



Outlook

Proposed Arco Station Durock Rd. and South Shingle Rd.

From Barbara Rogers <bdriskellrogers@hotmail.com>

Date Wed 1/28/2026 9:15 PM

To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

I am opposed to this project. The traffic is already a nightmare in that area and building a gas station will only add to the problem. I see no reason for another fueling station to be built at that location when there are already two stations in the area.

I use the Shingle Springs Post Office on a regular basis and the traffic is an issue even at non peak times. Durock Road backs up substantially late in the afternoon when people are getting off work, not to mention the backup of traffic getting off the freeway at the Ponderosa exit.

It is time for the leader of this county to begin listening to the citizens and do the right thing. I hope you will deny this project.

Thank you.

Barbara J. Rogers
Cameron Park CA
530 305-3849 cell
530 387-7191 home



Arco station at durock and south shingle

From Dava Trusner <trusner@sbcglobal.net>
Date Thu 1/29/2026 4:40 AM
To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

We live part time in the area and own our home. We were full time residents of shingle springs for 22 years.

We're oppose this gas station as we already have 2 on those corners and now you want to add a third! Why?

We already have bad congestion in that intersection and we heard that the bridge and road over hwy 50 was suppose to be widened. Until that happens no additional business should be allowed that would bring in more traffic!

We have plenty of gas stations! We do not need more!!

Michael and Dava Trusner

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)



El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

Honorable Supervisors,

The Shingle Springs Community Alliance (“Alliance”) appreciates your attention to our appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of CUP23-0007, Durock Road AM/PM.

As demonstrated in our comments below and in the record at the November 12, 2025 Planning Commission hearing, this project does not meet the legal requirements for the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit. The project would be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare of the Shingle Springs Community because it worsens an unacceptable and unsafe traffic situation in and around the US 50/Ponderosa Road interchange by introducing thousands of trips per day. It would also violate General Plan provisions that require adequate infrastructure to be in place before project development.

Nevertheless, a 3-2 majority of the Planning Commission voted to approve the project with a condition that the car wash portion of the project does not open until the earlier of 1) completion of the road improvement, or 2) January 1, 2030. Based on their verbal remarks at the meeting, it appears that the Commission majority was under the impression that they could only consider impacts from the car wash portion of the project. This is incorrect - county ordinances are clear that when a portion of a project requires discretionary review, the entire project becomes discretionary. Additionally, it appears that some commissioners based their decision in part on a desire to avoid costs and inconvenience for the applicant that would be incurred if a denial was made and the applicant chose to submit a revised project. Consideration of the cost of resubmittal should never be an issue in a quasi-judicial hearing – the decision should be squarely focused on whether the project complies with applicable laws and policies.

The Alliance requests that the Board correct these errors and stand for the public safety of the Shingle Springs community by denying this project.

Traffic Safety is a Serious Problem in Shingle Springs

Traffic is a significant concern around the US 50/Ponderosa interchange, especially during school drop off and pick up hours. This traffic congestion isn’t merely inconvenient - it poses a significant risk to public safety. According to traffic data from UC Berkeley’s California Traffic Safety Overview dashboard¹, the rate of fatal and serious injuries per capita from traffic collisions in Shingle Springs is 2.4 times the statewide average.

¹ [Statewide Analysis by Place | Traffic Safety Overview](#)

As the applicant concedes, traffic regularly backs up from the eastbound Ponderosa Rd. offramp onto the US 50 mainline during these hours due to inadequate queuing space. Drivers proceed along the freeway at regular freeway speeds, and then suddenly and unexpectedly encounter stopped traffic in the right lane. Within the period of the circulation of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project, there was a collision due to this backup. Adding to the serious safety situation is that many of the drivers that must navigate the area during these times are inexperienced drivers under 18 years of age heading to and from Ponderosa High School.

