

Attachment A: Board Memo



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
LONG RANGE PLANNING DIVISION**

---

**2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667  
Phone (530) 621-4650, Fax (530) 642-0508**

May 23, 2017

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Natalie K. Porter, P.E., T.E., Traffic Engineer  
Claudia Wade, P.E., Senior Civil Engineer

**Subject:** Agreement for Services No. 515-S1711 with Dokken Engineering for the  
Cameron Park Drive Interchange Alternatives Analysis

---

**Purpose**

Community Development Agency (CDA), Long Range Planning Division (Long Range Planning), recommending the Board approve and authorize the Chair to sign Agreement for Services 515-S1711 with Dokken Engineering (Dokken), in the not-to-exceed amount of \$198,340, to provide civil engineering consultant services to prepare the Cameron Park Drive Interchange Alternatives Analysis, with a term to become effective upon execution by both parties and expiring three years thereafter.

The Cameron Park Drive Interchange has been included in the County of El Dorado Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee program for many years. See Attachment E for a map of the Cameron Park Drive area.

The preferred alternative from the Caltrans Project Study Report – Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) was used to develop a cost estimate for El Dorado County's Major Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and TIM Fee Program Update that was adopted in December 2016. The 2008 PSR-PDS cost estimate was adjusted to 2015 dollars for a value just over \$87 million dollars. As staff and their consultant were updating the TIM fee program, frequent updates were given to the Board. The Board directed staff to keep the interchange improvements in the program, but to prepare updated alternatives analysis to investigate the potential of a less expensive fix that provides the appropriate Level of Service (LOS).

Initially, staff from CDA Transportation Division, working in concert with the Long Range Planning, had planned to complete the alternatives analysis in house. However, the severe rain this winter has redirected Transportation Division staff to designing and constructing the emergency projects to repair damage to the County's infrastructure. To assist in the Civil Engineering required to determine appropriate design alternatives and cost estimates for the Cameron Park Interchange, staff is recommending an agreement with a Civil Engineering firm to complete the alternatives analysis.

The Procurement and Contracts Division completed a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process for CDA in February 2017 for a variety of project support services. A multi-jurisdictional panel evaluated and ranked each Statement of Qualifications and established, based on category of service, a short list of acceptable service vendors. Dokken ranked first in Project Delivery - Transportation Projects, and determined to be highly qualified to provide the services required in this Agreement. The RFQ process was conducted in accordance with Procurement Policy C-17.

## **Background**

In 2007 - 2008 County staff worked in conjunction with Caltrans staff to produce a PSR-PDS for the Cameron Park Drive Interchange. Caltrans approved three alternatives to be evaluated in the original PSR. All three alternatives cost estimates were \$54 million or more. In October 2008, Caltrans approved the PSR-PDS. In 2009, Alternative 1 was incorporated into the 2009 CIP and TIM Fee update. Alternative 1 cost estimate was \$68 million and included eight lanes under the bridge, bridge replacement and \$12 million in right-of-way costs.

On January 25, 2010, the then Department of Transportation (DOT) provided the Board with an update on the U.S. 50/Cameron Park Drive Interchange Project (Legistar #09-1523). DOT recommended that additional alternatives be developed and evaluated because of the large increase in costs and because all three alternatives in the PSR/PDS may impact existing residences and businesses. DOT reviewed 14 alternatives with the Board. The Board recommended that DOT expand the preliminary matrix by adding the following important evaluation measures:

- Impacts on economic development
  - Property tax and sales tax impacts
  - Public benefits such as lost time and fuel caused by delays, impacts on air quality, and ease of finding way back to U.S. 50
- Effects of recent legislation (i.e., SB375)
- Define and differentiate regional vs. local benefits
- Benefits of adding parallel capacity
  - Expand area of analysis to include the Cambridge Road interchange to the Ponderosa Road interchange
  - Look at the area as a system
  - Include Rodeo Road connection from Cameron Park Drive to the Cambridge Road interchange
  - Include Country Club Drive connection from the Cambridge Road interchange to the Cameron Park Drive interchange
  - Include Wild Chaparral Drive and Palmer Drive connection

DOT's efforts in 2009 – 2010 included working with stakeholders, (e.g., County's Economic Development Coordinator, Caltrans, etc.) to define and refine evaluation criteria, refine definitions of alternatives, and add new alternatives if appropriate. DOT also reviewed the information with the Public including meetings/presentations with: Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber of Commerce, Cameron Park Community Leaders, North State Building Industry Association, Cameron Park Visioning Committee, Marshall Hospital, Economic Development Advisory Committee, Cameron Park Design Review Advisory Committee, No Gridlock

Committee, and the TIM Fee Working Group. Comments received during this public outreach included:

- Echoing similar ideas as the Board suggested
- Focus on creating jobs in the Cameron Park area
- Support alternative forms of transportation (e.g., Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit)

The net effect of the presentations to the Board and the public resulted in the substantial expansion of the evaluation matrix. The matrix now included 42 alternatives, more than twice as many as previously identified, and 36 evaluation criteria.

