

From: [LINDA CAMPBELL](#)
To: [BOS-District I](#); [BOS-District II](#); [BOS-District III](#); [BOS-District IV](#); [BOS-District V](#); [BOS-Clerk of the Board](#)
Cc: [Rafael Martinez](#)
Subject: Public Comment BOS Agenda Item 39, June 16
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 1:10:45 PM

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Clerk of the Board, please add this as public comment to the identified agenda item.

Legistar 26-0116: Adoption of 2026 CIP Book

Hello Supervisors,

Below are comments specific to the change table, as well as the new CIP book, as applicable for your consideration.

Highlighted Data Changes:

- **36104008** – Durock Road date shift by 1 year to 29/30 – PC raised concerns
- **36105008** – Country Club Drive – Silva Valley to Tong Road: Date shift for construction starts to 28/29. Also, **\$7.5M** in funding was removed from TIF and now showing TBD. This is a clear example of concerns I will note below for new project at Appian Way.

General New Cost Increases: There is a significant increase of approximately **\$12.2M** from the change table reviewed previously in March BOS meeting, as well as the PC meeting in April.

- Besides the ones highlighted that were not reviewed previously, there is a sizeable cost change that is not highlighted on **36104005 (Bass Lake Interchange)**. In the last two reviews, the total increase was **\$2.3M**, but now it is shown to be **\$6.9M**. What is the justification behind that **\$4.6M** difference now submitted?

CIP **36105087**: Addition of Silva Valley Parkway at Appian Way Intersection Improvements

During the Board of Supervisors meeting in March, it was asked what traffic impact analysis had been done to justify this addition. That information was not made available for the Planning Commission review, nor is it included again at this third review. It is even stated in the resolution in this agenda item that “.. **studies were conducted to analyze** the impacts of contemplated future development on existing public transportation facilities in the County, and to determine the need for new public transportation facilities and improvements required by the new development and **said studies set forth the relationship between new development, the needed transportation facilities, and the estimated costs of these improvements;**” **Why is no study being produced to confirm the “why” for this 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.

In the Planning Commission review, the following was made in 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.”

I continue to pursue this to ensure we have clarity in the planning and understanding of funding options. If an existing deficiency is identified by the county, any new development would not be requested to cover the costs directly as a condition of approval. Considering the project date is set out 20 years, then is it really a deficiency, or are we setting ourselves up to have the citizens cover rather than future development? There is also no guarantee that it could be covered by TIF/TIM, so would likely be done via grants or local funding which are all taxpayer funds, just like the current change to Country Club project **36105008**.

Based on the Proposed 2026 CIP Book (page 10), the annual cycle is to be used to provide roadway priorities for current year, and 5-year CIP, however this project is being added as new in the 20-year horizon with no supporting details on WHY the project is required.

The public is already being negatively affected by the lack of roadway expansions that were originally recommended in the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, so having a clear understanding of the data supporting this request vs. a full 4-lane expansion of Silva Valley from Harvard to Green Valley should be critical data. What is driving a decision for a signal at this intersection, while ignoring a 4-lane expansion along with it? Would a signal without the 4-lane increase further exacerbate an issue in that area? Without being able to review and provide public comment on the traffic analysis or project options, it seems to be a band-aid the public will pay for, rather than an optimal solution.

What I do know is that we have a project request for Serrano Village M in that area, and we have Costco pending, whose traffic analysis did not happen between Harvard and Green Valley Road (identified in DEIR feedback). Unless the TIA shows us otherwise, both of those could be options for developer funded solutions, but we are not being allowed to see the supporting data.

The resolution on the agenda items states “... the Board considered all evidence and testimony for or against..”. If we cannot review or participate in details from traffic analysis that has been requested 3 times now, then I suggest you have not considered all evidence.

Please do not approve the project for Silva Valley Appian Way Intersection Improvements request until such time as data is available and public review can be completed.

