

Appendix 7 Public Comments and Surveys

	Date	Name	Comment	Response
1	9/17/2014	Kevin Bewsey	1. Is the County Standard (Threshold for safety evaluation) current? What is this based on? Does it differ from other local agencies?	1. The County's method for performance measure (accident rates) is an acceptable method per various older and current traffic manuals, this includes ITE <i>Manual of Transportation Engineering Studies</i> and the FHWA <i>Highway Safety Manual</i> . Every agency, state or county, uses different criteria and methods to monitor their roadways for collisions and safety. The value of 1.0 (Million Entering Vehicles) MEV is an established threshold, for intersections, that is used by the County Traffic Unit and is also used by various state agencies as an accident rate threshold. The value of 1.7 Million Vehicle Miles (MVM), for road segments, is a historically established local threshold that is used by the County Traffic Unit. This threshold was established based on accidents on our County roadways to yield a representative accident rate that was more applicable to our County roadways. Thus, the County has approximately 40 years of California Highway Patrol collected accident data and 22 plus years of accident rates for various County roadways. This consistent and historical data has been recognized as an appropriate basis in previous traffic litigation court cases.
			2. Assessment for private driveway SSD & driveway sight distance was done per Caltrans HDM. Is this the County standard?	The County does use the Caltrans HDM in most instances, if it is not covered by the Caltrans HDM then the AASHTO standards are used. The County's Design and Improvement Standards Manual, adopted in May 27, 1986, and revised in May 1990, could be used for corner sight distance.
			3. During peak hour conditions, were any of those driveways evaluated for operations? (i.e., ability to find a gap in the traffic to turn onto Green Valley Road)	No. Operational analyses were not done for driveways.
			4. Request that Public boards be posted on the County website for all 4 centers.	The exhibit boards have been posted to the Long Range Planning website. See link below: http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/Transportation/Green_Valley_Road_Corridor_Analysis.aspx
			5. In order for the report to be meaningful and implementable, it should include a discussion of available State and Federal funds which addresses the existing corridor deficiencies available through El Dorado County, EDCTC & SACOG, i.e., HSIP, ATP & CMAQ.	A brief discussion of potential funding resources for consideration is included in the document.

Green Valley Road Corridor Analysis Comments

As of 10/15/2014

	Date	Name	Comment	Response
2	9/17/2014	Kelley Garcia	1. The Allegheny cut through traffic is incomplete. Need the t.i.r.e. studies. Blue Mac sensors may have been too far apart.	Comment noted. T.I.R.E. stands for Traffic Infusion on Residential Environment.
			2. Rumble strips are not an option on Allegheny - Residential - 5 homes - noise.	Comment noted.
			3. There are at least 5 instances in the count data technical appendices that the mean average speed is very high.	KAI will double check the results to ensure the correct mean average speed was calculated.
			4. Her intersection improvement priorities are 1) GVR/Salmon Falls - EDH Blvd.; 2) GVR/Silva Valley - Allegheny; 3) GVR/Loch Way; and 4) GVR/Ponderosa	The priorities are noted in the spot location survey roll-up.
3	9/14/2014	Cheryl McDougal	This study is a start. However, important road segments such as Alegheny Road does not have any data - only inferences.	This draft report is for the Green Valley Road Corridor, Alegheny Road is not a Green Valley Road segment.
			Recommendations seem weak and more "outside County responsibility" such as personal property owners removing site barriers.	Comment noted, as stated in the study the County does not improve private driveways.
4	9/17/2014	Marc Strauch	Thank you for completing this study.	Comment noted.
5	9/17/2014	Rich Stewart	The County should include a right turn pocket for the westbound GVR traffic at the El Dorado Hills Blvd./Salmon Falls intersection. The addition of a right turn pocket would help to re-route the cut through traffic on Allegheny Road.	This suggestion will be considered for inclusion in the major update to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Green Valley Road Corridor Analysis Comments