Additionally, traffic regularly backs up along Durock Rd. in the eastbound direction approaching the intersection with South Shingle Rd. during afternoon commute hours as employees of the Shingle Springs business park attempt to access Highway 50. Images 1 and 2 below show this traffic on a recent Monday afternoon. This problem is exacerbated when traffic along the highway in Cameron Park (a frequent occurrence during weekday afternoons) incentivizes drivers to exit the highway and use Durock Road as an alternate route. This traffic backup occurs directly adjacent to where the applicant's establishment would be located and will greatly impede ingress and egress to the site.

In their materials presented to the Planning Commission, the applicant concedes the problem by citing the Traffic Report for the County's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP):

The Transportation Analysis Report ("Traffic Report") for the CIP, prepared in November 2024, examined five of the same intersections that the Project's TIS analyzed. The Traffic Report evaluated intersection conditions and average maximum queue lengths under existing conditions and projected "Horizon Year" 2049 conditions with and without the CIP. **The Report found that under the existing conditions, on southbound Ponderosa Road and westbound N. Shingle Road, and eastbound left turn on S. Shingle Road/Mother Lode/US-50 operate at LOS F during the peak hours of 7:45 to 8:45 AM and 3:00 to 4:00 PM (Attachment 4- Section 3.2 Intersection Operations from Traffic Report).** This is consistent with the public comments indicating that school traffic is the cause of the existing congestion. **With respect to queue length, the available storage is exceeded at the northbound Ponderosa Rd./US-50 Westbound ramps and the eastbound S. Shingle Road/Mother Lode/US-50 in the AM peak hour** (Attachment 5- Table 16 from Traffic Report). The Report also analyzed freeway operations and determined that peak hours for eastbound US-50 are 7:45 to 8:45 AM and 4:15 to 5:15 PM, and for westbound US-50, 7:15 to 8:15 AM to 3:00 to 4:00 PM (Attachment 6- Tables 17 & 18 from Traffic Report). The Report confirmed that, without the Interchange CIP, by 2049, most of the study intersections will experience a deterioration in LOS to LOS F.

With the existence of the hazard conceded, the applicant appears to argue that their project should nevertheless be allowed to proceed because 1) They are not worsening the problem because most of their trips are "pass through" or "diverted" trips; 2) The County intends to fix the interchange at a point in the future; 3) In the interim they will stripe a portion of Durock Rd. as "keep clear" to provide ingress and egress; and 4) CalTrans doesn't require mitigation in cases where there is existing traffic spilling onto the mainline. We will address each of these claims individually.

The Traffic Study's Pass Through and Diverted Trip Assumptions are Suspect for this Site, and the Unique Nature of the Site makes Pass Through and Diverted Trips Problematic.

The applicant's traffic study estimates that the Project will generate a total of 3308 net trips per day, a large number for an already impacted interchange serving a rural community. The applicant's traffic

study claims that most traffic utilizing the project will be either pass through or diverted trips, meaning that the impact is minimized because vehicles would be using the local roadway network regardless. It appears that these claims are based on the National Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition.²

A national resource cannot capture the unique conditions present at this project site. It is implausible that a fuel station located directly adjacent to a major highway, especially a highway heavily used by tourists, would not divert a significant amount of traffic off the main line of the highway and to their establishment especially during high travel periods. Local residents have several other existing options for fueling, including two at the same intersection and five more at adjacent freeway exits. **The community already has ample fueling options – this project seeks to attract travelers who would not otherwise exit at the Ponderosa Road interchange.**

However, even to the extent that some trips are pass through or diverted, many of these trips will still impair circulation in the vicinity. Due to the unique and impaired nature of the site, prior to construction of road improvements (discussed further below) drivers wishing to exit the project and proceed north on South Shingle Road to access Highway 50 or destinations north of the freeway will be unable to turn north on South Shingle Road. Instead, they will need to exit onto Durock Road (already impacted) and turn left to return to South Shingle Road.

The alternate route if Durock is blocked is dangerous.

If traffic on Durock impairs egress, drivers would be forced to exit via the southern driveway, a right out onto southbound South Shingle Road. Most likely, these drivers would proceed south on South Shingle Rd, make a left on Sunset Lane, then make a left on Mother Lode Drive to return to the intersection. Image 3 at the conclusion of this submission shows an illustration of the alternate route that drivers would take.

