

7/29/13

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: BOS Agenda Item 28 - Green Valley Corridor Traffic Study

#28



LATE DISTRIBUTION

Kathryn Tyler <kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us>

DATE 7-29-13

Fwd: BOS Agenda Item 28 - Green Valley Corridor Traffic Study

1 message

The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 10:41 AM

To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, Kathryn Tyler <kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us>

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

From: Cheryl McDougal <cam4jrm@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 7:33 AM

Subject: BOS Agenda Item 28 - Green Valley Corridor Traffic Study

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

We understand that the you as the Board of Supervisors have put the issue of a Green Valley Corridor traffic study on the 7/30/13 Board hearing agenda. We are pleased to see this as so many of us as concerned residents of El Dorado County have spoken to you and the Planning Department as to the current level of traffic and unsafe road conditions of the Green Valley Road.

It is also our understanding that the associated staff report makes light of the existing traffic, and suggests delaying the study until the Travel Demand Model (TDM) is complete. This is very disconcerting at best. The county staff report as posted includes this excerpt: "Proceeding with the corridor analysis may be premature until the 2035 forecast is finalized". It is important to note that the 2035 forecast is being based on outdated figures. What we are requesting now is for you to have the County analyze the current safety issues and multiple driveway access points on Green Valley Road with current accurate traffic statistics to document a current traffic baseline of what we have today and then factor in all of the already approved adjacent and feeding land development projects to best assess the projected traffic for use in decisions of future land development projects.

We have heard that Green Valley Road is category F to the Sacramento county line. How does the category of traffic congestion magically gets better once it crosses the county line into El Dorado per the current rating that El Dorado gives it? With the utility work/road construction taking place today for the current land development project happening at the corner of Natomas and Blue Ravine, traffic is stacked up to the Purple Place. Cars are making u-turns and going back to Sophia Parkway.

Thank you for your oversight to ensure the current safety of El Dorado County residents.

John and Cheryl McDougal
1041 Uplands Drive
El Dorado Hills, CA

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.

7/29/13

13-0889

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Green Valley Traffic Study

#28



LATE DISTRIBUTION

Kathryn Tyler <kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us>

DATE 7-29-13

Fwd: Green Valley Traffic Study

1 message

The **BOSFOUR** <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 10:45 AM

To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, Kathryn Tyler <kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us>

RE: Item #28

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

From: **Catherine Taylor** <catherineetaylor@comcast.net>

Date: Sat, Jul 27, 2013 at 2:06 PM

Subject: Green Valley Traffic Study

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us

Supervisors, we need the county to analyze the safety issues and multiple driveway access points on Green Valley Rd. Proceeding with the corridor analysis may be premature until the 2035 forecast is finalized. It's important to note here that the 2035 forecast is being based on outdated figures! We do not want or need GV Rd widened East to Deer Valley at this time, and a study will show this is not necessary. Instead of widening GV drop the speed limit from 55 mph to 50 mph. **And most of those on GV during commute time should be out on Hwy 50 not GV. Make GV less attractive for those who commute by adding traffic lights.** Plus lots of money was spent on improving Hwy 50. So get those commuters out there and off GV.

I feel that this measure is not warranted given anytime of the day GV is not backed up to the point of not being tolerant. Hence, not commanding two extra lanes.

Your further detail attention for this action is greatly needed before this is implemented. Support your voters please.

NO ON WIDENING GREEN VALLEY ROAD!

Sincerely,

Catherine E. Taylor

3804 Amer Court

El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

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.

