

Appendix B: Comments on the Notice of Preparation

Art Marinaccio
4024 Jackpine Rd.
Shingle Springs CA 95682

County of El Dorado DOT
Jennifer Maxwell

RE: Response to the NOP Diamond Springs Parkway project on behalf of myself and the Teter Trust

January 18, 2008

Having heard the presentations and reviewed the proposed scope I have concerns that the project scope and therefore the scope of the project EIR may be inadequate.

The primary concern I have is that the area to be studied on the westerly portion of the project does not include the option of placing the roadway northerly of the current draft location.

By leaving the alignment as far southerly as is proposed may save a few dollars on construction and studies but will cause a significant portion of those lands that were anticipated to become developable with the infrastructure of the MC&FP to be essentially not suitable for use by high end retail.

Studies have shown that we have sufficient lands for low value strip commercial. The MC&FP was proposed to solve existing deficiencies, retain the community of Diamond Springs and its historic values while allowing for economic expansion that would therefore be able to help pay for both phase one and phase two improvements to the Missouri Flat corridor. To the extent that the current alignment does not allow for the implementation of the MC&FP as enacted and to the extent that it does not accommodate the fulfillment of the General Plan uses of properties in the area the purposes of the project are frustrated.

In order to be prepared to move ahead with a project that meets the project objectives additional studies should be included in the scope of work including all work necessary to allow using lands of the JPA that are protected by terms of the "Rails-to-Trails" act.

Failure to allow for the proper development of lands on the westerly end of the Parkway will have the result in greatly increasing the acquisition costs of the right of way making the project significantly more difficult to finance. Not accommodation the future uses of other lands assumed to be developed within the MC&FP would have a significant result in limiting the opportunities to enact phase two or the MC&FP.

Sincerely,

Art Marinaccio

Robert A. Smart, Jr.
4520 Lon Court
Diamond Springs, CA. 95619
January 11, 2008

Jennifer Maxwell, Project Planner
Department of Transportation
El Dorado County
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: Diamond Springs Parkway

Dear Jennifer,

I am very pleased the El Dorado County Department of Transportation is moving forward with the Diamond Springs Parkway. This project will help reduce the traffic that now has to go through the center of historic Diamond Springs. With implementation of the new El Dorado County General Plan, the community of Diamond Springs is going to see significant growth as will the lands east of town. We need this new arterial route around historic downtown. To be an effective arterial, please limit the number of intersections onto the route by consolidating access points and/or require frontage roads. Recognizing implementation will be in phases, please plan for the ultimate non-motorized user needs from the inception.

This project presents a great opportunity to start showing the benefits of our new El Dorado County General Plan. In particular, Transportation and Circulation Element Goals and Policies in TC-4 and TC-5 and Parks and Recreation Element Goals and Policies found under Objective 9.1.2 and 9.1.3 provide guidance how the project should be planned. Additional guidance is also found in our 2005 El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan. The management plan for the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor and the El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan need to be considered. Class II Bike lanes and sidewalks are needed along the route. Please consider a class I bike path that parallels the entire route. We need safe routes for our children to ride bikes to school and other facilities.

The existing El Dorado Trail (SPTC) alignment may be adversely impacted by the new route. The El Dorado Trail is a multipurpose trail for bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians and needs wider shoulders than normally required for a class I bike route. Impacts to the trail may be mitigated with new off street class I bike routes connecting to a grade separated crossing or a signalized intersection. The closer the grade separated or signalized crossing of Missouri Flat Road is to the original trail alignment, the better. Currently the El Dorado Trail is severed by Missouri Flat Road and only short segments of trail would need to be built to reconnect the trail at Golden Center Drive. The convergence of the El Dorado Trail and Missouri Flat Road could make the Golden Center-Missouri Flat intersection a hub for non-motorized users.

High density dwellings are within a quarter of a mile of where the new connector will meet Highway 49. More high density structures will be built under the new plan, and the connector road corridor will provide easy access for individuals to walk to Herbert Green School, Wal-Mart, and other activity centers. Construction of bike lanes and sidewalks not only meet the emerging community needs, but will reduce the number of motor vehicle trips through this very congested area.

The existing Missouri Flat Park and Ride at Highway 50 is full almost every weekday. Development of a new Park and Ride facility in conjunction with this project could have dual purposes by serving as a trail head facility.

I encourage the realignment of Highway 49, which would allow the use of old 49 as a frontage road. This change could greatly improve the safety through this area, because currently adjacent home owners frequently back out onto busy Highway 49 creating very dangerous traffic hazards.

Diamond Springs is heading in a similar direction that confronted Placerville. The primary transportation corridor to the east and west can continue to lead through the center of the community or go around the community center. I prefer the latter and strongly support implementing this route.

