

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

**I. Next Meeting: Thursday, May 15th at 6:30pm, Main Library, 345 Fair Lane, Placerville**

**II. Homework**

- A. ALL: Review this meeting record and let Jim Schoeffling know of any changes
- B. Craig will email out to the group what the TIM Fee program includes for spending (in total dollars) on mainline versus interchange improvements - with the caveat that on the interchange projects, ½ is a local road problem and the other ½ is a Highway 50 share.
- C. Craig will provide a list of the projects in the TIM Fee program that have sidewalks in them
- D. Craig will provide a list of roads and the thresholds that are close to the cutoff of 1.0 for urban, .9 for rural areas

**III. Discussion**

A. ***NOTE: THIS IS A RECORD OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED. THE USE OF "WE" DOES NOT IMPLY CONCENSUS BUT, RATHER, IS JUST A STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER. ALSO, THE COMMENTS REFLECT WHAT THE SPEAKER SAID AND MAY NOT REFLECT OTHERS' THOUGHTS OR OPINIONS. IN SOME INSTANCES, THE COMMENTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO SPECIFIC SPEAKERS WERE SUMMARIZED OR PARAPHRASED AND THEREFORE, ARE NOT DIRECT QUOTES.***

B. **Review and discuss bid prices on asphalt concrete, aggregate base, excavation, PCC sidewalk, and PCC curb & gutter, from Green Valley Road widening (2/06), Latrobe Rd widening (3/08), Missouri Flat interchange (4/07) projects (handout):**

- 1. JW: We can see the trend in bid prices over time (2006 to 2008) and how DOT has updated its estimates based on the most recent data at the time. In some cases, our estimate is high and in some cases low. Latrobe Rd project, bid 3/08, shows how the bid prices have come down since 06 when we only got 1 bid for the Green Valley projects.
- 2. KBone: Question: are these jobs comparable?
  - a. CM: For Latrobe and Green valley Road - probably yes
  - b. RS: for the items listed here, they're relatively the same; they're petty balanced with minor deviations in materials

**C. Review and Discuss the Following Topics and Associated Hand-outs:**

- 1. Cost Estimates
  - a. Cameron Park Interchange
  - b. Silva Valley Parkway Interchange
  - c. White Rock Road Widening
- 2. DB: The hard costs, quantities, and unit prices are within reason – 15 and 25%; however, I still have issues with soft costs and land acquisition assumptions – these are two major things and a 3<sup>rd</sup> thing

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

is the amount of contingency. The environmental also seems high. It seems like there is \$2M - \$3M extra in each project... and this all really adds up. I know we're within the Caltrans standard but it adds up to a heck of a lot of money. ROW costs are probably double what they should be (El Do Hills). I haven't looked at Cam Park, etc., but they appear high in El Do Hills

3. BC: Is it that we are chasing the market down?
4. RS: Our estimates are probably lagging land prices when real estate costs are on their way up (we're too low) and we're lagging them when they're on their way down (we're too high). We'd probably recommend we drop our estimates in land prices if we reviewed them all again today but we don't do that rigorous a process until the engineer is assigned the project. Every time a new bid comes out, we don't adjust our costs on all the projects but annually we do with the CIP. So, land costs are probably not accurately reflected in current costs...however, our estimates are pretty good when we look at our average bids for the items in the spreadsheet but the low bidder sometimes blows us out of the water with an extremely low bid...we try to monitor the trends and adjust our estimates accordingly.
5. BC: We're in a world in which the volatility is greater than we've seen on all materials and land before – it used to be 10 -15% up/down but not any more (the swings are more dramatic now).
6. BC: While we can't stockpile asphalt and excavation but we can conceivably do some early ROW acquisition – that is if you can from the point of view of cashflow (this item copied to the "Parking Lot")
  - a. RS: part is hindered by CEQA
  - b. AM: I think you can if property owner declares they have to sell and Board is willing to acquire it; in situations where the seller was requesting that the property be taken
7. BC: Are there structural things we can do address some of the things here? Is there value looking at things that do not have immediate payback (e.g., 6 months to year)...I don't know about CEQA but if a project is in the long-term CIP and consistent with the GP...there may be some boiler plate kind of approaches we can apply. All too often CEQA is viewed as a vulnerability area and people don't want to get sued on it but how often has the County been sued on CEQA?
8. JW: An example where the County was sued was on noise impacts for Saratoga (and some other minor things) and delayed the project 4 years.
9. BC: Part of what needs to be done better is the education process for the public; I worry less about Silva Valley interchange (unless people reach back into the area between White Rock and Latrobe) because they're concerned about offsite impacts. How do you deal