7/29/13

13-0889

Edcgov.us Mail - Opposition to Proposed Delay of Green Valley Corridor traffic study

28



LATE DISTRIBUTION

The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>

DATE 7-29-13

Opposition to Proposed Delay of Green Valley Corridor traffic study

1 message

Briana Finley-Link <briana@finley-link.com>

Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 10:59 AM

To: kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us

Cc: Ellen Van Dyke <gvralliance@gmail.com>, shawna.purvines@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Date: July 29, 2013

To: Ms. Kim Kerr, Assistant CAO and Acting CDA Director

From: Allen R. Link and Briana Finley-Link, Long-term El Dorado Hills residents

Re: Opposition to Proposed Delay of Green Valley Corridor traffic study

It has come to our attention that the county staff report makes light of the existing traffic on Green Valley Road, and suggests delaying a traffic study until the Travel Demand Model (TDM) is complete. In our opinion, and that of many of our neighbors who regularly use the Green Valley Corridor, such a delay would be disastrous. Many developments would be completed before the traffic study that should be considered in approving those developments. And, in our opinion, there could be serious negative impacts from widening Green Valley at this time. We believe the following:

- A traffic study will show that widening is not necessary for the low density growth consistent with the General Plan, thereby saving taxpayers more than enough money to pay for the study.
- There are many driveways along Green Valley. While traffic will increase even with low density growth, these increases need to be mitigated with the appropriate safety features. A traffic study is needed now to ensure public safety.
- No current decision should be based on the Traffic Demand Model, complete or not, as it is based on outdated figures.

My husband and I would be at the Board of Supervisors meeting tomorrow, except that I need to drive him to a medical appointment. Since his multiple strokes and heart attack a couple of years ago, we often use local streets for the many support services required by the disabled. As our population continues to age, increased use of local streets by retirees is a factor that should be considered.

7/29/13

Edcgov.us Mail - Opposition to Proposed Delay of Green Valley Corridor traffic study

Regards,

Allen R. Link and
Briana Finley-Link



Fwd: 'Institutional Memory' issue, and Green Valley Road

1 message

The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 12:22 PM

To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, Kathryn Tyler <kathryn.tyler@edcgov.us>

RE: Item # 28

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

From: **Ellen Van Dyke** <gvralliance@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Jul 27, 2013 at 7:04 AM

Subject: 'Institutional Memory' issue, and Green Valley Road

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

Cc: eileen.crawford@edcgov.us, Kimberly Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>, Green Valley Alliance <gvralliance@gmail.com>

Dear Supervisors:

The Summerbrook project is on Green Valley Road west of Bass Lake Rd., and was approved in 2008. I was not 'around' for this, but last week I dug up the map for one of our group members, and discovered something: [a signal light is required at Deer Valley and Green Valley, under the final conditions of approval.](#)

When the Springs Equestrian project (located at that intersection) was noticed last summer, in my many meetings with DOT, staff was *adamant* there is to be no signal there, and I repeated that to every neighbor who would listen, or who inquired. I do not think DOT had any underhanded motive in telling me there was no traffic light; I believe the people I spoke with just were not aware of that project and the condition.

So here we are, headed into the depths of a traffic study discussion for the corridor, and the staff report does not include the signal on Green Valley Rd. If it was 'removed' some where along the way, I don't believe any of my neighbors were noticed. The Bass Lake residents were likely not noticed, because I was the one who convinced them that no signal was going in there.

This 'institutional memory' is actually another good reason to analyze the Green Valley Rd corridor traffic situation. Because of what I have heard through my attendance at the Transportation Commission hearings and various BOS hearings, I believe each of you is in support of a corridor study, but the staff report associated with the hearing for the 30th makes light of the need to move ahead at this time, and the LOS (Level of Service) numbers do not seem to match our experiences driving the road.

I will do what I can to encourage people to come on Tuesday the 30th to convince all of you that the existing conditions on Green Valley Rd are more severe than portrayed in that staff report, and to move forward with the study now to solidify the plan for the corridor, so that we are not depending on institutional memory while approving projects.

Sincerely,
Ellen Van Dyke
www.greenvalleyalliance.org

Original query to DOT on July 19th below:

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

From: **Ellen Van Dyke** <gvralliance@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Jul 19, 2013 at 5:57 PM

Subject: Summerbrook Project, Green Valley Rd

To: eileen.crawford@edcgov.us

Dear Eileen:

I'm shocked. Please confirm I understand what I am seeing.