DOT gave a presentation to the Board on August 23, 2010 (Legistar Item #10-0836) with a review of the 42 alternatives. No formal action was taken. However, by consensus, the Board recommended the following items of general areas of focus:

- 1) Accessibility to areas identified for Economic Development
- 2) Commercial Corridors
- 3) Transportation, mobility and multi-modal
- 4) Avoid impact to residential areas
- 5) Minimal Caltrans involvement – including the current interchange
- 6) Improve circulation and capacity
- 7) Reduce Traffic Impact Mitigation fees, and
- 8) Increase capacity for commercial development

On October 26, 2010 DOT went back to the Board with an update to the study with a request for direction on the project alternatives and evaluation criteria. DOT had reduced the 42 alternatives to a more manageable 14, reduced the 36 evaluation criteria down to seven, included local road improvements with the interchange improvements and considered a cost threshold in the \$20 - \$30 million range. DOT held additional stakeholder meetings and received comments from the Cameron Estates Community Services District, Caltrans and Cameron Park Vision group.

The seven evaluation criteria became:

- 1) Cost
- 2) Caltrans Approval or Willingness of Acceptance
- 3) LOS – Cameron Park Drive at Palmer Drive and Coach Lane
- 4) Causes a removal of a house
- 5) Causes a removal of a business
- 6) Facilitates multi-modal transportation
- 7) Public buy-in

The Board received the report and by consensus noted the following:

- 1) Satisfied with the work to this point
- 2) The Wild Chaparral and Palmer connection is critical
- 3) The freeway overcrossing connection Palmer to the south side of the freeway is important
- 4) Local road circulation improvements need to be considered
- 5) Further study on the diverging diamond interchange concept is important
- 6) Consider the phasing of the improvement projects

7) Balance the cost of the improvements against the improvements in traffic flows

Further study of the interchange was placed on hold due to other on-going projects. The recession in the mid-2000's also lessened the urgency of the project. The Major Update to the CIP and TIM Fee brought the Cameron Park Drive Interchange project back into the discussion on cost.

### **Discussion**

During the Major Update to the CIP and TIM Fee Program, the 2008 PSR-PDS cost estimate was adjusted to 2015 dollars for a value just over \$87 million dollars. As staff and their consultant were updating the TIM fee program, frequent updates were given to the Board. The Board directed staff to keep the interchange improvements in the program, but to prepare an updated alternatives analysis to investigate the potential of a less expensive fix that provides the appropriate LOS. As noted in the background, several alternatives had been evaluated in 2010; however, no changes were made to the PSR-PDS. One alternative the "diverging diamond" configuration was vetoed by Caltrans during the preparation of the 2008 PSR-PDS. The configuration is now considered acceptable by Caltrans under certain conditions and will be considered under the updated alternatives analysis.

In addition, the El Dorado County travel demand model has been updated, as directed by the Board, to reflect a 1.03% average annual growth rate. This is significantly less than the previous assumption of 3% average annual growth rate. This significant change in traffic forecast, and current General Plan policies require the completion of the alternatives analysis to potentially reduce the TIM fees in TIM Fee Zones 2 and 3.

### **Recommendation**

Long Range Planning recommending the Board approve and authorize the Chair to then Agreement with Dokken Engineering to provide direct consultant services to the County to perform the Cameron Park Drive Interchange Alternatives Analysis.

Additional consultant expertise is also required to provide traffic engineering support needed to complete the alternatives analysis. A companion agenda item (Legistar #16-0189) will address Amendment #01 to Agreement #16-54405 to increase the consultant services contract for DKS Associates for Traffic Engineering consulting services for this project.

### **Next Steps**

Upon Board direction:

- 1) The Chair will sign two originals of the Agreement with Dokken Engineering;
- 2) The Clerk of the Board will return one fully executed original Agreement with Dokken Engineering to Long Range Planning for transmittal to the consultant; and
- 3) Staff will issue a Notice to Proceed

### **Contact**

Natalie K. Porter  
CDA Long Range Planning