Not only is this very inconvenient for travelers, Sunset Lane is a narrow roadway serving existing businesses and residences that struggles to adequately serve existing demands. It is not an appropriate roadway to carry tourist traffic that may be unfamiliar with driving in the area. Additionally, both left turns on the route (left onto Sunset from South Shingle, and left onto Mother Lode from Sunset) present significant challenges. They are both uncontrolled and located adjacent to curves that significantly limit drivers' views of oncoming traffic. In the case of the left turn from South Shingle onto Sunset, drivers stopped waiting to turn also risk a rear end collision from vehicles speeding downhill on South Shingle suddenly coming upon a stopped vehicle around the bend. A similar dynamic occurs with the Sunset/Mother Lode turn, except in this case the driver turning left from Sunset to Mother Lode must contend with crossing the path of drivers speeding down Mother Lode headed downhill eastbound around the curve. Images 4 and 5 demonstrate the existing safety issues at these intersections.

Other options for drivers include illegal U-turns or utilizing existing commercial parking lots to turn around and proceed north on South Shingle Road. Both options are disruptive, dangerous, and injurious to the existing community.

² See Pages 16-18 of the applicant's September 2025 Traffic Study

The “Keep Clear” Striping on Durock Road is not an Adequate Solution and could make the Existing Problem Worse.

In response to the existing problem on queuing on Durock Road which would conflict with egress from the project site, the applicant proposes to stripe a section of the road “keep clear”. This may provide some relief for drivers seeking to turn left onto Durock, but this will be a small minority of drivers. Most drivers will seek to turn right to access the freeway interchange, Mother Lode Drive, or destinations north of the freeway.

For drivers seeking a right turn to proceed east on Durock, striping does not solve their problem. They will still be stuck within the facility’s internal circulation seeking an opportunity to turn right. Additionally, it could result in drivers within the facility cutting in front of drivers already on Durock, leading to driver frustration and lengthening the queue backup on eastbound Durock, unfairly impacting other commercial centers further west.

El Dorado County’s Policies, Not CalTrans Guidelines, Govern the Decision on this Project

During the Planning Commission hearing³, the applicant’s traffic engineer attempted to excuse the Project’s contribution to the backup of the Ponderosa Road offramp queue onto mainline Highway 50 by stating that CalTrans only requires a project to mitigate this condition if traffic was not queuing onto the mainline prior to the project. The Alliance has not been able to verify this claim, but regardless this decision is an El Dorado County-level decision not a CalTrans decision. There are many areas of law, especially regarding traffic impacts, where the state law allows a higher tolerance for negative impacts than El Dorado County policy. El Dorado County’s standard for Conditional Use Permit Approval is clear – if the project is injurious to the neighborhood or harms public safety, it cannot be approved. This is the case even if there is already an existing issue that the Project would worsen.

The County’s CIP Project is Promising, but does not Justify Approval of this Injurious Project

As you know, the County is planning significant changes to the Ponderosa Road/Highway 50 interchange as part of its Capital Improvement Plan. These improvements will include a realignment of Durock Road to the south. The applicant has submitted site plans indicating that once the improvements are completed, project ingress and egress will be exclusively via South Shingle Road.

While welcomed, this Board has a responsibility to base its decision on the conditions on the ground at the present time, not as they might be at some future point. The voters have repeatedly provided clear direction to this Board (for instance, in 2016’s Measure E) that they want to see road improvements in place prior to major development occurring – not developments first and then necessary road improvements at a later point. This is reflected in our General Plan land use element:

Development within Community Regions, as with development elsewhere in the County, may proceed only in accordance with all applicable General Plan Policies, including those regarding infrastructure availability as set forth in the Transportation and Circulation and the Public Services and Utilities Elements. Accordingly, **development in Community Regions and elsewhere will be limited in some cases until such time as adequate roadways, utilities, and**