From the Summerbrook (PD07-0007) project, **Condition 25:**

25. The applicant shall design and construct a right in/right out at the intersection of A Street and Green Valley Road. This design shall include providing a raised traffic island, curbing, and/or striping to prevent left turn movements at this intersection according to the provisions of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. The improvements shall be sub-13-0889-O Public Comment 5 of 8

provisions of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. The improvements shall be substantially completed, to the approval of the Department of Transportation or the applicant shall obtain an approved improvement agreement with security, prior to the filing the final map. The applicant shall signalize the Green Valley/ Deer Valley Road intersection to meet current El Dorado County Standards, as required in the approved traffic study. These required improvements shall address all geometric issues, i.e. required right and left turn channelization and acceleration/deceleration lanes improvements and shall adhere to the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. The improvements shall be substantially completed to the approval of the Department of Transportation or the applicant shall obtain an approved improvement agreement with security, prior to the filing the final map.

Thank you-
Ellen Van Dyke

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.



Jim Mitrisin <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>

BOS Meeting Item 13-0889 - July 30th - Green Valley Corridor traffic study.

1 message

John & Kelley <bugginu@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 10:40 PM

To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, Bosfive@co.el-dorado.ca.us

Cc: jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us

Please submit this letter into public comment.

Dear BOS:

After reading all of the attachments and staff report we feel that staff marginalizes the public concern for safety on Green Valley Corridor. There are many errors and/or omissions in the data presented to you today. It is for this exact reason that the community has asked for the corridor study by an independent consultant. We have seen traffic and accident data that refutes what staff is telling you today.

Rather than arguing each detail at this time we feel compelled to remind the BOS about the essence of the request. The Corridor Study isn't really a LOS discussion. This request for a corridor study is about public safety and improvements that can be made in the near future to keep our current drivers safe.

Please know that it is not our intention to have Green Valley Road widened. Rather, we would like to save our road capacity for jobs. Live within our capacity, but make it safer for those who travel this road daily.

Residents Know:

- Rear end accidents would suggest that traffic is stopped and that there is poor visibility during peak hours due to the east west exposure.
- Rear end accidents would suggest that there is no where for the cars to go. No widened shoulders or turn pockets to get off the roadway.
- The speed numbers are appalling and unacceptable! 53.2 % of residents are speeding above the posted 55 MPH. 15% of these cars are in excess of 60 MPH! No local law enforcement.

Question: How many driveways are trying to access GVR?

Answer: 42 Driveways between Silva Valley and Bass Lake road.

You don't have to be a traffic engineer to know that this is a recipe for disaster.

- Because the community region line is what it is, it allows for higher traffic volumes @ GVR and Allegheny and GVR @ Salmon Falls. Here is another reason why the community region line needs to be corrected in this road segment.

- *From Staff Report: Attachment B depicts the LOS on Green Valley Road. It should be noted that according to Policy TC-Xd, the allowable LOS in Community Regions is LOS E, and the allowable LOS in Rural Regions is LOS D. Green Valley Road winds through both Community Regions and Rural Regions, as described in Table 1*

What we would like to see

1. Minimize Vehicle trips added to Green Valley Road.
2. A 50% reduction in rear end accidents due to road design, speed, and lack of options.
3. A speed and traffic study done during the school year at peak hours.
4. Wider shoulders, acceleration and deceleration lanes, and protected turn pockets @ Loch, Allegheny, Salmon Falls Road, etc.
5. Capture and redirect cut through traffic back on to Green Valley Road off of Allegheny/Malcolm Dixon Road
6. Signal and light timing improvement
7. Safeway TIM money returned to complete the necessary improvements to the intersection of GVR and Salmon Falls Rd.
8. Reduction of Speed limit from mile marker from at least west of MP 1.56 (Francisco) continuing east past MP 2.54 (Loch).
9. Realign the community region so that mile marker 1.87 (Salmon Falls RD) to 2.54 (Loch) are within the rural region and thereby can not exceed LOS D.
10. Improvements to the bike lanes to make them safer in the presence of high-volume, high-speed traffic.

This list is just a beginning. We really need the Corridor study to tell us what can be done to improve the safety on the heavily traveled Green Valley Road. Please support us in our request for additional safety measures.

Sincerely,

Kelley & John Garcia

El Dorado Hills CA

www.greenvalleyalliance.org