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

- with that? Government gets sued because they're a big target.
10. AM: The County needs to do a better job of bringing the public along e.g., EID has gotten public to the point where the public believes they are getting their job done. Saratoga is a good example of something that is important to the circulation system. I don't think it was explained well to the public how important this project was and that it was coming.
  11. AM: We have spent a lot of time on asphalt, etc. But we haven't looked at significant infrastructure that was included in the original program and is no longer needed e.g., we might not be doing sidewalks, passing lanes, etc...this is where big chunk of savings will be...i.e., the infrastructure that we're not building within the 30,000 unit plan. At one time, Pleasant Valley Rd was going to be 4 lanes – can we agree that we're not likely to build this out in the next 50 years (with medians, left turn pockets), etc. and take it out of the fee program?
  12. KBone: Question: How much are we including for ROW (\$/sq foot) for Silva Valley ROW \$17M (see handout)
  13. AM: It varies
  14. DB: Reference to Pete Fields memo: \$21 for commercial, \$14 for residential and it goes down from there
  15. DB: There are a lot of ways to get ROW early on in advance of when you need it; it's too late to wait right before you have to have it
  16. AM: Look at what ROW we need and then develop a program of acquisition rather than delay until we can find a developer who wants to give it to us (with their projects). There are projects out there that are waiting for the County and the County waiting for applicant and therefore it's going nowhere e.g., Headington Road extension – our philosophy seems to be that if we (the County) wait 5 years, then the developer will pay for it.
  17. RS: Headington was pushed out due to revenue forecast; we'd love to go sooner. It was one project put back in the CIP by the Board but as "TBD". We do need to look for ways to make government look more like business in terms of investment, etc.
  18. AM: At some point, somebody needs to come up with a plan with developers, property owners and County – let's stop the dance and figure out what we need to do here.
  19. JW: e.g., On the Saratoga interchange we are doing that (i.e., being proactive) because it's not necessary until Empire Ranch development and others come along.
  20. BC: What spawned Monday's meeting was a concern about individual projects and I was trying to get a sense of the remaining concerns. What I'm hearing is that there are some large systems approaches that may need to be dealt with not applicable to individual projects e.g., CEQA and ROW. They're big and we need

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

to look at those. CIP wasn't what spawned Monday's meeting as just the individual project costs. You can pick 5, 10, 15% off the costs, that's not insignificant but...

21. Kbone: if you look at \$72M Silva Valley interchange project, 10% is \$7M
22. BC: Richard, would it be worth spending \$50K to \$100K to work on ROW acquisition?
23. RS: It's possible to develop a process to go out and make investment in ROW where we can.
24. BC: Be opportunistic; we're not doing the County a favor when we're buying high and not doing property owner a favor when we're not buying at all. Timing is so important because prices are going to be driven by comps.
25. RS: We are sometimes looking at people who are unwilling sellers.
26. KBone: ROW acquisition can be fairly complex especially on interchange projects. Sherry Smith already has 1 of 2 sites bought for high school expansion so you can't tell me you can't do it if you want to.
27. BC: School districts seem not to be subject to the same problems as the County.
28. CM: School districts have program level document and then sit on it (e.g., Latrobe environmental document was done 8 or 9 yrs ago). Our problem is getting caught up with that process.
29. JW: They also have the ability sometimes to ignore environmental comments as well as those from the County/DOT e.g., when they planned in 2 intersections 60 feet apart is when they started ignoring DOT's comments.
30. RS: We'd love to be a little more proactive on ROW. There is a GP policy.
31. AM: Has there been any environmental documents out there for public comment recently?
32. RS: Francisco realignment, public meeting on Headington Rd last night, Weber Creek last week, Diamond Springs Parkway earlier this year.
33. AM: Jack did give his input as to looking at reducing the scale of some of these projects...Perhaps scale down the infrastructure to be a little more reasonable in some areas...Pleasant Valley Rd is the prime example... it was originally envisioned as a major collector and fairly substantial – the Board removed it if I remember correctly.
34. CM: Earlier fee programs were based on travel forecasts at the time and development in rural regions was forecasted higher at that time; the new stuff now isn't forecasted that way. There are some roads in EDH, Cam Park that get sidewalks but it's not a blanket kind of thing.
35. KR: Question: What is the LOS east of 49 in Diamond Springs now?

