



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
LONG RANGE PLANNING DIVISION**

**2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667
Phone (530) 621-4650, Fax (530) 642-0508**

April 27, 2015

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Claudia Wade, Senior Civil Engineer

Subject: Major Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Update – Board of Supervisors (Board) Study Session #2

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

The purpose of today's Board study session is to provide information and seek input on the following:

- 1) Traffic analysis methodology
- 2) TIM Fee Zone geography options
- 3) Land use categories
- 4) Existing and future deficiency analysis results
- 5) 2035 land use scenario
- 6) Alternative funding
- 7) Summary of the initial public outreach and focus groups

Staff is recommending that the Board:

- 1) Receive and file information relating to the traffic analysis methodology (Attachment 8B)
- 2) Confirm that the four (4) TIM Fee Zone geography options presented are appropriate for further analysis (Attachment 8C)
- 3) Provide input on the land use categories (Attachment 8D)
- 4) Receive and file information on the existing and future deficiency analysis results (Attachment 8E)
- 5) Provide staff direction on proceeding forward with the 2035 General Plan Land Use Scenario, as summarized in Attachment 8E, for the purposes of creating a draft CIP list and preliminary TIM Fee structure
- 6) Receive and file information on alternative funding
- 7) Receive and file the summary of the initial public outreach and focus groups (Attachments 8F and 8G)

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

On February 20, 2015, staff provided a comprehensive summary of what the Board could expect as part of the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update process through its scheduled adoption in January 2016. The Board confirmed the following:

- 1) Project purpose and goals
- 2) Baseline assumptions
- 3) TIM Fee zone geography options
- 4) Approach to public outreach
- 5) Project schedule

Staff also provided a summary of future Board meetings, including anticipated discussions and recommended Board actions. The purpose of today's Board study session is to provide information and seek input on the following:

- 1) Receive and file information relating to the traffic analysis methodology (Attachment 8B)
- 2) Confirm that the four (4) TIM Fee Zone geography options presented are appropriate for further analysis (Attachment 8C)
- 3) Provide input on the land use categories (Attachment 8D)
- 4) Receive and file information on the existing and future deficiency analysis results (Attachment 8E)
- 5) Provide staff direction on proceeding forward with the 2035 General Plan Land Use Scenario, as summarized in Attachment 8E, for the purposes of creating a draft CIP list and preliminary TIM Fee structure
- 6) Receive and file information on alternative funding
- 7) Receive and file the summary of the initial public outreach and focus groups (Attachments 8F and 8G)

A detailed description of each of these topics is provided below.

1) Traffic Analysis Methodology

Draft Technical Memorandum 2-1: Traffic Analysis Methodology, prepared by Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (KAI) and included as Attachment 8B, summarizes the traffic analysis methodology, assumptions and tools for the technical analysis associated with the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update. The purpose of the memorandum is to describe the technical methodologies and tools used to perform the traffic analysis. The memorandum discusses the following in detail:

- Traffic Analysis Methodology
- Traffic Analysis Assumptions
- Level of Service (LOS) Standards/Criteria

Circulation Policy TC-Xd of the El Dorado County General Plan provides LOS standards for County-maintained roads and state highways. LOS is a grading system that indicates the quality of service motorists experience on roadway facilities such as intersections or along roadway segments. LOS is a qualitative measure of the effect of a number of factors, including delay, vehicle speeds and travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, driving comfort and convenience. LOS are designated "A" through "F", from best to worst, designations which cover the entire range of traffic operations that might occur. LOS "A" through "E" generally represents traffic volumes at less than or at roadway capacity, while LOS "F" represents over capacity and/or forced flow conditions.

A table demonstrating the LOS criteria and thresholds are included in Attachment 8B. All traffic analysis assumptions are also detailed and provided in Attachment 8B.

2) TIM Fee Zone Geography Options

As discussed at the February 20, 2015 Board meeting and in Draft Final Technical Memorandum 2-2: Evaluation of TIM Fee Zone geography (prepared by KAI and included as Attachment 8C), there are currently eight TIM Fee Zones. In the creation of the 2004 General Plan TIM Fee Program (specifically, the 2006 TIM Fee program, which resulted in the 20-Year program we know today) several variations of the TIM Fee Zones were evaluated. Consultant proposals originally considered included a single zone for the entire West Slope or multiple zones with various boundaries. An eight-zone structure was ultimately selected as appropriate to recognize the different land use characteristics of various areas of the County, while keeping the number of zones manageable for ease of fee calculations, updates and implementation. The boundaries of these zones were based on a combination of the market areas included in the General Plan environmental analysis, historic community boundaries, traffic flow sheds, rural versus urban development patterns, etc.

