



El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee

1021 Harvard Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

2013 Board Chair

John Hidahl

Vice Chair

Jeff Haberman

Secretary/Treasurer

Kathy Prevost

March 16, 2013

El Dorado County Planning Services
Attn: Tom Dougherty, project Planner
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: Application S12-0015/pd 12-0003 - Green Valley Convenience Center and Special Use permit request and Development plan for construction of the Center.

The full APAC committee met on March 13th, 2013 and **voted unanimously (6-0) for conditional support** for the project based on APAC conditions, which are **included in the Development Conditions of Approvals**.

In general, APAC believes the project is an acceptable location for an ARCO station which includes an AM/PM market and a small drive thru food service (Schlotzky's Deli). This commercial project will help reduce the sales tax leakage into Sacramento County. The business plans for the site are appropriate for the area and could draw residents from outside of the County to the center. However, APAC has some **major** concerns regarding the project designs and entry points into the project. **The Conditional support is based on the following APAC conditions:**

- a. **No left turn be allowed for West bound traffic on Green Valley into the project. (See note 1)**
- b. **A right turn deceleration and acceleration lane must be added on East bound Green Valley road entrance to the project as well as other improvements. (See note 2)**
- c. **The reduction of the Wetland setback from 50 feet to 10 is not granted without additional mitigation. (See note 3)**
- d. **The traffic impact study is using questionable data and must be revised (See note 4)**
- e. **Onsite circulation should be reviewed for improved circulation and provisions (i.e. temporary use permit for the drive thru) defined to ensure that the drive through**

**window does not impact traffic flow on either Sophia Parkway or Green Valley Road.
(See note 5)**

- f. Project signage program should use back lighted signs and not exceed 12 feet (See note 6)**
- g. The 12 ft. high wall located on the edge of east property line should be designed to be aesthetically pleasing to the residents that will overlook the site.**

Note 1 Driveway access on Green Valley Rd approx. 200 ft. north of curb return of Green Valley/ Sophia has significant Traffic Operational challenges. The traffic entering the proposed driveway from westbound GreenValley would be in the queue of the westbound Left turn from Green Valley to southbound Sophia Parkway. If a left into the proposed driveway was delayed as is a high probability due to the high volumes especially at peak hours this would dramatically affect moving traffic through the intersection and clearing the backup. This Traffic Operational issue is exacerbated with the geometric transition of the additional lane opening up on eastbound Green Valley Rd just west of the intersection. You now have vehicles transitioning into the added lane #2 and picking up speed with limited sight distance of just coming around the single lane and into two lanes. This would be an operational problem as well as a Traffic Safety issue to allow a left turn into this proposed driveway within 200 feet of the intersection. DOT should do a full Traffic Operational review of the proposed Commercial as this is just one of many operational issues that were identified in a site review. The Traffic study trip numbers do not include the increase in left turns on to Sophia Parkway when the new freeway interchange on to highway 50 at Empire Ranch is operational. The new interchange will have a major impact on the left turn lane at this intersection.

Note 2 The site is deficient in clearing entry traffic from the roadway. There are no turn lanes that would remove slowing traffic from Green Valley Road as they enter the site. Traffic can be travelling east along GVR at 50 mph through the intersection and come upon cars at a near stop turning into the project.

At this same location, the addendum notes the criticality of the west bound left in to accommodate patrons' vehicles and 40' tandem delivery trucks (fuel). Many issues arise from this entry point that needs additional consideration.

- a. If a 40 foot tanker is to cross two lanes of traffic into the project entrance, there should be a much greater site distance requirement due to the extended time of entry vs. a single automobile.
- b. The turn pockets indicated to control queuing, utilize outdated TIA's based on the general plan and extrapolated data to 2025. Not only are these numbers outdated and an inaccurate representation of current traffic in the area, but the study neglects the effects of the opening of the HWY 50 interchange at Sophia parkway. When this occurs, the turn lanes suggested by this project will be will not have sufficient queuing capabilities and will not be able to make adjustments due to the raised median, "Left In" turn pocket created immediately aft of the Sofia Parkway left turn. A similar queuing issue will occur along Sophia blocking the right in right out entrance of the project.