As of 10/15/2014

	Date	Name	Comment	Response
6	9/22/2014	Ellen & Don Van Dyke	<p>Thank you for authorizing this study in response to requests from the EDH Area Planning Advisory Committee, numerous members of the public, and the Green Valley Alliance petition signed by nearly 400 individuals. The draft Report validates public concerns over safety, traffic, and lack of bike lanes, sidewalks, etc. Feedback from corridor residents and users is needed, but at that point, how do we turn this into an action item? We believe this could be the basis for a 'master plan' for the Green Valley corridor, but do NOT wish to see an infinite loop of subcommittee meetings or have it fall into a black hole of inaction. Please discuss in public hearing, and clearly delineate the possible next steps.</p> <p>1) We realize that decades ago, the plan for Green Valley road was to make it four lanes. That is not appropriate anymore. In 1998 the voters approved Measure Y. Then in 2004 they approved what they thought was a 'slow growth-control traffic' General Plan, followed by the 2008 vote to reaffirm Measure Y. References to this study (see Page 1; Executive Summary), as providing 'short term' fixes until we presumably turn Green Valley into a multi-lane highway do not acknowledge that circumstances have changed. This study is an opportunity for the basis of a corridor Master Plan. Those in Long Range Planning must adjust their mindset, and acknowledge a new direction that does NOT involve a 4-lane Green Valley Road.</p> <p>2) Also on page 1 (p8/152), it says there are "several other projects programmed along the corridor which are listed in the County's current Year, 5-Year, 10-Year, and 20-Year CIP. Please provide a list of those CIPs and what improvements are already planned for the project study area. If this has been done, it is not footnoted.</p> <p>3) On page 4 (p11/152), it is stated "Over the study period, 158 total crashes were reported <u>along the segment</u>." Please clarify by revising the underscored phrase to read 'within the study area'. Additionally, this quote, "None of the study intersections or segments exceeds the County's benchmark of average crash rates. Therefore, the County is not required to take further actions" raises the question of exactly what the benchmark is. Please specify the county benchmark for segments and intersections. 158 crashes in under a year seems excessive.</p>	<p>The draft report will be presented to the Board of Supervisors (BOS). The BOS can then direct staff on the next steps. It is the intention of Long Range Planning staff to use the report as input data into the update of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program.</p> <p>Comment noted, this study will be used as a reference document in the major update of the CIP and the TIM Fee Program. The results of the analysis will determine the appropriate size of the Green Valley Road corridor for the existing General Plan land use and in compliance with Policy TC-Xd.</p> <p>The additional projects in the current CIP are listed in Part C: Key Findings and Improvement Considerations.</p> <p>The text will be revised to read "within the study area". Additionally, the 158 crashes are along the whole corridor over a three year period, not a single year. As was stated in the report in the Introduction section and Part D: Technical Data, Analysis and Results section, the County's criteria for further evaluation due to a high crash rate is 1.0 crash per Million Entering Vehicles (MEV) for intersections and 1.7 crashes per Million Vehicle Miles (MVM) for road segments.</p>

