

**Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District**501 Main Street Diamond Springs, CA 95619 ~ (530) 626-3190 Fax (530) 626-3188  
www.diamondfire.org

12 AUG -6 PM 1:04

RECEIVED  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT.PC 08-09-12  
#10  
(2 pages)

August 6, 2012

El Dorado County Planning Commission  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667Re: Response to Comments on the Draft EIR  
Diamond Dorado Retail Center

Dear Planning Commission,

Chief Cunningham provided comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Diamond Dorado Retail Center on January 24, 2012. Upon review of the Notice of Public Hearing we received this week, we would like the following comments to be added to the record:

1. Since our response in January we have not had any other correspondence or inquiries from Michael Brandman Associates or any other party asking for clarification or asking any questions about our comments. The first opportunity we had to read the response to our comments was when we received the report last week.
2. Since the initial comment period, the district underwent a staffing reduction of 33 percent and had to close Station 46. In your response to our comments, you state that call volume concerns have been mitigated but the anticipated call volume numbers have not been provided by the developer. The response to our comments say that the project will result in 98 calls for service per year during which 50 percent of the District's emergency response resources will be required for 45 minutes. In reality, due to staffing reductions, 98 calls for service per year would commit 100 percent of the District's resources for 45 minutes. We would like to request that the anticipated call volume expected by the developer be provided to the district.
3. We would like to remind all parties that approval of subject project is conditioned on meeting the public safety and fire protection requirements of the County of El Dorado General Plan, which shall include provision of a financing mechanism for said services. The financing mechanism shall include inclusion within, or annexation into, a Community Facilities District ("CFD") established under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 (Government Code § 53311 et seq.) established by the Diamond Springs / El Dorado Fire Protection District ("District") for the provision of public services permitted under Government Code § 53313, including fire suppression services, emergency medical services, fire prevention activities and other services (collectively "Public Services"), and as such, shall be subject to the special tax approved with the formation of such CFD with the Tract's inclusion or annexation into the CFD.

County of El Dorado General Plan sections Policy 5.1.2 and Policy 6.2.3.

El Dorado County Planning Commission  
Diamond Dorado Retail Center Project  
Final EIR Responses to Comments  
August 6, 2012  
Page Two

4. In regards to the Adoption of our new Capital Improvement Plan, our Board Approved Resolution 2010.08 adopting the plan and an increase in Development Impact Fees on June 9, 2010. The plan and resolution were then sent to the Planning Commission for review to insure consistency with the General Plan. The Planning Commission approved the plan and it was then forwarded to the CAO's office on June 14, 2010. Therefore, we request that the impact fees for this project should be collected at the new rate of \$1.22 per square foot.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Robert Combs,  
Fire Chief

:lt

cc: Roger Trout, El Dorado County Development Services  
Mel Pabalinas, El Dorado County Development Services  
Peter Mauer, El Dorado County Development Services

PC 8-9-12  
#10  
(2 pages)



# City of Placerville

Community Development & Engineering  
3101 Center Street  
Placerville, California 95667

RECEIVED  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
12 AUG -9 AM 8:29

August 8, 2012

Roger Trout, Director  
El Dorado County Development Services Department  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Mr. Trout:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Diamond Dorado Retail Center. The City appreciates the responses to our comments regarding the traffic and economic concerns we anticipate with the project. Let me also state that we support the County's economic development efforts and projects to reduce the current sales tax leakage. However, we would like to take this opportunity to reiterate our concerns regarding the project in two areas:

**Traffic:** We continue to disagree with the assumption that traffic from the Placerville area will primarily use Hwy 50 to access the project rather than Sacramento/Hwy 49, thus eliminating traffic concerns on Sacramento Street/Hwy 49. Specifically, page 3-74 of the Final EIR states:

*"It should be noted that the Crossings at El Dorado project traffic study did not analyze intersections within the City of Placerville, since most project traffic is assumed to be focused on US-50 within the city limits. The effects of adding the Crossings at El Dorado project to the City's roadway network, outside US-50, are expected to be nominal."*

Contrary to the assumption noted above, we believe that Placerville residents are very likely to utilize Sacramento Street/Hwy 49 as a direct route to the project site, and that the impacts to our local roadway/intersection network are more significant than claimed in the Draft and Final EIR. The Final EIR language noted above acknowledges that the intersections within the City of Placerville were not analyzed and further states that most project traffic is "assumed" to be focused on US-50 within city limits. We do not necessarily agree with this fundamental assumption and respectfully request further analysis and/or pro-active mitigation measures to satisfy the City of Placerville that

the impacts will be, in fact, less than significant or mitigated to a less than significant level. Specifically, we request that the County acknowledge that there may be an impact within the City of Placerville and require reasonable, but meaningful, monitoring and mitigation for those intersections that would be impacted by the project, primarily Sacramento St at Pacific St and Pacific St at Main St in Placerville. Monitoring should include pre and post project conditions and evaluate impacts after occupancy of the buildings, incorporating a reasonable period of time to allow traffic patterns to establish. Should the monitoring show that the traffic is indeed impacted beyond that anticipated in the EIR, the County would work with the City to identify funding to mitigate the impacts. If the monitoring shows less than significant impacts, no further action would be required.

