



Alfa Omega Associates

Management Consulting • Public Relations • Publicity
Specializing in Land-Use, Environmental & Historic Preservation Issues

3410 Sunshine Way • Auburn, CA 95602-9284

Tel/Fax 530-888-1523 • Cell: 530-308-2689

E-mail: drdalesmith@aoaconsult.net

Dr. Dale Smith, H.H.D., General Manager

July 22, 2009

Ms. Lillian MacLeod
Senior Planner
El Dorado County
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Via Email & USPS Priority Received

Re: DR00-11/76 Gas Station/Circle K Mini Mart Project Appeal Process

Dear Ms. MacLeod.

As part of our continuing best efforts to complete the filing of materials for the above project's Administrative Record, I am sending the latest from our Traffic Expert, Daniel T. Smith who may be submitting additional relevant material prior to the 08-04-09 hearing.

I am sending attached in a Zip File, the following documents from Dan Smith in Arial Font:

- 1) - **EDC Design and Improvement Standards.** These are still the currently applicable standards. The Driveway Separation requirements are on Chart A of Standard Plan 109 which is at page 112 of the pdf.
- 2) - **The General Plan Circulation Map.** According to this map, Mother Lode is classified as a "Major Two Lane Road" as is Durock, South Shingle is classified as a "Two Lane Regional Road" and the short segment of Ponderosa between Mother Lode and North Shingle is classified as a "Four Lane Divided Road".
- 3) - **The General Plan Circulation Element chapter text.** Text on pages 10 and 11 of the pdf describe the roadway classifications shown in the map above. Table TC-1 on page 15 of this pdf describes how access control applies to the General Plan roadway classifications and references to the 1990 Design and Improvement Standards as being applicable as to details for access control (see note 1 of the table). However, nothing in any of this gives a clue how the new General Plan road classification designations correspond

to the older road classifications on Chart A of Standard Plan 109 of the Design and Improvement Standards.

4) - **The County's new Highway Design Manual** which is still in Draft status. This contains some relevant information in Topic 104 (page 31 of the pdf) including 104.2 which suggests this project should perhaps only have access from So. Shingle, Topic 205.1 and 205.2 (pages 37 and 38 of the pdf) which also references Topic 405 and Standard Plan RS 40 (which really isn't relevant to our case, involving sight distance at left turn pockets). Topic 405.6 Access Control is a blind alley, merely a circular reference back to Topic 205. Topic 500 Interchanges simply defers to the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, which we have already been relying on. In sum, most of the content re driveway access is vague, and since this is still draft anyway, somewhat irrelevant.

So in short, the County documents do not provide a clear picture of which standard from Chart A of Standard Plan 109 applies to the Project's driveway to Mother Lode.

However, it is evident that a road classified as a "Major 2-lane Road" is at least a major collector to which the 150 foot separation standard would apply if not an arterial where the 250 foot separation standard would apply.

I am sending you separately, the transparency showing the inconsistency of the site plans on the turning circle maps.

Daniel T. Smith, Smith Engineering & Management

Picking it up once again, Ms. MacLeod, I made note of the fact that Dan Smith is sending a transparency. As soon as I receive this, I will send it along.

As mentioned earlier, we are working hard to see that all necessary documentation is filed with your office as soon as possible since we are 12 days away from the hearing of August 4, 2009.

Sincerely yours,

D

Dale Smith, H.H.D. for
Friends of Shingle Springs Interchange, Inc.