Zone 8 (El Dorado Hills) was considered separately, primarily due to pre-existing agreements and development of this area under a previously created fee program referred to as the El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Area Road Improvement Fee Program.

During the Major Updates, staff and the consultant team intend to review the TIM Fee zones and revisit how many zones should exist, their criteria, and review of other conditions. This analysis will determine if changing the TIM Fee Zone geography structure could provide a more equitable distribution of fees. Note that holistically, TIM fee zones do not lower fees (i.e., if fees decrease in one zone they must increase in another). Alternative TIM fee zone geographies simply allow for an examination of how fees are distributed geographically. Attachment 8C provides for four (4) different options of TIM Fee Zone geography that staff and the consultant team have identified for further analysis, including:

- *Option 1: Existing eight (8) zone structure*
The existing boundaries have been modified as little as possible while not splitting the El Dorado County Travel Demand Model's (TDM) transportation analysis zones (TAZ). This boundary structure is the "status quo" option.
- *Option 2: Planning Areas "smoothed" to conform to TDM TAZ boundaries (eight zone structure)*
This option slightly modified Option 1 to smooth out the transition between fee zones, minimizing intrusions and extrusions into adjacent zones caused by the differences in TAZ geometry and prior TIM fee zone areas.
- *Option 3: Population Equivalency – Community Centered (five [5] zones) – i.e., fee zone boundaries adjusted based on achieving proportionate population in each zone while reducing the number of zones from eight (8) to five (5)*

This option seeks to balance fee zones by population totals. The zones are centered on existing communities and expand to include enough area to allow each zone to contain a similar number of residents. This prevents communities from being split into different zones.

- *Option 4: Zones Grouped by Fee Level (four [4] zones) – i.e., zones with similar fees aggregated to reduce the number of zones from eight (8) to four (4)*
This option aggregates zones whose existing impact fees are similar which would create fewer zones with similar fees. The zones were aggregated based on existing fee levels to avoid significantly changing fee expectations in any one area. Two exceptions were made, resulting in the splitting of two (2) zones that had “transitional” fee levels between higher cost and lower cost development fee areas.

Staff recommends the Board confirm that these four (4) TIM Fee Zone geography options (as discussed in detail in Attachment 8C) are appropriate for further analysis. As an alternative, the Board could instead choose to:

- 1) Confirm different TIM Fee Zone geographies than the four (4) presented – either completely new geographies or amended versions of those presented. The project scope and budget assumes four (4) geographies will be studied; adding additional geographies to further analyze would increase project cost.
- 2) Continue with only the existing eight (8) TIM Fee Zone geography (smoothed to match the new TAZ zones, described as option #2) without analyzing additional geography options.

Upon Board confirmation of TIM Fee Zone geography option(s) for further analysis, the consultant team will commence with the TIM fee update analysis. Staff will discuss the preliminary results with the focus groups and at the public workshops in August. Upon receiving further public comment, public will return to the Board in September with a preliminary TIM fee structure for all Board-identified TIM Fee zone alternatives.

3) Land Use Categories

Draft Technical Memorandum 3-1: TIM Fee Program Industry Standards and Current El Dorado County TIM Fee Program Issues (prepared by Urban Economics and included as Attachment 8D) is a memorandum which describes correct professional practices associated with the transportation impact fee programs in California, current El Dorado County TIM Fee Program practices, and opportunities for the County’s 2015 TIM Fee Program update. Ten topics are discussed in Attachment 8D, which includes:

- 1) Measure Y
- 2) Growth Projections
- 3) Identifying Impacts
- 4) Cost Allocation
- 5) Land Use Categories
- 6) Improvements to Alternative Modes
- 7) Program Administration Costs
- 8) Fee Deferral
- 9) Waiver and Offset Policies
- 10) Credits and Reimbursements
- 11) Appeals

As the project progresses, future Board sessions will further discuss updated TIM Fee land use categories, cost allocations and updated program administration (including but not limited to fee deferrals, waiver and offset policies, credits and reimbursements, and appeals).

As part of creating Technical Memorandum 3-1 (included in Attachment 8D), discussions took place with County staff from the Development Services Division, Transportation Division, Administration and Finance Division, Long Range Planning Division and the Chief Administrative Office to discuss current issues with the land use categories as part of the existing TIM Fee program.

Professional practices with regards to land use categories tend to keep the number of categories to a minimum while still capturing significant differences between projects with different impacts. This approach is consistent with the current state of the art for land use (growth) projections and transportation system modeling. To effectively plan for large-scale transportation infrastructure (e.g., highways, major arterials, etc.), the analysis must incorporate long-range planning horizons of 20 to 30 years and large geographic areas (i.e., all of El Dorado County). Consequently, the level of detail for the land use categories used in this type of analysis is appropriately limited to several high-level categories that can be reasonably be projected over these long horizons and large regions.