³ November 12, 2025 Planning Commission meeting video, timestamp 2:21:15

other public service infrastructure become available and wildfire hazards are mitigated as required by an approved Fire Safe Plan.⁴

It is possible that the interchange will resolve the traffic situation enough that this project could be acceptable in the future. However, this determination should only be made after the improvements have been constructed. The new configuration will present its own challenges, as Durock Road will not be an option for egress and traffic heading towards the freeway will need to turn left across South Shingle. A future traffic study after improvements are completed should examine these issues before any project is considered. But even if the Board assumes that the improvements will address the traffic concerns, it should not approve the construction of the Project now and force the community to suffer injury until improvements are made.

The Planning Commission Agreed the Traffic Impact of the Project was Problematic – Then Approved the Project Based on a Mistaken Understanding

Throughout the November 12, 2025 Planning Commission hearing it was clear that traffic was a significant concern for Commissioners. However, Commissioner Patrick Frega expressed his view that the Commission could only consider the impact of the car wash portion of the Project, because gas stations and convenience stores are by right uses in commercial zones.⁵

Upon conclusion of the Commission's initial discussion Commissioner Tim Costello, representing District 4 which includes Shingle Springs, made a motion to deny the Project which was seconded by Commission Chair Bob Williams. "When it comes to traffic, its hard to separate the two of them, and the impact is to the community and to the residents," stated Commissioner David Spaur in considering the motion, "You aren't going to move and relocate the high school, and you can't pick up and relocate the residents. So mitigating the traffic is probably the most important issue, and I would like to hear if there is any suggestion on how that can be approved, and if that can't be approved today and can in the future do we deny the project until the future?" Commissioner Jeff Hansen also indicated his intent to vote in favor of denial. Staff requested that the Commission take a brief recess to allow for the preparation of findings of denial, which seemed inevitable at that point. The Commission took a recess as requested.⁶

Upon reconvening⁷ staff presented their proposed findings of denial. However, the applicant's representative was invited to speak to the Commission once again, even though the public hearing had closed and a motion was on the table. The applicant's representative spoke of an openness to phase the project and of the significant investment that had been made in the project. Commissioner Spaur expressed sympathy with the applicant's prior costs and the costs they would need to incur to resubmit a project. Commissioner Jeff Hansen then made a second motion approving the project with a condition to delay car wash opening until the road improvement project is completed or January 1, 2030, whichever is earlier. This second motion appeared to be based on the arguments advanced earlier by Commissioner Frega claiming that the Commission could only look at the car wash portion of the Project. This second motion passed 3-2, abruptly ending consideration of the item.

⁴ General Plan Policy 2.1.1.7

⁵ November 12, 2025 Planning Commission meeting video timestamp 2:05:00

⁶ This exchange takes place beginning at November 12, 2025 Planning Commission meeting video timestamp 2:33:50

⁷ The Commission reconvened at November 12, 2025 meeting video timestamp 2:54:20

The Assumption that the Commission Based its Approval on – That Only the Impacts of the Car Wash can be Considered – was Incorrect.

As noted above Commissioner Frega advanced an argument, which the Commission majority appeared to endorse, that the Commission could only examine the impacts of the car wash and not the rest of the Project. This is in direct contradiction to the County's Zoning Ordinance which states that, "Where a single lot is proposed for concurrent development of two or more uses listed in the tables, the overall project shall be subject to the permit level required for each individual use under Subsection B (Planning Permit Requirements) below in this Section. Consolidation of multiple permits into the one permit application may be allowed, subject to Director approval."⁸ The section on Conditional Use Permit further states, "If there is any single use that triggers the need for a Conditional Use Permit, **the Conditional Use Permit will include and address, as long as it remains active, all existing and subsequent uses** allowed by discretionary permit."⁹ Staff explained that the entire project is subject to discretionary review and covered by the Conditional Use Permit in their introductory presentation on the item¹⁰

These requirements are important because it prevents applicants from "piecemealing" – attempting to implement projects piece by piece so that each subsequent step appears less impactful. A project that is just a gas station and/or convenience store is a fundamentally different project than the Project that is before you. The Alliance recognizes that the applicant has the option to forgo the car wash and file an application for a gas station and convenience store, and that such an application *could* be considered by right under the County's current Zoning Ordinance (we emphasize *could* because even by right projects must meet County requirements and standards, and the Alliance does not assume that such a project would meet those requirements given the site's limitations). However, such an application is not before the County at this hearing.