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

36. CM: Fee program has about 7 (?) turn pockets and a 2 way left turn lane which is small in the fee program and that's it. No improvements on 49 thru downtown Diamond Springs at all. But when you look at new Diamond Springs Parkway, it probably forecasts having sidewalks on both sides because that whole area will probably go commercial at some point rather than industrial as zoned.
37. AM: It's unfortunate if you look at the silly design guidelines that are being proposed to turn all of Mo Flat into a walk able community and grab them all by the throat and remind them that the bypass was to make Diamond Springs a walk able community, not Missouri Flat a walk able community. People are running off on tangents. The letters to the editor that are being sent in including Doug Noble...the Board needs to get involved and put a stop to some of this.
38. KR: The Board will read these minutes and get working on it.
39. AM: There are some big picture things getting lost in the shuffle. It's good to pull out all of these cost estimates but looking at asphalt costs is not really going to get a \$1B fee program down. In my mind, it's policy. Is it matter of reducing scale of infrastructure? Finding other resources? More years than 20 and then there will be more state and fed dollars?
40. DB: it's a combination of things that will add up...not asphalt, or concrete by it self. Just this year, the 2 projects came in under by 25% which is \$6M which are reflected I'm assuming in the last 2 fee increases. So how do we take the \$6M and apply it to offset future fee increases?
41. CM: Projects that are completed and closed out, we have actual money that was spent. For projects built by developers and reimbursing per agreements, we put in the actual reimbursement, on projects where we have future reimbursement agreements, we use those. Everything else gets estimated. Those projects close in get the 8 page engineering estimate. The stuff farther out gets the 6 page estimate e.g., Silva Valley (more global level) and as you go farther out the project costs are based on # of lane miles and \$/lane mile. The \$6M that doesn't get spent sits in the pot for the projects coming down the road. If a project overruns, then it bites some of that out. When we get the last project finished there should be zero in the bank.
42. JW: We have to look at not just construction costs but also whatever are the whole project costs to deliver - e.g., staff costs, mitigation bank land for frog habitat, ROW we didn't include in the original estimate. The deputies are tasked to ensure that everyone is doing what they are supposed to be doing to deliver projects (consultants, DOT staff). I liked having the deputies there (on Monday) because it puts more of a "face of the customer" on what

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

- they are doing. The projects (overall) are coming in about what they estimated.
43. BC: It strikes me that what we've experienced in the last 2 to 3 years - I wouldn't go so far as to call it the perfect storm - but I think it's important to recognize where we've got to - we went thru 15 - 20 years of building entirely auto dependent communities. We went through a period where we thought we could build ourselves out of any problem but didn't collect the money for it. Kind of like 12/28/07, when you could see what was happening up in Tahoe and predict that it's going to get really nasty down here at Camp Lotus in a couple of days. We can look back and recognize it's a big lump for this County to process... Add on 2 other major things - the building boom drove up all the prices and then the bottom fell out of the market in a way we've never seen before. Now, we're talking about chasing bids looking backwards where in 6 mos. we're seeing 60-70% swing as trends change. We are driving forward by looking in the rear view mirror. I understand what, Art, is saying about walk able communities et cetera but if there is a place to develop jobs/housing, perhaps not entirely walk able, but have a better circulation system than an (8) lane arterial going from big boxes to acres of business parks, we should invest in that and affect the biggest single thing re: the traffic numbers - VMT (vehicle miles of travel) and trip ends - as these are growing faster than the housing growth; if we could keep VMT and trip ends to the same growth as housing growth then we are being responsible as we are looking at all aspects. From my perspective, if people pay for consequences of their decisions then, that might give them feedback to make different decisions. The consequences of building 2 - 3 units/acre and stringing them together with arterials, that's an expensive alternative. I would hope we look at some of the other alternatives. The golf course in El Do Hills and the area south of the Business Park, Tong ranch - these provide potential opportunities.
44. AM: I agree 99%. Where I disagree is the plan that's come forward in Mo Flat as a walk able community - not when it's divided by a 6 lane connector. We talked about making Diamond Springs a walk able community - by by-passing most of the commute traffic around the town. The planning/design community should have started there rather than between Mo Flat and Forni road and trying to make that a walk able community. We (the County) lost sight of what we originally talked about.
45. BC: There's opportunity to do some stuff at Mo Flat because it's flatter than where I live. One of the things we have found out is the ability of public pressure to have an impact on Caltrans e.g., pressure from the community in Coloma. No one expected Caltrans' response to be to add a bike lane, etc. They have made that area a

