



Public Comment for BOS 12/17/13, item #51, GV Corridor Study Scope

1 message

Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Dec 16, 2013 at 6:06 AM

To: Ron Mikulaco <bosone@edcgov.us>, Ray Nutting <bostwo@edcgov.us>, Brian Veerkamp <bosthree@edcgov.us>, Ron Briggs <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Norma Santiago <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Jim Mitrisin <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Cc: Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>

Green Valley Corridor Traffic Study, item #51, 12/17/13

Dear Members of the Board:

Just to clarify, Alternate 1 is the 'baseline' scope. Alternate 2 is staff recommended, and does NOT include any of the items without asterisks. Alternate 3 includes remaining items, but staff does not recommend this option or list it in the conclusion. Please consider the following comments prior to giving scope of work direction to staff regarding the Green Valley Corridor traffic study:

- 1.** Page 2 of the public comment matrix (att. 3D) says the "capacity analysis" will factor in the multiple driveways, curves, and topography along Green Valley Rd., but there is no capacity analysis listed in the scope. Determination of capacity is critically important and must be included.
- 2.** Alternates 1 and 2 leave out numerous problem areas on the corridor that must not be considered "optional". Key issues excluded:
 - a.** Review of Rocky Springs/Steve Way (excluded; see item 1B), Loch Way access/egress (optional w/ Alt 2), and Malcolm-Dixon Rd (optional w/ Alt 2)
 - b.** The safety issues of 42 existing direct access driveways (excluded; see item 4B-8)
 - c.** Pleasant Grove Middle School congestion (excluded; see item 4B-3)
 - d.** Planning level cost estimate (excluded; see item 4B-7)
- 3.** Approved projects such as Summer Brook and Silver Springs, with conditioned road improvements, should be documented in the study along with their impact regarding existing corridor capacity. Summer Brook

conditions include a signalization at Deer Valley Rd that should be discussed.

4. A noise study (item 5B-5) is excluded from Alternates 1 and 2. I would propose that a baseline reading of noise levels from peak hour traffic should be mandatory. A complete analysis is not necessary where no development is being proposed, however, knowing the current noise levels is most definitely relevant for corridor planning.

5. The staff recommendation regarding speed analysis is inconsistent: under scope item 2B-3 it is not recommended (Alt 3), but under item 5B-2 (with Alt 2) the speed analysis is assumed to be done. Speed analysis should be a basic item to include.

6. Scope item 5B-3 suggests doing research, analysis and surveys for bike lane improvements. We understood from staff that this was already done and funded. Please confirm so as not to duplicate effort and costs. Previously planned bike lane improvements should be documented and coordinated in the corridor study.

7. Public comment by traffic engineer K. Bewsey suggests figuring out the existing deficiencies and constraints first, then present this to the public to determine if the problems have been adequately defined. "This would be a much more collaborative process" he says – I agree.

As currently defined, I am very concerned the scope is missing the mark. Issues that are very important to residents have been given very low priority, or are not recommended for review at all.

This study is important. Please take the time to get the scope right.
Ellen Van Dyke



Fwd: Green Vly Rd traffic study not inclusive

1 message

The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Dec 16, 2013 at 1:56 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ann Jeppesen (gmail)** <nesepej.nna@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Dec 16, 2013 at 1:24 PM
Subject: Green Vly Rd traffic study not inclusive
To: "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Hello Supervisors: as a frequent traveller on Green Valley road, I want to make sure that ALL potential traffic issues are addressed in the upcoming study. As a taxpayer and frequent user of this road, I would anticipate that ALL proposed additions to the flow of traffic be included in a study that is going to directly affect my safety and that of my family. To not include upcoming proposals for additional sources of traffic seems to me to be negligent. It does not fully address the problem we are trying to solve for, and to be short sighted in the name of procedural timelines is not in the best interest of your constituents, and not good for the county. Thank you very much for your time. I will expect to see alterations in the upcoming traffic study to reflect these concerns.

Sincerely,
Ann Jeppesen

Sent from my iPhone
Sent from my iPhone
Sent from my iPhone

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Green Valley Corridor Analysis Scope

2 messages

George Kucera <gkucera@hotmail.com>

Mon, Dec 16, 2013 at 1:53 PM

To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing this from San Francisco and will again not be able to attend the meeting scheduled tomorrow where decisions will be made that will affect my family down the road. As a proxy, I am writing this letter, which is what I would say if standing in front of you all tomorrow.

Based on the documents I have read on the county website, I cannot see clear goals or a plan that will answer any definitive questions useful for planning. There is a vague goal related to "baseline traffic conditions", which appears to have some value, especially for making further inquiries that would lead to good information for planning. I would suggest instead someone clarify what exact questions we want to be able to answer with the results of the study (begin with the end in mind). For example:

1. What is the capacity of Green Valley Road today (for the various segments) considering all major factors, including driveways, cross-through traffic (e.g., Malcom Dixon, Allegheny, etc.), topology, bicycle traffic, etc.?
2. How much of this capacity is utilized today, and at various times of the day?
3. How much additional capacity will be utilized (and with what consequences to traffic, wildlife, noise levels, accident rates, cyclist safety, etc.) when all of the already approved developments are completed?
4. What can be done to mitigate the downsides of #3?
5. What steps should be taken before approving further development adjacent to GSR?

The current draft scope is designed only to gather some of the information needed to answer the above questions. I request the scope be amended so that the results of the study are far more useful for planning.

The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Mon, Dec 16, 2013 at 1:57 PM

To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

[Quoted text hidden]

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.