

El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC)
Camino Corridor Project
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
Monday, December 10, 2007; 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Camino Elementary School; Old Gymnasium
Meeting Summary

Project Team Attendees

Kathryn Mathews, EDCTC
Dan Bolster, EDCTC
Jerry Barton, EDCTC
Matt Smeltzer, EDC DOT
Clark Peri, Caltrans
Robert Peterson, Caltrans

Captain Bill Donovan, CHP
Mike Higgins, David Evans & Associates
Greg Oslund, David Evans & Associates
Wendy Hoyt, HDR|The Hoyt Company
Kim Pallari, HDR|The Hoyt Company
Desiree Mervau, HDR|The Hoyt Company

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Attendees

Maryann Argyres, Apple Hill Growers Association
Christa Campbell, Camino Community Action Committee
Tami Knieriem, Camino Heights Advisory Committee
Bessie Deitz, Camino Hills Property Association
Matt Barnes, El Dorado High School
Mindy Jackson, El Dorado Transit
Justin Boeger, El Dorado Winery Association
Scott Chadd, Farm Trails
Jean Huettis, Ivy Knoll Road Association
Jim Mullens, Still Meadows Road Association
Eileen Crim, Trails Now

On Monday, December 10, 2007, the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) hosted a Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting for the Camino Corridor Project Study Report (PSR). The meeting was scheduled from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Camino Elementary School in the old gymnasium.

The SAC meeting was promoted by the EDCTC and was open to the general public. Approximately 60 community members attended the meeting as well as 11 SAC members and members of the Technical Advisory Committee. Special attendees included El Dorado County Transportation Commission Chair Mark Acuna who made opening comments and introductions of the Project Team and Stakeholder Advisory Committee members.

The meeting format included the following agenda:

- I. Open House (6:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.)
 - a. View Displays
 - b. Talk one-on-one with Project Team Staff
- II. Welcome by EDCTC Chair Mark Acuna (6:30 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.)
 - a. Introduction of Project Team and consultants
 - b. Introduction of Stakeholder Advisory Committee
 - c. Purpose of the meeting
- III. Presentation by David Evans and Associates (6:45 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.)
 - a. Prelude to PSR efforts
 - b. PSR Outline – What must a PSR address?

- IV. Facilitated Discussion by HDR|The Hoyt Company (7:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.)
- a. Meeting Ground Rules and Objective
 - b. Project Need
 - c. Project Purpose
 - d. Project Scope
 - e. General Public Comments
 - f. Wrap up and Next Steps

The informal open house allowed attendees to walk around the room and visit a number of information stations and talk one-on-one with the project team staff and consultants. The information stations included:

- Speed Limit Information
- Project Study Report Development
- Camino Corridor History
- Transportation Project Delivery Process
- Apple Hill Traffic Circulation

At 6:30 p.m., Wendy Hoyt formally opened the meeting with welcoming remarks and thanked the attendees for coming before introducing the EDCTC Chair, and Placerville Mayor, Mark Acuna who gave a brief overview of the meeting's purpose and introduced the Project Team and SAC. Greg Oslund, Project Manager with David Evans & Associates, then gave an overview of the Project Study Report and its relevant requirements.

Following Mr. Oslund's presentation and prior to beginning the SAC discussion (see below), Ms. Hoyt thanked SAC members and community members for their participation, and reviewed the format and goals of the meeting.

The facilitated discussion with the SAC was broken out into three topics:

1. Need
2. Purpose
3. Scope

SAC members were asked to comment on each topic and all comments were recorded and summarized back to the SAC for their concurrence.

Following the facilitated SAC discussion, the general public was provided the opportunity to comment through a facilitated Public Comment period. These comments were also diligently recorded and are included below. Following the Public Comment period, Kathryn Mathews, Executive Director of the EDCTC, wrapped up the meeting with a report out of the next steps.

During the meeting, The Hoyt Company recorded all comments and questions made by SAC members and community members. These comments have been placed under four topics:

1. *Need*
2. *Purpose*
3. *Scope*
4. *Additional Comments*

Need

- Safety is the key issue and immediate need.
- Need safer ingress/egress onto U.S. Highway 50 with possible acceleration lanes.
- Camino Heights community wants a safe entrance/exit to community from U.S. Highway 50.
- School buses (high school and elementary level) utilize U.S. Highway 50 and move slower than normal traffic. They need to have a safer option for left turn movements.
- Accidents continue on Highway 50, including the latest one on December 3rd which took out most of the median barrier.

- Still Meadows is the location of the majority of the accidents. We have had two collisions since the increase in speed.
- Still Meadows area poses an immediate safety risk and needs to be addressed now, not ten years out.
- Camino School is on the south side of U.S. Highway 50 and most students live on the north side of U.S. Highway 50. Snows Road is the only access to the school. There was an accident today on Snows Road. There is a lot of traffic and speeding on the road. It is very dangerous.