	Date	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>4) Also from pg 4 (p11/152), one of the CIP projects (#72309) is the Class II bike lane from Loch Wy to the west entry of Pleasant Grove Middle School. The county website shows a projected cost of \$320K for this project. This is an old estimate, and cannot possibly include the necessary grading and ROW acquisition costs. If the other CIPs referenced have equally outdated or unverified cost estimates, then this study is NOT a constructive tool, and is out of date before it is even drafted. We cannot determine the feasibility of this bike path or it's place within the corridor plan, with a meaningless cost estimate.</p>	<p>CIP #72309 is the Class II bike lane from Loch Way to the west entry of Pleasant Grove Middle School. This majority of this project is the addition of the striping and stencils, on the existing pavement, to identify the Class II bike lane with minor asphalt patching as needed. It does not include any road widening, grading or ROW acquisition.</p>
			<p>5) On page 5 (p12/152), under 'Findings: Private Driveways', there is a serious avoidance of County responsibility. It states: "It should be noted that the County does not improve private driveways".</p> <p>While most home owners will acknowledge that the trimming of vegetation is indeed their responsibility, the County must take responsibility for project approvals that have increased traffic and rendered these driveways unsafe. Those approvals were TOTALLY within the County's control, and in fact are usually accompanied by the mantra of "there's no significant impact". Either the driveways were erroneously approved in an unsafe configuration, or they were rendered unsafe by increased traffic from these projects. Either way, the County has a responsibility to individually evaluate and recommend solutions for each driveway directly on Green Valley Road. The solutions may range in scope from requiring the homeowner to trim vegetation (in simple cases) to the county performing grading to increase shoulder / improve sight distance.</p>	<p>Comment noted, as stated in the study the County does not improve private driveways.</p>
			<p>6) The Executive Summary does not explain that this report only addresses the existing corridor conditions; that point was made in the public outreach meeting last week (9/17/14). The corridor study must be revised to include the as-yet unrealized impact of already approved projects. Projects would include Silver Springs, Summerbrook, Diamonte, La Canada, Alto, Grand Amis, Migianella, and Bass Lake Specific Plan, to name those we are aware of. These are projects that have come in for map extensions and Development Agreements, and are anticipated to move forward with direct impact on Green Valley Rd.</p>	<p>The Executive Summary will make it clear that the report is for existing conditions study only. It was clear in the BOS authorization that the study was for existing conditions only.</p>
			<p>7) There are inconsistencies in the report that must be corrected. An example is Rocky Springs Rd.</p>	

	Date	Name	Comment	Response
			a. Page 32 (41/152) states the visibility issue at Rocky Springs is due to the horizontal curvature of the roadway, but it also mentions overgrown foliage, purposefully distracting from the road curvature problem that can in no way be corrected via tree trimming.	The key findings correctly lists both horizontal curvature and overgrown foliage as having limited the Rocky Springs Road intersection sight distance.
			b. Page 78 (87/152) states there are no apparent stopping sight distance limitations at the intersection. It is possible this refers to vehicles traveling on Rocky Springs coming to a stop at the intersection with Green Valley Rd, BUT it appears to indicate there is not a problem at this intersection, which there most definitely is and which would be inconsistent with 'a' above.	The study will include a clarification that the stopping sight distance that is referenced on page 78 is for the Green Valley Road traveler, whereas, page 32 is referring to intersection sight distance for the Rocky Springs Road traveler.
			c. Page 22 (p32/152) discusses improvements that will possibly decrease the speed differential at the road segment in front of this intersection, and the improvement suggestions include the bike lane project. Cyclists are not the problem at this intersection, and it is not clear how constructing a bike lane will slow traffic down.	Text has been added to indicate that narrowing travel lanes has been shown to slow automobile speeds.
			8) Page 22 (40/152) discusses widening Green Valley to four lanes as a traffic calming strategy. Traffic engineers must acknowledge that this will actually increase traffic speed. It will also encourage additional development along the corridor (...that residents oppose) which will further increase the traffic. Local residents have repeatedly made known that they strongly desire a two-lane Green Valley Rd with the added safety measures of turn lanes and flares.	The study does not state that widening Green Valley Road is a traffic calming strategy. The study simply lists the existing CIP projects for Green Valley Road.
			9) Sidewalks in the El Dorado Hills Community Region have not been provided as required in accordance with General Plan policy TC-5(a) through (c). With so many past development projects, and the property taxes collected in this zone, where are the required sidewalks? An action item to construct sidewalks should spring forth as a result of this report. See pictures on pages 70-73 (p79-82/152).	Property taxes are not used for road improvement projects. In addition, TC-5(a) also states that sidewalks and curbs are required where any residential lot or parcel size is 10,000 square feet or less. Many of the subdivisions were created prior to the adoption of this General Plan and may not have to comply with this requirement.
			We would like to see a 'master plan' for the Green Valley corridor, and not just for safety, but for the scenic rural gateway to the foothills that are El Dorado County's pride and joy. Green Valley Rd should NOT be just another parallel-capacity high-volume connector. This is a beautiful corridor that should be designated 'scenic' and must be developed as such, and not simply 'paved' over and lined with concrete sound walls.	Comment noted.