A common set of land use categories found in transportation system modeling and impact fee schedules include the following two residential categories and three non-residential categories:

- ◆ Residential
 - Single family residential
 - Multi-family residential
- ◆ Non-Residential
 - Retail/commercial
 - Office
 - Industrial

The existing El Dorado County TIM fee schedule has 14 land use categories, four (4) residential and 10 nonresidential, that are listed in Table 1. This level of detail provides several opportunities to combine land use categories and create new categories more reflective of El Dorado County development. Some of these opportunities are discussed below, and will be further discussed during the September Board study session. Currently staff is requesting the Board to provide input on potential land use categories for consideration. Any combining of land use categories or creation of new categories would have a neutral impact on TIM Fee revenue. **None of the suggestions discussed below would change the total revenue collected through the TIM Fee Program.**

Table 1: TIM Fee Land Use Categories

Residential	Nonresidential (continued)
• Single Family ¹	• Industrial
• Multi-family ²	• Warehouse
• Age-restricted Single Family ³	• Church
• Age-restricted Multi-Family ³	• Gas Station
Nonresidential	• Golf Course
• High Trip Commercial	• Campground
• General Commercial	• Bed & Breakfast
• Office	
¹ Includes mobile homes. ² Includes secondary units. ³ As defined in California Civil Code Sections 51.2 and 51.3, and only applicable within community regions that have adequate public infrastructure.	

Combine Industrial and Warehouse Categories

Industrial development projects in El Dorado County are typically “flexible” space that can be adapted to a range of uses. Often the developer constructs a building “shell” and pays the TIM Fee based on the lower rate associated with the Warehouse category. When individual tenants with any type of industrial use apply for building permits to improve their spaces they are often surprised to find out that they have to pay an additional TIM Fee. The additional fee is associated with the difference between the fee for the Industrial category and the fee for the Warehouse category paid by the original developer.

To associate impacts solely with the original developer and avoid pushing costs onto individual tenants, the County may consider combining the Industrial and Warehouse categories into a single Business Park category. The Business Park land use type includes a combination of light industrial and office uses and represents the most common type of industrial development in the County.

Combine or Eliminate Golf Course and Campground Categories

The current TIM Fee schedule has two detailed categories for outdoor recreation, golf courses and campgrounds. Since 1999 the County has permitted one golf course and no campgrounds. Given the lack of activity in this general category of outdoor recreation, the County could combine the golf course and campground categories into a new Outdoor Recreation category with a fee based on number of project acres.

Alternately, the TIM Fee schedule could eliminate the golf course and campground categories and simply charge a Per Trip fee (see *Create Per Trip Fee* section, below) for any visitor lodging projects based on a motel trip generation rate.

Convert Bed & Breakfast To Hotel/Motel Category

Some transportation impact fee programs have a separate category for visitor lodging because the trip generation rates tend to be much different (lower) than the average retail/commercial trip rate. The current TIM Fee schedule has a Bed & Breakfast category. The most closely related

category for which trip generation data is generally available is for hotels or motels.¹ To clarify the source of the trip generation rate, the County could re-title the category to “Hotel/Motel”. Alternately, the TIM fee schedule could eliminate the Bed & Breakfast category and simply charge a Per Trip fee (see *Create Per Trip Fee* section, below) for any visitor lodging projects based on a motel trip generation rate.

The TIM Fee administrative guidelines could clarify that a Bed & Breakfast establishment would pay both the single family TIM Fee for one dwelling unit plus the Hotel/Motel TIM Fee based on number of rooms available for rental.

Create Per Trip Fee

Given the comprehensive nature of the land use categories discussed above, most development projects would fall into one of the categories listed in the current TIM schedule or as modified based on the discussion in this section. Still, a few projects will likely remain outside the definitions of these categories.

For the few projects that do not fall within listed land use categories, some transportation impact fee programs adopt a Per Trip fee in the fee schedule. The Per Trip fee is simply the cost per trip derived from the nexus analysis and used to calculate the fee for all the other land use categories. For a project that does not fit into one of the listed categories, the County would develop a trip generation rate based on the project’s specific characteristics and available industry data.² The total fee would be the multiple of the Per Trip fee, the trip generation rate identified for the project, and the size of the project.

The types of development projects that may use a per trip fee combined with a trip generation rate from established sources include:

- Projects that combine commercial and residential uses such as nursing or convalescent homes, as well as Bed & Breakfast establishments.
- Projects that do not have any significant building square feet relative to their trip generation such as mining and outdoor recreation projects.