Regards,

Linda K Campbell

Public Comment #39

BOS RCVD 6/15/2026

From: [Steven Proe](#)
To: [Lori Parlin](#); [BOS-Clerk of the Board](#); [BOS-District V](#); [BOS-District IV](#); [BOS-District III](#); [BOS-District II](#); [BOS-District I](#)
Cc: [Steven Proe](#)
Subject: Support of not allowing the Approval of Silva Valley Appian Way Intersection Improvements. Agenda Item Item 39
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 2:42:47 PM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

My Comments for the Board to not approving Item 39. on tomorrows Agenda.

Please do not approve this item not to approve Agenda Item Item 39 . on tomorrows Agenda.

Respectfully

Steven Proe resident of District 4.

Legistar 26-0116: Adoption of 2026 CIP Book

Hello Supervisors and Staff:

Below are comments specific to the change table, as well as the new CIP book, as applicable for your consideration.

Highlighted Data Changes:

- **36104008** – Durock Road date shift by 1 year to 29/30 – PC raised concerns
- **36105008** – Country Club Drive – Silva Valley to Tong Road: Date shift for construction starts to 28/29. Also, **\$7.5M** in funding was removed from TIF and now showing TBD. This is a clear example of concerns I will note below for new project at Appian Way.

General New Cost Increases: There is a significant increase of approximately **\$12.2M** from the change table reviewed previously in March BOS meeting, as well as the PC meeting in April.

- Besides the ones highlighted that were not reviewed previously, there is a sizeable cost change that is not highlighted on **36104005 (Bass Lake Interchange)**. In the last two reviews, the total increase was **\$2.3M**, but now it is shown to be **\$6.9M**. What is the justification behind that **\$4.6M** difference now submitted?

CIP **36105087**: Addition of Silva Valley Parkway at Appian Way Intersection Improvements.

During the Board of Supervisors meeting in March, it was asked what traffic impact analysis had been done to justify this addition. That information was not made available for the Planning Commission review, nor is it included again at this third review. It is even stated in the resolution in this agenda item that “.. **studies were conducted to analyze** the impacts of contemplated future development on existing public transportation facilities in the County, and to determine the need for new public transportation facilities and improvements required by the new development and **said studies set forth the relationship between new development, the needed**

transportation facilities, and the estimated costs of these improvements;" Why is no study being produced to confirm the "why" for this 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.

In the Planning Commission review, the following was made in 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."

I continue to pursue this to ensure we have clarity in the planning and understanding of funding options. If an existing deficiency is identified by the county, any new development would not be requested to cover the costs directly as a condition of approval. Considering the project date is set out 20 years, then is it really a deficiency, or are we setting ourselves up to have the citizens cover rather than future development? There is also no guarantee that it could be covered by TIF/TIM, so would likely be done via grants or local funding which are all taxpayer funds, just like the current change to Country Club project **36105008**.

Based on the Proposed 2026 CIP Book (page 10), the annual cycle is to be used to provide roadway priorities for current year, and 5-year CIP, however this project is being added as new in the 20-year horizon with no supporting details on WHY the project is required.

The public is already being negatively affected by the lack of roadway expansions that were originally recommended in the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, so having a clear understanding of the data supporting this request vs. a full 4-lane expansion of Silva Valley from Harvard to Green Valley should be critical data. What is driving a decision for a signal at this intersection, while ignoring a 4-lane expansion along with it? Would a signal without the 4-lane increase further exacerbate an issue in that area? Without being able to review and provide public comment on the traffic analysis or project options, it seems to be a band-aid the public will pay for, rather than an optimal solution.

What I do know is that we have a project request for Serrano Village M in that area, and we have Costco pending, whose traffic analysis did not happen between Harvard and Green Valley Road (identified in DEIR feedback). Unless the TIA shows us otherwise, both of those could be options for developer funded solutions, but we are not being allowed to see the supporting data.

The resolution on the agenda items states "... the Board considered all evidence and testimony for or against...". If we cannot review or participate in details from traffic analysis that has been requested 3 times now, then I suggest you have not considered all evidence.

Please do not approve the project for Silva Valley Appian Way Intersection Improvements request until such time as data is available and public review can be completed.