Green Valley Road Corridor Analysis Comments

As of 10/15/2014

Date	Name	Comment	Response
7	9/23/2014	Friends of Green Valley	<p>I also want to acknowledge the quality of consulting and the candor exhibited in the information contained in the draft report. It gives us all hope that this information will actually be used to improve long-range planning to meet the collective needs of El Dorado County's citizens, and to honestly assess requirements for projects that will impact the Green Valley Corridor in the future.</p> <p>The content of the draft Corridor Analysis contains numerous recommendations for improvements to enhance public safety. Most of these improvements are not currently required because the intersections and segments identified by Kittelson & Associates as being problematic do not exceed the County's threshold for taking action. This finding should be developed in greater detail to determine whether the County's threshold is a valid and effective measure in determining an acceptable risk level for public safety.</p> <p>A general concern repeatedly raised by the Community is that the factual contents of the draft Corridor Analysis will be diluted or materially changed in the final version in order to absolve the County from implementing or requiring appropriate improvements to protect public safety.</p> <p>A general concern raised by the Community is the Green Valley Corridor Analysis will not be used as a tool to enhance the process of reviewing project specific traffic impact analyses and evaluating requirements for new development projects targeted for Green Valley Road.</p> <p>The Community's expectation is that the County will use the findings from the Corridor Analysis as a basis to undertake corrective action in the areas identified as having the highest number of accidents. This is particularly expected when improvements could be implemented at minimal costs to the County or included as required roadway improvements for new development project approvals to mitigate project impacts.</p>
			<p>Comment noted.</p>
			<p>1. The County's method for performance measure (accident rates) is an acceptable method per various older and current traffic manuals, this includes ITE <i>Manual of Transportation Engineering Studies</i> and the FHWA <i>Highway Safety Manual</i>. Every agency, state or county, uses different criteria and methods to monitor their roadways for collisions and safety. The value of 1.0 (Million Entering Vehicles) MEV is an established threshold, for intersections, that is used by the County Traffic Unit and is also used by various state agencies as an accident rate threshold. The value of 1.7 Million Vehicle Miles (MVM), for road segments, is a historically established local threshold that is used by the County Traffic Unit. This threshold was established based on accidents on our County roadways to yield a representative accident rate that was more applicable to our County roadways. Thus, the County has approximately 40 years of California Highway Patrol collected accident data and 22 plus years of accident rates for various County roadways. This consistent and historical data has been recognized as an appropriate basis in previous traffic litigation court cases.</p>
			<p>The report will be presented to the BOS and will be available to the public.</p>
			<p>All new proposed development projects will be required to perform a new transportation impact study. Any new studies will use this report as background baseline information.</p>
			<p>The study will be used as an input data for the update of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) fee program.</p>

General Survey Responses

Question					Total Surveys = 10			
1. Does this draft study address your key concerns regarding existing traffic conditions on Green Valley Road?	Yes = 6	No = 1	NA/Unknown = 1	Somewhat = 2 (written in)				
2. What is your primary use of the Green Valley Road corridor?	Commuting = 6	Recreational = 2	School = 1	Shopping = 5	Other = 2			
3. What time of the day do you most frequently travel on the corridor?	AM Commute Peak = 5	PM Commute Peak = 4	Afternoon School Pk = 2	Off-Peak = 5				
4. How many times in the last three years have you personally had an accident on the corridor?	None = 8	One = 1	Two to Five = 1	>Five = 0				
5. What best describes your place of residence?	EDH = 6	Rescue = 2	CP = 0	Placerville = 1	Other = 1	Non-County Resident = 0		
6. Does your driveway intersect Green Valley Road?	Yes = 3	No = 7	NA = 0					
7. What is our age?	<18 = 0	18-35 = 0	35-50 = 3	50 - 65 = 6	>65 = 0			
8. If you're accessing the Pleasant Grove Middle School, how would you rate the traffic conditions this year at the signalized intersection, i.e., is it operating better this year compared to last school year?	Good = 1	Average = 0	Poor = 0	N/A = 9				
9. If you drive by the Pleasant Grove Middle School, how would you rate the traffic conditions this year at the signalized intersection, i.e., is it operating better this year compared to last school year?	Good = 2	Average = 0	Poor = 2	N/A = 6				