Planning Commission thus erred by considering only the impact of the car wash. **The Project before you is discretionary in its entirety. Because this discretionary application cannot meet the requirements to obtain a Conditional Use Permit, it must be denied.**

The Commission's Consideration of the Costs and Inconvenience to the Applicant was Inappropriate

As discussed above, the Commission appeared swayed by highly irregular testimony from the applicant's representative provided after the close of the public hearing and after a motion was already on the table. In these comments, which appeared to factor into the decision of some Commissioners and could not be challenged by opponents, the applicant's representative noted the significant investment the applicant had made in the Project to date.

Real estate development is an inherently risky proposition. When the applicant decided to pursue a project, they were aware that there was a risk that it may not be approved. They also were, or should have been, aware of the significant traffic issues at the Project site and decided to take a risk to proceed with an application. The decision that was before the Commission, and is now before the Board, is simple. **You must determine if all the findings needed to issue a Conditional Use Permit can be made,**

⁸ El Dorado County Ordinance Sec. 130.20.030(b)

⁹ El Dorado County Ordinance Sec. 130.52.021(D)

¹⁰ November 12, 2025 Planning Commission meeting video timestamp 42:50

or not. If the answer is no, the Project must be denied. Prior investments and the prospect of future inconvenience and potential costs to the applicant must not play a role in the decision.

Other CEQA Issues Remain Unaddressed

Prior to the Planning Commission hearing, the community members submitted comments noting that the Project's Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is deficient in its analysis in the areas of Aesthetics, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Public Services. The Alliance holds that these issues remain unresolved and an Environmental Impact Report should be required should the Project proceed. While the Alliance believes that there is ample evidence to deny the Project based on its failure to meet the County's requirements for a Conditional Use Permit and thus the CEQA issues would be moot, should the Board approve the Project the Alliance reserves the right to raise these CEQA issues in future legal action.

Conclusion

The requirements in the County Code to issue a Conditional Use Permit are as follows:

- The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan; and
- The proposed use would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, or injurious to the neighborhood; and
- The proposed use is specifically allowed by a conditional use permit pursuant to this Title.¹¹

All three requirements must be met. As described above, the proposed use is not consistent with the General Plan, would be detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare, and would be injurious to the neighborhood. Two out of the three requirements cannot be met, and the Planning Commission's "compromise" of delaying the opening of the car wash do not rectify the issues. Therefore the Board must uphold the appeal and deny the Conditional Use Permit.

Should you have any questions about the Alliance's position, please contact Andy Nevis at (916) 837-1385 or andynevis@gmail.com

Sincerely,

Shingle Springs Community Alliance

¹¹ El Dorado County Ordinance Sec. 130.52.021(c)

Images 1 and 2



Eastbound traffic on Durock Road approaching South Shingle Road on Monday, January 12 at approximately 4pm, taken from the approximate location of the proposed egress from the Project site. Traffic extends well past the proposed project site and impacts nearby businesses.

Image 3



On occasions when Durock Rd. is backed up and egress from the site to Durock is not possible, drivers will be forced to proceed south on South Shingle, turn left on narrow Sunset Ln., and turn left on Mother Lode Dr. to return to the freeway.

Image 4



The turn from South Shingle Rd onto Sunset Ln is uncontrolled and forces drivers to navigate oncoming traffic with minimal visibility. There is also a risk of a rear end collision from traffic speeding downhill.

Image 5



Drivers navigating the uncontrolled left turn from Sunset Ln. to westbound Mother Lode Dr. must cross approaching eastbound traffic that proceeds quickly around a downhill curve.