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

- lot better. We could get some short term gain by eliminating sidewalks, etc. but it could come back to bite us...it's beyond our scope here...
46. RS: It does go beyond our scope because the Public Health Officer talks about the money spent on walk able communities far outweighing the health care costs if you are looking at total tax dollars.
  47. BC: Everything today is silo'd and this might change over time...I think there is room to do that...there are some significant changes (speaking for no gridlock committee), Measure Y is on the Board Agenda on Monday at 2pm...On the funding issues, we've realized that the '98 issues are different than those existing now. It is Important to encourage an appropriate jobs/housing mix, and get every fed/state dollar where it costs too much to keep a road below LOS F; it's important to let the decision makers change that. They're not going to change the TIM fees. Our perspective is that TIM fees have peaked because of trends we see happening to date.
  48. AM: Taxpayers Association – that's exactly what we have said for 25 years...the jobs housing affordability balance is critical...a lot of things need to be thought through differently...make the incentives align with the behavior – we have gotten cross wise – I don't believe you don't get people to do the right things until it costs them; e.g., separating recycling and garbage. If there are no consequences in building auto dependent communities, because someone else is picking up the tab, things won't change.
  49. KR: Re: livable communities – look at where the trends of people are - jobs near housing – let's start with places like Diamond Springs, Placerville where we like to walk. But I don't think the fees are fair to families (people who can't afford the fees). Then, we need to look at what people are doing – like driving down the hill to go shopping at Christmas time. Many of the cars in the parking lot are from El Dorado County. People near Wal-Mart on Mo Flat are not going to walk to Wal-Mart and fill up a big shopping cart and walk home; they're going to put it in their car and drive. We don't have recreation and tourism paying into the fee program. We don't have people (users) paying for existing deficiencies in the fee program. We don't have an equitable system; you can't just put it all on one segment.
  50. AM: I think the region just went through the blue ribbon process and yes, I ridiculed it. The blueprint process was a lot of people looking at these concepts and asking how can we make these work? There are some concepts out there that need to be thought about. EDC needs to look at them comprehensively. E.g., Keep it rural on campaign signs...if we want to start looking at some of these new urban concepts, is there a way to do them like Bill said and reduce

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

overall trips per day? I think there are things that can be done. I think we've obligated ourselves to look at it. I think we should take what we can from it and take some positive steps forward without bowing to a new religion.

51. DH: Per Jacks' suggestion, we need to get into the details
52. AM: Looking at ways to reduce numbers of trips
53. CM: Traffic is a spatial function...there are different impacts on the fee program if you build 100 houses east of Diamond Springs versus El Do Hills. An example is whereby we have traditionally put commercial and industrial uses on the south side of Highway 50 in the west side of the County and the houses are on the north side of Highway 50. Residents have to drive through an interchange to get from homes to jobs, so we must have big crossings under the interchanges. If you can rearrange your residential and non-residential so that they're on the same side of the freeway, the interchange gets smaller and the fee program goes down.
54. KR: and then you can bike and walk to work.
55. DH: We have a commute based economy today.
56. AM: We can't resolve this issue in the next 30 days but we should start ...In '1994 Sacramento County prepared their General Plan and it had all jobs and no houses which made EDC dependent on building the houses and having no jobs. SACOG and LAFCO suggested – we need to move jobs up the hill and houses down the hill....
57. BC: Asphalt concrete, excavation, none of these do we have a hope in hell of affecting in El Dorado County. They're driven by global issues. We're not going to change CEQA in El Dorado County. We have beat our heads on things that we have no effect on and spent no time on things that we can have an effect on. What Craig said about Hwy 50 is equally applicable to Mo Flat. How many people enjoy walking across 6 lanes of traffic, with a marginal median in the middle? I bet a lot of movement on Mo Flat is due to north-south movement. We can look at some things that can make an impact in 5 years. I've never been shy to move outside of my particular interest and move into somebody else's. For me, (and Richard recognized it) it's willing to be passionate about reducing short-term costs and investing the same passion on the long-term side with benefits that won't be as immediate. I don't know how to get there but I think it's important for us to start to do it. It's simply not going to happen otherwise.
58. KR: I agree Bill, just building wise we're tapped out on paying the fees. We've got a problem when we can't make a parcel map or subdivision pencil in areas that are zoned for it. We can't afford what the fees have gotten to be and can't afford not to have them in order to have the community we want.