You are starting on a very worthwhile effort. Please let me know if I can help.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Smart, Jr.
cc: Supervisor Jack Sweeney

El Dorado County DOT
Diamond Springs Parkway EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Card
Wednesday, January 9, 2008

Please provide your comments below. Thank you for your participation.

1. Major concern is how this configuration will effect the fully manufactured eight lot subdivision I own on Bradley Drive and Elisa Way. The proposed road will directly effect five of the eight lots and thus affect the value of the others.

The value of this long standing industrial subdivision will be greatly affected.

2. The proposed location is being influenced by a large commercial private development to the south of my property.

3. Proposed road location will conflict with three large existing propane storage tanks and distribution centers located on Bradley Drive and Truck Street. Relocation of these facilities would create a great burden on the property owners.

4. Concern the road was designed to serve the proposed commercial development rather than the other land owners in the area.

Please feel free to contact me at any time.

Name Barry Brewer Telephone: 916-536-2236

Agency or Organization _____ Email Address: bdbrew@yahoo.com

Address 9221 Rock Canyon Way City Orangevale Zip 95662

Signature Barry D. Brewer Date January 11, 2008

El Dorado County DOT
Diamond Springs Parkway EIR
Scoping Meeting Comments

January 17, 2008

The purposed Diamond Parkway as is currently laid out in your illustration appears acceptable for our existing homes along Hwy 49.

Our issues with the project that needs answers after your study has been completed.

1. The Diamond Parkway 2 lane will be done in phase one from Pleasant Valley to Missouri Flat connector. The current traffic, noise, and speed of vehicles is dangerous for us to pull in and out of our driveways now. More traffic will only increase the danger and noise levels that are not and will not be acceptable.
2. What is the distance of the final 4 lane Parkway and Hwy 49? And what will that property become?
3. Will there be sidewalks for the pedestrians that are commuting on Hwy 49?
4. After your studies are done are you going to contact the Property Owners with the results? Or advise us by mail with scheduled meetings about this project?

I wish to thank you for your attention we have in regards to the existing problems as well as future concerns.

Signed
Jerry Herrington
4133 Hwy 49
Diamond Springs, Ca 95619
Jerry@EliteControl.net
916-203-7345

From: Jennifer P Maxwell <JMaxwell@edcgov.us>
To: <cmeyer@brandman.com>
Date: 1/18/2008 2:22:11 PM
Subject: Fw: Comments prior to Draft Environmental Impact Report for Diamond Springs Parkway and SR 49

Scoping comments.

----- Forwarded by Jennifer P Maxwell/PV/EDC on 01/18/2008 02:21 PM -----

Matt McCollum <mgmccollum@yahoo.com>
01/18/2008 02:02 PM

To
jmaxwell@edcgov.us
cc

Subject
Comments prior to Draft Environmental Impact Report for Diamond Springs Parkway and SR 49

Attention: Jennifer Maxwell
El Dorado County DOT

The purpose of this email is to present two issues that need to be considered when preparing the EIR for the development of the Diamond Springs Parkway and SR 49 development.

Problem A)

There currently exists a problem with SR 49 between Pleasant Valley Road and Lime Kiln that El Dorado County Department of Transportation is aware of. The highway curves as it passes several residences north of the Pleasant Valley Road intersection. A natural spring exists in this curve that pushes ground water up through cracks in the highway even after there has been no rain for days. The water on the highway can then freeze. The frozen water on the highway can cause automobiles to lose control and crash as has happened on several occasions. Obviously this poses a threat to life and property for those living in the adjacent houses.

Problem B)

The speed limit on SR 49 north of Diamond Springs is regularly ignored by motorists. We estimate that drivers could be exceeding 70 Mph at times. Most traffic flows between 45-50 Mph. This situation often makes it dangerous and difficult for people trying to leave driveways located adjacent to the highway.

How these problem could be exacerbated by improper development:

It would appear that the proposed DOT plan would eventually solve both of these problems when the new SR 49 is completed as a new four lane road located to the west of existing SR 49. Under the proposed plan, the current SR 49 becomes a frontage road, which would alleviate the above problems. However, the question of phasing and timeline are of serious concern. The DOT plan advocates building the Diamond Springs Parkway first. The new SR 49 development would occur last. From the time the Diamond Springs Parkway is completed until the time the new SR 49 project is completed, we can expect traffic flow on the existing SR 49 north of Diamond springs to increase dramatically because it will become the fastest route to reach Missouri Flat and thus Highway 50. Many "south county" commuters and many other additional motorists would use the route.