Purpose

- Make access available for public transit options.
- Provide additional access to the high school site as it expands.
- Minimize affects on existing business and services.
- Improve ingress/egress on highway.
- Minimize impacts to businesses and residents.
- Plans should facilitate both local and through traffic mobility.
- Maintain integrity for El Dorado Trail and provide alternative modes of transportation.
- Ensure logging trucks maintain access.
- Connect Camino Heights with Camino with all modes of transportation.
- Maintain emergency vehicle access in all kinds of traffic.
- Provide additional options for people other than U.S. Highway 50.
- Utilize portions of existing road system already built.
- Slower speed limits.
- Create parallel capacity so there is not so much congestion on Highway 50.
- Would like to see minimal impacts to neighbors as well as businesses: I am for moving an underpass to upper Carson Road.
- Camino School has two bus stops on U.S. Highway 50. A frontage road will benefit the school. Would like to ensure safety of students at the bus stops.
- Would be great to connect neighborhoods with bicycle/pedestrian and vehicular access.
- Maintain safety of Camino Heights Drive. East of Camino Heights Drive there has traditionally been a chain control stop. Need to consider a turn-around location on U.S. Highway 50 if the plan includes placing a median barrier on the highway.
- Suggest speed limit return to 55 miles per hour and area be designated as a safety corridor with enforcement and signage.
- Do not put businesses at risk or congest side street traffic.
- All the major intersections need consideration of slow traffic such as large trucks and High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) like school buses.
- Do not want more traffic in Still Meadows neighborhood.
- Minimize the dangerous left turns on and off of U.S. Highway 50.
- Reduce and/or eliminate left turn movements onto or off of U.S. Highway 50.
- Minimize congestion on U.S. Highway 50.

Scope

- Still Meadows area (Apple Café) needs a barrier/median with crash gates for emergency vehicles.
- The Project Study area should go from Smith Flat Road to the Cedar Grove Interchange.
- Need to look at every access point to U.S. Highway 50 individually due to uniqueness of each.
- Need a barrier with mitigation for the loss of access on and off of U.S. Highway 50. If there is a barrier, how far east will traffic have to travel before gaining access to westbound U.S. Highway 50. How will traffic get redirected west; with a U-Turn?
- Would like to consider an undercrossing on U.S. Highway 50 to Carson Road.
- Need an underpass at upper Carson Road; not lower Carson Road, which already has enough congestion in the area.
- If we move underpass east of upper Carson Road (1000 feet), it will disperse congestion and bring people to Camino.
- Improved traffic is important. Not interested in interchange at Camino Heights neighborhood.

- Camino Heights would like to see access to U.S. Highway 50 be located 1,000 feet east of upper Carson.
- Camino Heights Neighborhood is not interested in a parallel road going through Camino Heights.
- Concern about eastbound off-ramps connecting to Carson Road – need turn pockets (right, left, and through movement options).
- Place park-and-ride lots at Upper Carson for alternative option for carpoolers.
- Need to diffuse traffic in western Carson and the idea of a grade separated under crossing to the east of upper Carson is a good idea that will not disturb current business and property owners located at upper Carson and U.S. Highway 50.
- The connection that is most important is from Newtown Road to Still Meadows Road, especially if we place a barrier on U.S. Highway 50 in that location.
- All objectives need to take into account and incorporate seasonal traffic as well as the seasons of the year due to the changes in roadway conditions or characteristics.
- Please do whatever is necessary to create a three-mile long “safety corridor” on Highway 50 with reduced speed, flashing lights, and devices showing each car’s speed. Caltrans has these designated areas in other places in California. It would be a quick, relatively inexpensive fix that could save life and limb as the final project may take years to complete.
- If we eliminate left turns, Apple Café will suffer. Just to the west of Apple Café, we can do an underpass or u-turn to allow access to westbound U.S. Highway 50. We can do the same near upper Carson.
- A freeway interchange or underpass east of upper Carson would benefit the largest portion of the left turn problem; the rest will need consideration on a case by case basis.
- How do we know if we close lower or upper Carson Road exits during Apple Hill season that it will improve congestion? We know it does as it has in the past. Apple Hill Growers Association has worked hard to place signage along the road directing the public to alternative access.
- Need more law enforcement.
- Incorporate “Iowa Hill Project” traffic estimates into project.
- There have been improvements implemented to the Highway from Paul Bunyan Road east, but no improvements to the west.

Additional Comments Not Related To PSR Need/Purpose/Scope Development

- Include “Iowa Hill Project” representative from “Iowa Joint Advisory Committee” in Camino corridor project.
- With Park & Ride lots on either side of an interchange there will be “event” parking.
- Does this situation occur anywhere else that we can look to as an example to help solve our problems?
- Camino Heights Neighborhood, Apple Hill, and Camino Action Committee all have letters for the EDCTC.
- Has the Project Team taken into account what will occur to traffic if Placerville eliminates the traffic signals?
- In 2005, El Dorado County signed SMUD agreement for Iowa Hill project that will increase traffic. Construction is scheduled to last 5 years. Would like to see a member of the Iowa Hill Action Committee be on the stakeholder committee for this project. The Level of Service, or LOS, information is available through SMUD and should be taken into consideration.
- Line of sight and visibility has diminished since the speed limit was increased.
- Have been attending meeting since the 70s regarding improvements to U.S. Highway 50 in Camino without any implementation. The County should take the 1964 freeway agreement from Caltrans that planned for a frontage road on south side of freeway. We should build that and then let the grandkids decide what to do next.
- It is important to the community to create the right plan rather than one that is less expensive or can be implemented sooner.