Location Specific Survey

Total Surveys = 9

1. For the existing traffic conditions, which segment(s) are you most concerned about?

Existing Traffic Condition Study Segments for Green Valley Road Corridor	No. of respondents who indicated this is a Segment of Concern
Segment #1 - County Line to Sophia Parkway	2
Segment #2 - Sophia Parkway to Francisco Drive	2
Segment #3 - Francisco Drive to El Dorado Hills Blvd./Salmon Falls Road	4
Segment #4 - El Dorado Hills Blvd./Salmon Falls Rd to Silva Valley Pkwy./Allegheny Rd	5
Segment #5 - Silva Valley Pkwy./Allegheny Road to Malcolm Dixon Road	3
Segment #6 – Malcolm Dixon Road to Deer Valley Road (West)	2
Segment #7 – Deer Valley Road (West) to Bass Lake Road	0
Segment #8 – Bass Lake Road to Cameron Park Drive/Starbuck Road	1
Segment #9 - Cameron Park Drive/Starbuck Road to Ponderosa Road (East)	4
Segment #10 – Ponderosa Road (East) to North Shingle Road	4
Segment #11 – North Shingle Road to Lotus Road	1

2. What is your greatest concern for the segment(s) checked in question No. 1?

For Segments #1 & #2	
Traffic congestion, motorist safety, pedestrian/bike safety, roadway features, pavement conditions, other: wide turn pockets like Bidwell has, more sidewalks, reduce accidents	
For Segment #3	
Traffic congestion, motorist safety, pedestrian/bike safety, roadway features, pavement conditions, cut-through traffic, other: wide turn pockets like Bidwell has, more sidewalks, reduce accidents	
For Segment #4	
Traffic congestion, vehicular speed, motorist safety, pedestrian safety, roadway features, pavement conditions, cut-through traffic, other: wide turn pockets like Bidwell has, more sidewalks, reduce accidents	
For Segment #5	
Motorist safety, traffic congestion, cut-through traffic, vehicular speeds	
For Segment #6	
Vehicular speeds, cut-through traffic	
For Segment #8	
Motorist safety, roadway features	
For Segment #9	
Motorist safety, roadway features, traffic congestion, pavement conditions, other: wide turn pockets like Bidwell has, more sidewalks, reduce accidents	
For Segment #10	
Road features, motorist safety, traffic congestion, pavement condition, other: wide turn pockets like Bidwell has, more sidewalks, reduce accidents	
For Segment #11	
Road features, traffic congestion, pavement condition, other: wide turn pockets like Bidwell has, more sidewalks, reduce accidents	

3. Check the type of improvement that is your highest priority for the segment(s) checked in question No. 1

For Segments #1, #2 & #3	
Safety, roadway operations, road widening, other: turn pockets, wider shoulders, sidewalks	
For Segment #4	
Safety, roadway operations, road widening, traffic calming, other: turn pockets, wider shoulders, sidewalks	
For Segment #5	
Intersection control, safety	
For Segment #6	
Roadway operations, traffic calming	
For Segment #8	
Safety, physical features	
For Segment #9 & #10	
Safety, road widening, physical features, other: turn pockets, wider shoulders, sidewalks	
For Segment #11	
Road widening, other: turn pockets, wider shoulders, sidewalks	