



**Green Valley Road Corridor Analysis Public Meeting
Wednesday, September 17, 2014**

Comment Card – Please return by 09/24/14

Comments: 1. Is the County Standard (Threshold for Safety - evaluation) current? What is this based on? Does it differ from other local agencies 2. Assessment for private Driveway SSD & Driveway sight Distance was done per the Caltrans HDM. Is this the county standard? 3. During peak hour conditions were any of these driveways evaluated for operations? i.e. Ability to find a gap in the traffic to turn onto green valley Road. 4. Request that Public boards be posted on the County website for all centers

Comments may be submitted today at this meeting or email to: natalie.porter@edcgov.us or mail to: Natalie Porter, El Dorado County, Long Range Planning Division, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

Your Contact Information (Optional):

Name: Kevin Bewsey
Address: EDH
Email: bewseyk@yahoo.com Phone: _____



**Green Valley Road Corridor Analysis Public Meeting
Wednesday, September 17, 2014**

Comment Card – Please return by 09/24/14

Comments: *(ask during)* The Allegheny cut through traffic is incomplete. Need the tie studies - Rumble strips are not an option on allegheny - Residential 5 homes - noise

Comments may be submitted today at this meeting or email to: natalie.porter@edcgov.us or mail to: Natalie Porter, El Dorado County, Long Range Planning Division, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

Your Contact Information (Optional):

Name: Kelley Garcia
Address: 515 Alta Vista Ct.
Email: bugginu@sbcglobal.net Phone: 916-941-0418

Friends of Green Valley

September 23, 2014

County of El Dorado
Community Development Agency
Long Range Planning
Att: Natalie Porter
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

VIA EMAIL

Subject: Green Valley Corridor Analysis

Dear Ms. Porter:

Thank you for the extension of time for public commentary on the draft version of the Green Valley Corridor Analysis submitted for review by Kittelson & Associates. It was extremely helpful to have a little extra time to reflect upon the content of the written analysis, and also discuss key findings with the consulting team at the community meeting last week. 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.

The following are bullet point comments regarding the draft corridor analysis:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Friends of Green Valley

- 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.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide public commentary on the draft version of the Green Valley Corridor Analysis. We look forward to the final version of the analysis with great hope for the future of El Dorado County. Please extend a sincere message of appreciation from Friends of Green Valley to the staff at Kittelson & Associates for their outstanding work on this project to date.

I also want to personally thank Claudia Wade and David DeFanti for their thoughtful consideration of the Community's needs, and placing the Community's collective best interest first in this process.

Sincerely,

Amy L. Anders

for Friends of Green Valley

Sept 22, 2014_Public Comment for the Green Valley Rd 'Draft Corridor Analysis Report'

(report dated September 2014)

Dear Supervisors:

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.

Our feedback with suggested revisions to the subject Green Valley Rd '*Draft Corridor Analysis Report*' follows:

- 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 Rd.

- 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.
- 3) On page 4 (p11/152), it is stated "*Over the study period, 158 total crashes were reported along the segment*". 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.

- 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 its place within the corridor plan, with a meaningless cost estimate.

- 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"*.

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.

- 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.
- 7) There are inconsistencies in the report that must be corrected. An example is Rocky Springs Rd.
- 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.

- 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.
- 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).

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.

Ellen & Don Van Dyke

cc Natalie Porter, LRP Transportation Division
Norm Rowett, EDH APAC
John Hidahl, EDH Community Council
Cheryl McDougal, Green Valley Alliance



El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee
1021 Harvard Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

2014 Board Chair
John Hidahl
Vice Chair
Jeff Haberman
Secretary
Kathy Prevost

October 8, 2014

El Dorado County Planning Services
Attn: Dave Defanti, Long Range Planning
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

**EL DORADO COUNTY
RECEIVED**

OCT 16 2014

LONG RANGE PLANNING

Subject: Green Valley Corridor Traffic Study

An APAC subcommittee consisting of Norm Rowett and Don Van Dyke reviewed the draft traffic study document and provided the following comments:

Thank you for producing this Green Valley Corridor Study. The end result validates many of the safety and traffic concerns of citizens living along the corridor. We would like to see this study used for a basis for a "Green Valley Corridor Plan" that could eventually spell out aesthetic items like sound walls, setbacks, signs, etc. in addition to traffic and safety improvements.

Some items that need to be included in the report:

1. Projected traffic from already approved subdivisions such as:
Silver Springs
Summer Brook
Diamante
Alto
2. As promised, "Final baseline version will include traffic service levels (A, thru F) designations and peak hour directional traffic counts for corridor segments". This still needs to be provided and include traffic service levels for **intersections** along Green Valley Road and related intersections such as El Dorado Hills Blvd and Francisco Drive.
3. Number of lanes. Many of the residents of the Green Valley Corridor wish to see it remain a two-lane road (one in each direction East of Silva Valley). Given future development patterns and other roadways such as Silver Springs Parkway, a 4-lane Green Valley Road should not be a foregone conclusion.
4. Calculation of % cut-through traffic on Malcolm Dixon Road doesn't add up. Many people turn right at Salmon Falls, then to Kensington as a cut through to local schools. It appears the cut-through study only looked at vehicles returning to Green Valley Road.
5. Fixing traffic and safety problems. More time needs to be spent analyzing the problems for cost-effective solutions that can be implemented sooner rather than later.

6. Methodology. LOS calculations are suspect in several cases and don't match the experience of daily drivers. For example, table 11 lists a delay of 0 at Rocky Springs Road. This intersection has restricted sight-distance and frequently can take several minutes to make a left turn onto Green Valley Road. Similarly, intersections 5, 6, 7, 8 show very low average delays, yet this is not what people experience on the ground.

Table 12 lists segment 1 as LOS E, yet that segment frequently backs up to East Natoma Street in Folsom during the evening commute. It then requires several cycles of the signal to make it through the intersection.

Perhaps the county and / or consultants should have met with people reporting specific issues. Those issues could then have been investigated on site with the residents, resulting in a better resolution of problems.

If you have any questions about any of these conditions, please contact John Hidahl, APAC Chairman at Hidahl@aol.com or 916- 933-2703.

Sincerely,

John Hidahl

John Hidahl,
APAC Chairman