



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
LONG RANGE PLANNING DIVISION  
2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667  
Phone (530) 621-4650, Fax (530) 642-0508

---

December 13, 2016

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Claudia Wade, Senior Civil Engineer

Subject: Major Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Update – Clarifications

---

On December 6, 2016, the Board of Supervisors (Board) requested clarification on items related to the Major Capital Improvement Program (CIP) & Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program Update. This memorandum summarizes questions not already addressed in previous staff reports which were asked by the Board and public during the hearing and provides a brief explanation on each topic.

**CIP Book – Explanation of Project Funding**

A member of the public had specific comments on the U.S.50/Silva Valley Parkway Interchange Phase 2 (Page 78) and Missouri Flat Road Widening – China Garden to Pleasant Valley Road (Page 80) as shown in Attachment 22D. The request was for clarification on how those projects are considered one hundred percent funded, and what “all the zeros” meant. The Board responded that clarification would be provided. Both pages 78 and 80 come from the Cash Proforma section of the CIP. The cash proformas show how funding source revenues are used and what is left in each fund at the end of each year. The following clarifications are provided:

U.S. 50/Silva Valley Parkway Interchange Phase 2: Page 78 of Attachment 22F demonstrates how funding from the Silva Valley Interchange Set Aside component of the TIM Fee Program will be spent on all projects from the list provided. The table demonstrates in what fiscal year it is anticipated that money from this fund will be allocated to all projects, including the U.S. 50/Silva Valley Parkway Interchange – Phase 2 project. A zero value under a given fiscal year denotes that no spending will be done in that year. The individual project summary section of the 2016 CIP Book provides further detail of revenue sources and expenditures. Page 257 of 378 of Attachment 22D specifies that this project is to be fully funded by the Silva Valley Interchange Set Aside fund.

Missouri Flat Road Widening – China Garden to Pleasant Valley Road: Page 80 of Attachment 22F demonstrates how funding from TIM Zones 1-7 of the TIM Fee Program will be spent on all projects from the list provided. The table demonstrates in what fiscal year it is anticipated that money from this fund will be allocated to each project including the Missouri Flat Road Widening-China Garden to Pleasant Valley Road. A zero value under a given fiscal year denotes that no spending will be done in

that year. The individual project summary section of the 2016 CIP Book provides further detail of revenue sources and expenditures. Page 173 of 378 of Attachment 22D specifies that this project is to be fully funded by the TIM Zone 1-7 fund.

#### **Safety Projects on the CIP Unfunded Project List**

The Unfunded CIP Project List includes a number of projects that address several criteria including safety, bike and pedestrian, and capacity projects. Safety projects are considered high priority projects by the Community Development Agency and the Board. The Board can add projects on the Unfunded CIP Project List to the CIP as funding becomes available. Funding sources include grants or special programs.

In addition, many of the projects in the Unfunded CIP Project List were added as a result of public comments received through the Major CIP and TIM Fee Program process (e.g., project website, comments received during public workshops), as well as from various planning documents, including studies completed by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission and the Green Valley Road Study completed by the County.

#### **Minor Update to the TIM Fee Program**

As discussed on December 6, 2016, staff will begin work on the Minor Update to the TIM Fee Program. The Minor Update will include minor revisions to the traffic analysis zones and TIM Fee boundaries, updates to the land use projections in the City of Folsom, and other minor clean up items. Staff estimates that the Minor Update will be completed by the end of 2017.

#### **External Trip Calculations**

There have been questions about how “external” trips are accounted for in the El Dorado County CIP and TIM Fee updates. External trips can refer to any trip which starts and/or ends outside the specific fee study area. For this study, the fee study area consists of the unincorporated portions of the El Dorado County West Slope.

External trips are considered in two parts of the CIP and TIM Fee updates:

- The future deficiency analysis which identifies the need for future CIP improvements due to growth
- The shares of trips on each improvement segment, which identifies how much of the improvement cost should be carried by each fee district

The external trips are determined through calibration and application of the County’s travel demand model. The travel demand model tracks the specific origins and destinations of all trips, both within El Dorado County and within adjacent counties. The model was calibrated based on detailed land use and Census information, surveys of Sacramento area residents which identify amounts and types of trips made by households, and adjustment to closely replicate observed traffic counts in all parts of the County. Once the model is calibrated, the future growth is input and the model produces defensible estimates of all of the future origins and destinations of travel. The future growth inputs within El Dorado County are based on specific knowledge of development potential, while the growth assumptions outside El Dorado County (including areas such as the Tahoe basin and Sacramento which generate trips through El Dorado County) are based on the best available regional economic growth forecasts. The forecast of external trips are not input to the travel model, but are instead derived by aggregating these very detailed origin-destination patterns based on calibrated travel patterns and regionally accepted growth rates. The growth rates are



further checked by coordinating with adjacent jurisdictions (such as Folsom and Sacramento County) and verifying that the land use growth assumed for their jurisdiction is up to date. This procedure is specific to El Dorado County and is considered a more robust analysis than the use of default average values published in national research reports.

The future deficiency analysis considers the demand from all types of trips, including trips that stay within unincorporated El Dorado County West Slope fee study area (internal-internal or “I-I”), trips that have one end inside and one end outside the study area (internal-external or “I-X/X-I”) and trips that pass through the study area (“through” or “external-external” or “X-X”). These through trips would include trips between Placerville and Sacramento or between the Tahoe Basin and the Bay Area. External trips are not excluded from the deficiency analysis, because the County needs to know which level of improvements are required to maintain quality of traffic flow for County residents and employees even if some of the demand comes from trips external to the fee study area.

The calculations of fair shares of trips are based on a different treatment of external trips. The fee shares are based on “local” trips that represent the responsibility of land use growth within the fee study area.

These local trips include:

- All (100%) of internal-internal trips with both ends in the unincorporated El Dorado County West Slope fee study area (growth from the 2015 base year only).
- A 50% responsibility share for internal-external trips, trips with one end within the study area and one end outside the study area (growth from the 2015 base year only). For example, this would include all commute trips between El Dorado Hills and Sacramento or Rancho Cordova.

External trips excluded from the fee share calculation include:

- All (100%) of through trips (growth from the 2015 base year).
- 50% of internal-external trips, trips with one end within the study area and one end outside the study area (growth from the 2015 base year).

To the extent that the growth in through trips may contribute to the need for future improvements, this is taken into account in the deficiency analysis and CIP. The cost shares associated with these through trips are excluded from the fee calculation, so local El Dorado County West Slope development is not being asked to cover the cost shares for the through trip growth. The share of funding for external trips would be covered by other sources.