Note 3 Wetland encroachment

1. The wetland 'encroachment' is really more invasive than pictured – 6 feet to the 'water line' is a trampling, basically, during construction.
2. At completion there will be a 12' wall at 11' distance from the 'presumed' water line. Is the fence on top open, where people might toss fast food wrappers into the waterway? Or is it a solid fence all the way to 18', which neighbors *behind* this center will be looking at?
3. The mitigations do not mention the containment of oil/asphalt runoff – some containment should be mentioned, and the parking slope & 'edge' of the pavement becomes important (does water from parking run into the wetland?)
4. The Army Corps' definition of 'intermittent' is based on 30 days after the last major rain of the season. In 2007, that would have been about December. The satellite photo (<http://wdr.water.usgs.gov/wy2007/pdfs/390135121261001.2007.pdf>), shows green at the tail end of June. APAC feel skeptical that the Army Corps wouldn't care – maybe they don't – but the data is just sketchy.
5. The project site actually contains potential nesting sites for special-status birds, per the report. The mitigation (#2) says that IF a nest is found, it will be 'flagged' for a minimum 250'. What does 'flagged' mean, and is 250' a radius or diameter? Also, this buffer can be 'reduced' if there appears to be no disturbance to the nest – so if the mitigation is working, it is reduced until it is no longer working?

APAC really feel as though they are trying to cram too much onto this site. A gas station, sure, and associated food/deli; but drive through food and separate drive through carwash is too much. There just is not circulation space, particularly if they provide an actual reasonable setback to the wetland area.

APAC suggests elimination of the self-service carwash which will allow additional room on the side to meet the Wetland requirements and provide better traffic circulation on the side.

Note 4 The methodology in determining Approved/Pending Projects (APP) is flawed in that the county staff provided only Wilson Estates, Green Valley Center and Dixon Ranch for review purposes. They neglected to evaluate the project with cumulative effects of Alto, Grand Amis, La Canada, Diamante estates, Green Springs Equestrian, Summer Brook, Silver Springs and the PA07-0067 commercial and 10 residence projects. All of these projects contribute to the congestion of Green Valley Road. (See measure Y below)

Page 7 paragraph 3 states annual volume adjustments were made based on 2% annual increase or an increase based on a straight line interpolation from 1998 to 2025. El Dorado Hills has already exceeded the GP growth projections of 2%. Population growth of EDC was 2% or 27,000 people. The El Dorado Hills growth exceeded 9% between 2000 and 2010 which was 24,000 people. 90% of the growth was in EDH. Traffic models based on the GP are deficient at best in this area. Recommendation would be to run a current traffic study for the project area.

Trip distribution needs to be based on a real time study performed at the project site. As a resident of this area, it is apparent that the project trip distributions in table 4 are an inaccurate representation of traffic flow in this area. West toward Folsom at 20% is low and East to EDH Blvd (South) is extremely high at 30%.

Road improvements noted as mitigations are included in the CIP to be completed in the next 20 years (after 2021). This does not meet the community expectations for approval of this (or any other) project along this corridor.

Note 5 On site Queuing: The drive through may block through traffic around the buildings and car wash when autos pass the ordering sign and proceed to the pickup window. APAC has regularly opposed development of fast food outlets outside the Highway 50 corridor. The proposed deli sandwich shop would be an exception. A Special use permit (or other provisions) must be established to preclude blocking traffic onto Sophia Parkway.

Note 6 At best, signage is not attractive. What is the point of having more than minimum signage on a road which rarely sees a "new" driver, one who is not fully aware of all the businesses along his route? APAC recommend that the proposed sign be similar to the one at the ARCO station at the intersection of Foothill and Vineyard in Roseville, CA or not larger than the Chevron sign located up the street. The sign must be a back-lite non electronic display.

Overall APAC believe this is the right site for a commercial application of this type, but the site is too crowded with the addition of the car wash and has significant traffic safety issues (and environmental issues with the creek) that the developer needs to consider before moving forward seeking a project approval.

APAC may change its **position to non-support** if the concerns and conditions documented in this letter, are not implemented into the project design.

If you have any question about any of the comments and concerns expressed here, please contact John Hidahl, APAC Chairman at Hidahl@aol.com or Norm Rowett GVC subcommittee Chairman at arowett@pacbell.net.

APAC appreciates having the opportunity to comment on this project.

Sincerely,

John Hidahl,
APAC Chairman