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

59. DB: The projects that get penalized the most are the innovative ones, not the more traditional ones e.g., In Blackstone, we are planning a project with an office on the bottom and living space on the top 2 floors – it's experimental for us but the fees are a big issue. Fees that are \$5K or \$10K apiece can kill it.
60. BC: One of my recommendations right now is we take the opportunity to create a reasonably streamlined bureaucratic process so that we can invest and take a chance.
61. DB: But we can't penalize somebody else's project.
62. JC: Agreement.
63. CM: If a project results in lower trips and therefore a \$900M program vs. \$1B, then nobody has to pay more since the total is lower.
64. JW: If large innovative projects (or a combination of them) lower the infrastructure requirements, then the program costs go down. e.g., the senior housing project that Jim is looking at.
65. RS: I'm hearing that we should consider setting up an incentive program to help address the long term issues. We have \$1M set aside for affordable housing that we use to help defray their TIM costs. I like the idea of trying to provide incentives for something innovative because it helps us get to the walk able community that we discussed earlier.
66. KR: Isn't the \$1M already part of the TIM Fee program?
67. AM: It was just a start up funding pot. I would have every confidence that a project that had a traffic study showing a reduction of impacts and it went before the Board now (would be approved) There must be some kind of neo urban stuff out there so we can get some idea of what (kind of innovative projects) provide benefits and what doesn't.
68. BC: I think that in some of the mixed use projects such as housing + commercial or all housing and all commercial, some of the benefits include the ability to use the same parking lots for day time parking and night time parking. We should be trying to build things that are not going to be used for just 2 hours a day. Today, we're building to the one hour peak but there may be things that we can do with that that can be smart.
69. CM: Example: We have roads that go from 2 to 4 lanes because they cross the LOS threshold by about 4-5% so if you can reduce that 4-5%, you don't have to build some lane miles that you otherwise would have had to.
70. AM: If the Board forms some kind of GP implementation committee with Planning and DOT, then which items on this list are more appropriate for that group vs. this one?
71. RS: These are great comments and we're trying to capture all those here. I would also throw my pitch out that it's very important to go through these yearly cycles and iterations. Doing these annual

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

updates is probably more important. The Fee program should go through its annual cycle and we should continue this group and come up with our ideas etc. and then in the next update, we reflect those issues we've identified as a group in the update. Without sticking to the annual cycle, we cannot resolve every issue that comes up in a short period of time. It helps keep things flowing rather than waiting and constantly putting off the update as we wait for more information.

72. KR: Good idea...so much of this is an education and I wouldn't want to start over.
73. RS: Let's continue (this group) and keep the continuity. Maybe the trend in the fees start going down because we're able to work with GP Implementation group and land uses start to change (which will affect the TIM fees).
74. BC: It's always challenging in traffic engineering is to fix the road while handling the traffic. We have to be able to handle the maintenance of the infrastructure while handling the ongoing process of (planning). This process will impact other processes e.g., GP, mixed use. There will be less contention if we keep the group going.
75. JW: We're not going to get costs down by 30% unless we start taking out projects...
76. JC: When does DOT go back to Board with the proposed inflationary adjustment? The date is...
77. CM: ....drifting...
78. JC: I would like to see the proposal before it goes back to the Board if it's before our next TIM fee meeting.
79. CM: The proposal on TIM fee inflation update won't go to Board before our next meeting.
80. RS: I will talk to Laura before to see if it's OK with her if I submit to her later so this group can also look at the proposal.
81. CM: Part of drifting problem is that in some projects there was a 12% adjustment on some pieces of the project, but not all of it. These need to be backed out so that the ENR inflator can be used on the whole project and then recalculate all the fees. It was missed in the first pass because only part of an estimate (not all of it) was bumped up. I'm not sure if the changes will result in a drop in the fees or what yet...
82. RS: Let me reiterate what we are planning to do. We will calculate the fees based on ENR and post and advertise as usual and the Board will be able to adopt if they choose. If the numbers are such that they result in an increase, then this group is going to recommend to the Board, that, due to the business climate that the Board consider not to adopt an increase. If the fees go down, we don't have to make this recommendation.