Given that problems A and B already pose a threat to life and property for both motorists and homeowners, it would be irresponsible to exacerbate these problems by increasing traffic along this route in its current condition. For these reasons, the timeline for completion of the project should be considered as a subject of study in the EIR.

As soon as the DOT has more detailed information about the plan or the proposed timeline I would appreciate being notified. I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your time.

Matt McCollum

Be a better friend, newshound, and
know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. Try it now.
http://mobile.yahoo.com/;_ylt=Ahu06i62sR8HDtDypao8Wcj9tAcJ

From: Jennifer P Maxwell <JMaxwell@edcgov.us>
To: <cmeyer@brandman.com>
Date: 1/15/2008 7:41:14 AM
Subject: Fw: Diamond Springs Parkway

NOP comments

----- Forwarded by Jennifer P Maxwell/PV/EDC on 01/15/2008 07:40 AM -----

"Paul Brown" <p.m.brown@comcast.net>
01/09/2008 06:19 PM
Please respond to
p.m.brown@comcast.net

To
jmaxwell@edcgov.us
cc

Subject
Diamond Springs Parkway

Jennifer,

First, I want to thank you very much for your efforts to keep the public informed about this project. I was at the 2pm scoping meeting earlier today. You did a good job of managing the meeting and keeping it on topic.

I still have a map that we picked up at one of the first public meetings on this subject 10 or 12 years ago. I thought then this project was a great idea and I still do today. I just wish it was built already! You can't build it soon enough as far as I'm concerned.

My only concern about this project is that there be good access to the El Dorado Trail, especially from the south. I think there would be trail use demand from the residents of Diamond Springs. Ideally, it would be nice to incorporate a trail parking lot along the new Parkway project as it comes quite close to the trail.

Would you please pass along any specific links to this project on the DOT website? I look forward to following this long over due project to it's completion and wish you to greatest success in it's management.

Sincerely,

-Paul

From: Jennifer P Maxwell <JMaxwell@edcgov.us>
To: <cmeyer@brandman.com>
Date: 1/17/2008 3:34:57 PM
Subject: Fw: Diamond Springs Parkway Comment Card

Scoping comments.

----- Forwarded by Jennifer P Maxwell/PV/EDC on 01/17/2008 03:33 PM -----

Jerry Herrington II <jerry@elitecontrol.net>
01/17/2008 03:22 PM

To
jmaxwell@edcgov.us
cc

Subject
Diamond Springs Parkway Comment Card

Hi Jennifer

Attached is my comment card for the meeting on Jan. 9th 2007.
Thank you for your help
Jerry Herrington

Paul Fluckey
Land Agent

Technical & Land
Services.
343 Sacramento St.
Auburn, Ca. 95603

Office: (530) 889-3160
Fax: (530) 889-3392
E-mail: phf2@pge.com

December 26, 2007

County Of El Dorado DOT
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
Attn: Jennifer Maxwell
E-Mail jmaxwell@edc.gov.us

RE: NOTICE OF PREPERATION (NOP) OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING for the DIAMOND SPRINGS PARKWAY

Dear Ms. Maxwell

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above project at the referenced location.

PG&E has the following comments to offer:

PG&E owns and operates electric facilities which are located within and adjacent to the proposed project. To promote the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of utility facilities, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has mandated specific clearance requirements between utility facilities and surrounding objects or construction activities. To ensure compliance with these standards, project proponents should coordinate with PG&E early in the development of their project plans. Any proposed development plans should provide for unrestricted utility access and prevent easement encroachments that might impair the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of PG&E's facilities.

The requesting party will be responsible for the costs associated with the relocation of existing PG&E facilities to accommodate their proposed development. Because facilities relocation's require long lead times and are not always feasible, the requesting party should be encouraged to consult with PG&E as early in their planning stages as possible.

Relocations of PG&E's electric transmission and substation facilities (50,000 volts and above) could also require formal approval from the California Public Utilities Commission. If required, this approval process could take up to two years to complete. Proponents with development plans which could affect such electric transmission facilities should be referred to PG&E for additional information and assistance in the development of their project schedules.

We would also like to note that continued development consistent with the County's General Plans will have a cumulative impact on PG&E's electric systems and may require on-site and off-site additions and improvements to the facilities which supply these services. Because utility facilities are operated as an integrated system, the presence of an existing electric transmission or distribution facility does not necessarily mean the facility has capacity to connect new loads.

Expansion of distribution and transmission lines and related facilities is a necessary consequence of growth and development. In addition to adding new distribution feeders, the range of electric system improvements needed to accommodate growth may include upgrading existing substation and transmission line equipment, expanding existing substations to their ultimate buildout capacity, and building new substations and interconnecting transmission lines.

