would not necessarily encourage the lowering of GHGs.

N/A – Not applicable.

Possible - Project may encourage the lowering of GHGs.

B. Air Quality (SB375 compliance requirements):

Project allows local developers to participate in AB375’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) incentive plan. There are caveats to this measure, ie. El Dorado County cannot meet the density planning of 20 units per acre (16 units per acre is the maximum in El Dorado County) and it is difficult getting bus routes with bus service every twenty minutes, as is available in an urban area.

However, the Project opens up the area to developers that can potentially utilize SB375 and the Project will consider reducing GHGs by adding alternative modes of transportation and traffic flow.

Grading: Yes – No – N/A - Possible:

Yes – Project would encourage the lowering of GHGs.

No - Project would not necessarily encourage the lowering of GHGs.

N/A – Not applicable.

Possible - Project may encourage the lowering of GHGs.

C. Public Delay Due to Construction:

How much delay does the Project create due to its construction? How much more time (as to delays) does the driving public perceive, or see in accessing business or doing their daily local shopping in the Cameron Park Interchange area?

Grading: Low – Medium – High:

Low – Construction is not affecting a major Cameron Park arterial or collector road, e.g., Cameron Park Drive, Coach Lane, Durock Road, or Palmer Drive.

Medium - Construction is having an affect on a few of the major Cameron Park arterial or collector roads, e.g., Cameron Park Drive, Coach Lane, Durock Road or Palmer Drive.

High – Construction is taking place on many of the major Cameron Park arterial or collector roads, e.g., Cameron Park Drive, Coach Lane, Durock Road and Palmer Drive.

D. Improving HWY 50 Accessibility for Public:

The ultimate Project allows the public and motorists good, easier and logical access to Hwy 50.

Grading: Low – Medium – High:

Low – The ultimate Project does not necessarily allow the public good, easier and logical access to Hwy 50.

Medium - The ultimate Project does allow the public better, easier and logical access to Hwy 50.

High – The ultimate Project does allow the public good, easier and logical access to Hwy 50. The Project opens areas for future growth and good access to Hwy 50.

E. Improves Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities (Alternative Trans.):

The Project improves bicycle and pedestrian facilities; a betterment to the existing facilities.

Grading: Yes – No – Somewhat:

Yes – Project would include an emphasis for alternative modes of transportation, e.g., bicycle and pedestrian access and movement.

No - Project would not include a betterment of alternative modes of transportation, e.g., bicycle and pedestrian access and movement.

Somewhat - Project would include some alternative modes of transportation, e.g., bicycle and pedestrian access and movements; not necessarily a strong emphasis but somewhat of a betterment than existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

F. Local Benefits (Shopping/Commerce/Goods and Services):

The ultimate Project benefits local residents to adequately access Cameron Park Drive/Durock Road/Coach Lane/Robin Lane businesses easily for service and commerce reasons. Project allows facilitation of local traffic movement through the community for bus transit, pedestrian, bicyclists and vehicles. Vehicular and modes of alternative transportation (bicycle and pedestrian) traffic can more easily move from the north side of the interchange to the south side and vice-versa.

Grading: Yes – No – Potentially:

Yes – Project continues and improves access of local residents to Cameron Park Drive/Durock Road/Coach Lane/Robin Lane businesses easily for service and commerce reasons.

No - Project does not necessarily improve access of local residents to Cameron Park Drive/Durock Road/Coach Lane/Robin Lane businesses easily for service and commerce reasons; existing conditions persist and worsen over time.

Potentially - Project may improve access of local residents to Cameron Park Drive/Durock Road/Coach Lane/Robin Lane businesses easily for service and commerce reasons.

G. Regional Benefits (Countywide Transportation Use and Commerce Use):

Project benefits regional users (County outskirt residents) of the Cameron Park interchange area businesses. Project is attractive and draws El Dorado County regional resident users to the Cameron Park area for services and commerce.

Grading: Yes – No – Potentially:

Yes – Project better the benefits of County outskirt residents (Rescue, Coloma, South Shingle, Frenchtown, Greenstone, West Cameron Park [Cambridge], Bass Lake/Marble Valley, and upper Clarksville) to adequately access Cameron Park Drive area businesses easily for service and commerce reasons.

No - Project does not really better the benefits of County outskirt residents (Rescue, Coloma, South Shingle, Frenchtown, Greenstone, West Cameron Park [Cambridge], Bass Lake/Marble Valley, and upper Clarksville) to adequately access Cameron Park Drive area businesses easily for service and commerce reasons; existing conditions persist and worsen over time; potential revenue loss to Cameron Park businesses over time.

Potentially - Project better the benefits of County outskirt residents (Rescue, Coloma, South Shingle, Frenchtown, Greenstone, West Cameron Park [Cambridge], Bass Lake/Marble Valley, and upper Clarksville) to adequately access Cameron Park Drive area businesses easily for service and commerce reasons.

H. Super-Regional Benefits (Through Tourism Use):

Project benefits super-regional users (out-of-County residents) to the Cameron Park interchange area businesses. Project is attractive and can draw El Dorado County super-regional out-of-town users to the Cameron Park area for services and commerce. Can this Project induce Cameron Park to become a destination/tourism and recreation hub area?

Grading: Yes – No – Potentially:

Yes – Project entices and has a great potential to draw super-regional users (out-of-County residents) to the Cameron Park Drive area businesses for service and commerce reasons and potentially as a tourist destination location.

No - Project will not necessarily draw super-regional users (out-of-County residents) to the Cameron Park Drive area businesses for service and commerce reasons. The Project probably will not create a tourist destination location; existing conditions persist and worsen over time; potential revenue loss to Cameron Park businesses over time.

Potentially - Project may entice and has a great potential to draw super-regional users (out-of-County residents) to the Cameron Park Drive area businesses for service and commerce reasons and maybe even as a tourist destination location.

CRITERIA GROUP 6: Public Concerns

A. Public Buy-In (Potential Public Acceptance):

Does the public like the Project? Does the Project look, feel or is it engineered attractively enough to the public that they are convinced the Project is best for their needs and/or Cameron Park's needs?

Grading: Low – Medium – High:

Low – The Project does not feel or fit the Cameron Park Community and peoples' needs.

Medium - The Project somewhat feels or potentially fits the Cameron Park Community and peoples' needs.

High – The Project does feel and fit the Cameron Park Community and peoples' needs. The Project addresses traffic/bicycle/pedestrian concerns adequately, the community feels the Project would enhance the local area, commerce and local business and the Cameron Park vision for the next twenty (20) years.