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

83. KR: Question; there's one big ticket item (the Hwy 50 fee) that we pay and other areas don't. What do we get as a County for this? Can we see a line item that says what we're getting? It's close to \$10K that's going in and I'm not clear on the benefit.
84. RS: The state doesn't have a lot of dollars to pour into Hwy 50 so it buys us improvements on 50. It buys us some goodwill with Caltrans – they are more supportive and proactive in facilitating the work we have to do along Hwy 50 – e.g., timing and we don't have to meet full state standards that cost us more money in some instances. They are more supportive of our needs in general....
85. AM: Caltrans came up with money on Mo Flat
86. KR: What is the amount of benefit since we incorporated that fee? What are we getting for the money that we are paying?
87. RS: Example: the State and local partnership program. The State has the prop 1B fund of about \$100M to be eligible for distribution to local agencies that can match the monies. We don't know if we qualify. Right now the self help counties are trying to lasso the money and ear tag it just for them. We have been saying "no, no, no, look what we are collecting". We'll see where this goes. Caltrans has been very supportive in helping us incorporate legislation that says developer fees can be used as a match for this 1B money.
88. KR: How does it translate into benefits?
89. RS: I don't think we can quantify the benefits.
90. JB: Clarification on Measure Y – one of the clarifications is to allow Fed/State funds – what is the impact on the fee program? You will be asked to come forward and discuss this issue as part of CEQA. During this review period, it would be good to show the benefits received.
91. JW: Measure Y has direct impact on TIM Fee program.
92. CM: As time extends, we would expect to see more fed/state money come in because we have a longer window. However, it's hard enough to predict what we will have 4 to 5 years from now let alone 20/30 years from now.
93. RS: Clarify the question – is it, what can we expect to see during the course of the fee program from fed/state?
94. AM: My question was more about being prepared for questions the Board will want answers on (when DOT goes to the Board with the inflation update).

**IV. Possible Topics for Next Meeting (May 15, 2008)**

- A. AM: Look at agreements that come out of Board meeting next week on Measure Y – there are a number of issues to be worked on based on the results of the Board's meeting/decisions. The preparation is required by 7/1 to weigh in on Y.
  - a. RS: If something gets put on public agenda re: Y it will get a lot of

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

attention.

- b. David Storer will be back to the Board on 4/29 too
- B. CM: Should we have a small group look at ROW and soft costs in parallel?
  - a. We could use the 3 projects we have already started talking about as the leaders

**VI. Topics for Discussion at Future Meetings**

- A. Additional sources of funding
  - 1. The Casino – What funds will be available, what additional projects need to be included and how will this impact the fee rates? (first check anticipated Fall 09)
  - 2. Federal and State “matching dollar” opportunities – using TIM fee money to leverage other sources
  - 3. Are we getting any kind of priority for \$ from state and federal because of our TIM fee program? What have we gotten to match the \$ we have contributed to TIM fees?
  - 4. Inclusion of Safety and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) “local match share” items into project list along with other potential grant funding opportunities
- B. Impacts from the slow-down in residential development (e.g, growth in the County affects the road plan)
- C. Format/Style to be used for annual Government Code compliance Report.
- D. Can we discuss the “uniqueness” that affects the El Dorado County TIM FEE Program? Do we spend more or less for example because of the # of Highway 50 improvements than other counties do? Do others have other funding sources that we don't have?
- E. Parking Lot Items
  - 1. The Variable Highway 50 Fee Program had three different levels of TIM fees for single family residential houses. Smaller houses paid a lower fee." (e.g., apt vs. granny flat)
  - 2. If the program becomes a 30 year program instead of a 20 year program, what does this imply for federal and state matching \$? Can we count on more coming in and thus, reduce the fees?
  - 3. Can we talk about shifting when we pay the fee from when the building permit is pulled to at occupancy.
  - 4. Look into doing early ROW acquisition while prices for land are low.

V Attendees:

- A. James Brunello (JB)
- B. Dave Harnagel, SAGE and URS Corporation (DH)
- C. Kathye Russell, El Dorado Business Alliance (KR)
- D. Bill Center, Measure Y Committee (BC)
- E. Don Barnett, Lennar (DB)
- F. Kirk Bone, Serrano Associates, LLC (KBone)
- G. John Costa, BIA, (JC)

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008

**MEETING RECORD for TIM FEE Working Group Meeting**  
**April 17, 2008, 6:30-9:00pm**  
**Main Library**  
**345 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA.**

- H. Art Marinaccio, Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County (AM)
- I. Richard Shepard, DOT (RS)
- J. Craig McKibbin, DOT (CM)
- K. Jim Ware, DOT (JW)
- L. Jim Schoeffling, DOT (JS)
- M. Val Akana, DOT (VA)

Deleted: TIM Fee Working Group Meeting Record 4-17-08 v4

Deleted: 5/9/2008