We would like to recommend that environmental documents for proposed development projects include adequate evaluation of cumulative impacts to utility systems, the utility facilities needed to serve those developments and any potential environmental issues associated with extending utility service to the proposed project. This will assure the project's compliance with CEQA and reduce potential delays to the project schedule.

PG&E remains committed to working with the County to provide timely, reliable and cost effective electric service to the planned area. We would also appreciate being copied on future correspondence regarding this subject as this project develops.

The California Constitution vests in the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) exclusive power and sole authority with respect to the regulation of privately owned or investor owned public utilities such as PG&E. This exclusive power extends to all aspects of the location, design, construction, maintenance and operation of public utility facilities. Nevertheless, the CPUC has provisions for regulated utilities to work closely with local governments and give due consideration to their concerns. PG&E must balance our commitment to provide due consideration to local concerns with our obligation to provide the public with a safe, reliable, cost-effective energy supply in compliance with the rules and tariffs of the CPUC.

Should you require any additional information or have any questions, please call me at (530) 889-3160.

Sincerely,

Paul Fluckey
Land Agent
Land Rights Protection
El Dorado County -Solano County
External: (530) 889-3160
E-Mail phf2@pge.com

**El Dorado County DOT
Diamond Springs Parkway EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Card
Wednesday, January 9, 2008**

Please provide your comments below. Thank you for your participation.

① Where is Rails + Trails to
ANSWER questions?

②. Property on Old Depot RD. (40250)
too restrictive →
Want road put in -

Name

John Faber

Telephone:

530-626-4848

Agency or Organization

Email Address:

Address

City

Zip

Signature

Date

**El Dorado County DOT
Diamond Springs Parkway EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Card
Wednesday, January 9, 2008**

Please provide your comments below. Thank you for your participation.

I have a concern that the historical Hwy 49 signs going thru Diamond Springs NOT be changed due to this project. I have property down town Diamond Springs. This could impact my property.

Name Robert SANDIDGE Telephone: 621 3936

Agency or Organization SANDIDGE FIRE AFD Email Address: SANDIDGER@SBC

Address 517 MAIN ST City DIS Zip 95619

Signature [Handwritten Signature] Date 1/9/09



HOAGLAND CHIROPRACTIC

3961 El Dorado Road • Placerville, CA 95667 • (530) 626-0338 or (530) 626-6630

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2008

**EL DORADO COUNTY
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION**

January 28, 2008

DOT

We are the current owners of parcel 327-250-34 and were notified by you to attend the informational meeting in Diamond Springs. Our parcel is .81 acres, is industrial and has a street address of 60 Old Depot Rd. As you can understand we are anxious to see the bypass proceed. We have met with various groups at DOT over the last 4 years to make sure our parcel meets with your planning. We do need water and sewer hook up. I questioned you during the meeting as to your projected schedule and it sounds like this project is next on the list. If so, we will wait to put in our own water and sewer. Basically we have been told by EID that even if we did hook up to sewer now we would have to re-hook up when the road goes in. We of course would prefer the lines go down our side of the road, the north side I believe. We also need access of some sort. Really I think a turn land down the middle of the bypass would alleviate most of the access problems. PG+E thinks there is phase 3 electricity there but it is not.

If we can be of further help please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

David E Hoagland DC

**El Dorado County DOT
Diamond Springs Parkway EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Card
Wednesday, January 9, 2008**

Please provide your comments below. Thank you for your participation.

① Hwy 49 at the area proposed between Diamond Parkway & Pleasant Vly Rd. is deteriorating from traffic in general & specifically trucks traveling the state route as well as garbage truck runs. The additional vehicles coming off the future connector will have a huge impact on our quality of life and also our property value as residents in this area. Is the widening & improvement of Hwy 49 to be done at the same phase as Diamond Parkway? The alternative is not something we look forward to.

② The noise factor in our neighborhood is already constant & high. More traffic - another huge negative impact. How will you address that? Is a noise barrier in the plans?

③ There is a spring that ever since the widening & realignment has created a bridge of ice across & down the middle of the road on frosty mornings. We have had 2 front fenders wiped out by accidents from the ice and an adjacent property on the North side from us has lost one. The possibility of serious and even fatal accidents exists now but increased traffic flow could make it a reality. What do you propose to do about this winter hazard?

④ We feel that these initial concerns can all be addressed in one way or another by moving the highway

Name Pete & Priscilla Petanovich Telephone: 530/627-0193

Agency or Organization Homeowners/Hwy 49 Email Address: _____

Address 4151 Hwy 49 N / P.O. Box 108 City Diamond Springs Zip 95619

Signature Priscilla Petanovich Date 1/12/08

Pete Petanovich

in a westerly direction and leaving the existing
road as thru fare for residents. Is this
alternative probable?