**Blighted Physical Impact:** The City recognizes the amount of sales tax leakage in the County and we agree that this major development will capture some of the leakage. However, we also strongly feel that the development may adversely impact development and existing business within the City of Placerville, thus causing potential for physical blight in the City. Unfortunately, no project specific retail sales tax leakage analysis was conducted for this project proposal to help ascertain to the extent to which specific retail sectors, and existing local businesses, may be impacted.

We respectfully request that the County work cooperatively with the City to monitor the economic impact of the project as it moves forward and agree to explore meaningful solutions consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan Objective 10.2.7 to:

“Coordinate land uses with other jurisdictions. Resolve conflicts with other jurisdictions regarding the location of revenue-generating land uses”

We look forward to working with the County in a cooperative manner on such projects in the future. To that end, we will endeavor to establish a good working dialogue with the County on pending projects moving forward.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to continued cooperation between the City and the County on economic development and land use issues.

Sincerely,



Mike Webb

Director, Community Development & Engineering



Rommel Pabalinas <rommel.pabalinas@edcgov.us>

PC 8-9-12  
#10  
(2 pages)

### Caltrans Concerns with DDRC

1 message

**Eric Fredericks** <eric\_fredericks@dot.ca.gov>

Wed, Aug 8, 2012 at 10:30 AM

To: bob.slater@edcgov.us, steve.kooyman@edcgov.us, rommel.pabalinas@edcgov.us

Cc: Jeff Pulverman <jeff\_pulverman@dot.ca.gov>, Nieves Castro <nieves\_castro@dot.ca.gov>, Teresa Limon <teresa\_limon@dot.ca.gov>, John Holder <john\_holder@dot.ca.gov>, Susan Wilson <susan\_wilson@dot.ca.gov>

Hi Bob, Steve, and Mel,

We have reviewed the material for the Diamond Dorado Retail Center project and still are in disagreement and have concerns the County must address. We plan to present the following comments at the Thursday Planning Commission hearing unless you can advise us on how our concerns can be met before the hearing. Also, resolution of these concerns is required for our approval of the Diamond Springs Parkway PSR-PDS to ensure the consistency of all planning, programming, and roadway improvement activities.

1. The requested modifications provided to El Dorado County on July 16, 2012 have not been incorporated into the Final EIR nor in the Staff Report, Attachment 1 - Conditions of Approval (COA).

MMTRANS-3a (page 4-37,38 ERRATA) and Attachment 1, Condition 11(Page 3)

Written concurrence of Caltrans in the determination of available capacity and appropriate improvements to mitigate the significant impact of vehicle queueing capacity at the US50/Missouri Flat Rd interchange onto mainline Highway 50. Caltrans is the owner, operator, and expert regarding the impacted transportation facility. Therefore, our concurrence is required to ensure the adequacy and feasibility of any study or recommended improvements to the Missouri Flat Interchange and Highway 50.

A contingency plan including ongoing monitoring and performance threshold strategies is needed to ensure we have a plan to address unexpected safety issues that may arise in the interim period prior to the implementation of any improvement project.

Any necessary additional improvements to the interchange should result in a service life of 20 years from the date of construction completion.

Attachment 1/Page 6 - State Route 49 Improvements

Condition 13 d - The cumulative scenarios should forecast and analyze traffic conditions 20 years from construction completion.

2. The COA language must be consistent with the proposed Diamond Springs Parkway (DSP) PSR-PDS document. If the written concurrence language is not

12 AUG -8 AM 11:06  
RECEIVED  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

incorporated into the DDRC COA, we will not be able to approve the DSP PSR-PDS, Project Report or Encroachment Permit for work within the State Route 49 Right of Way.

3. There are inconsistencies between the Final EIR Mitigation Measures and Attachment 1 - COA. Section 5 of the Final EIR Errata has eliminated Mitigation Measure MM TRANS-3i (upgrade DSP between Throwita Way and SR49 to a four-lane divided arterial). Yet, Attachment 1 - COA, page 4 states that the applicant..."shall cause to construct both DSP Phase I and II improvements." It is critical that this segment provide two through lanes in the westbound direction in order to receive the dual northbound lefts from the Diamond Springs Pkwy at SR49 and to accommodate the projected queuing. We reiterate that there are elements of DSP Phase II that will be needed at opening day of the DS Parkway.

Sorry for the timing of the comments, but there was a lot of material to review this last week. We'd be happy to discuss these comments with you in advance of the meeting. I'm not in my office today, so please call my cell at 916-669-0676 or email me if you'd like to set up a time to discuss. It would be helpful to discuss before 2:30pm today so that some of our key staff is available.

Thanks,  
Eric

—

Eric Fredericks  
Chief, Office of Transportation Planning - South  
Caltrans District 3  
Sacramento Area Office  
Desk (916) 274-0635  
Email: eric\_fredericks@dot.ca.gov