Other Land Use Category and Fee Application Issues

County staff raised several issues with regards to application of the fee to specific types of projects based on their experience administering the impact fee programs in the County for over 20 years. These fee application issues would be clarified in administrative guidelines to be updated concurrent with the 2015 TIM Fee Program update. These issues include:

- Public concern about most covered outdoor dining areas considered building space for purposes of the Retail/Commercial fee calculation.
- Public concern about caretaker houses on commercial property paying the Multi-Family rate.
- Public concern about clubhouses serving homeowner associations paying the General Commercial rate.

¹ See Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Trip Generation* manual, 9th Edition.

² Ibid.

- Staff request to consider recreational vehicle storage be charged at the Outdoor Recreation rate.
- Public concern about pre-fabricated shipping containers for exclusive use as a storage facility included in the calculation of building square feet.

In addition to the issues listed above relating to fee use categories, County staff also raised a concern related to the building categories within the building code used during the permitting process, which is then translated into a TIM Fee category. This administrative concern will be further addressed with the Administrative Procedures Manual developed as part of the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update.

Staff is requesting that the Board provide feedback on the TIM Fee program land use categories mentioned as part of Technical Memorandum 3-1 and summarized above, as well as provide suggestions on other potential land use categories to be analyzed as part of the update process. The land use categories will be further discussed during the focus group meetings, public workshops, and at the September Board study session as part of the draft TIM Fee structure discussions.

4) Existing and Future Deficiency Analysis Results

Draft Technical Memorandum 2-3: Existing and Future Deficiency Analysis has been prepared by KAI and included as Attachment 8E. This memorandum summarizes the existing and future deficiency analysis including the Mitigation Fee Act nexus justification for the improvement concepts to be advanced as part of the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update. The analysis includes results based on both the existing General Plan as well for the proposed Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update (TGPA-ZOU).

The memorandum describes the following:

- Traffic Analysis Methodology (repeat of Draft Technical Memorandum 2-1)
- Traffic Analysis Assumptions (repeat of Draft Technical Memorandum 2-1)
- LOS Standards (repeat of Draft Technical Memorandum 2-1)
- Roadway Segment Analysis
- Interchange Analysis
- Parallel Facility Analysis
- Existing Operations Results
- General Plan Operations Results
- TGPA Operations Results
- Summary of Roadway Deficiencies
- Interchange Deficiency Analysis Results
- Parallel Roadway Deficiency Analysis Results

The analysis scenarios which are discussed in detail below include:

- 2015 Baseline (Existing) Scenario
- 2035 Existing General Plan Land Use Scenario assuming 2015 Baseline Road Network (no-build)

- 2035 TGPA-ZOU Land Use Scenario assuming 2015 Baseline Road Network (no-build)

Because the TGPA-ZOU is near completion, the future deficiency analysis was also completed for this scenario. Further analysis to include a draft TIM Fee structure for the TGPA-ZOU Scenario would require a budget amendment to include the required detailed analysis.

Growth Forecast

The current CIP and TIM Fee programs are based on the 2003 Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. report and a traffic analysis completed by Dowling and Associates, Inc. in 2005. In 2012, the County commissioned BAE Urban Economics, Inc. (BAE) to prepare an updated set of housing and employment growth projections through 2035 (Attachment 8H). BAE found that a residential growth projection based on a continuation of the County's historic West Slope residential growth trend over the 2010 to 2035 time period yields an average annual growth rate of 1.03 percent, and since this estimate falls in the middle of the range between the Department of Finance and Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) residential growth rate forecasts for the County, this growth trend was deemed a reasonable basis to project residential growth through 2035. This growth forecast was presented to the Board on July 30, 2013. Subsequent Board workshops were held on February 24, 2014 and April 8, 2014 to discuss the growth forecast and distribution to be used for the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update. On April 8, 2014, the Board identified the 1.03% residential average annual growth rate, with 75% of that growth anticipated to occur within the Community Regions and 25% of the growth anticipated to occur outside the Community Regions, as the starting point for the Major CIP and TIM Fee Program Update. The employment projections used for the Major CIP and TIM Fee Program Update follows the same general methodology used for the preparation of the 2004 General Plan Environmental Impact Report. It assumes that an overall relationship between housing growth and job growth will prevail through 2035. The employment projection update is documented in the BAE report.

2015 Baseline (Existing) Scenario

The 2015 baseline TDM was created by incorporating all building permits resulting in occupancy between 2010 (model validation baseline year) and January 1, 2015 to ensure that the future traffic resulting from new development has been appropriately accounted for. The 2010 baseline model network was also modified to include only transportation infrastructure improvements either completed or under construction by January 1, 2015.

The 2015 Baseline (Existing) Scenario was used as a basis to build the 2035 scenarios described below.

2035 Existing General Plan Land Use Scenario assuming 2015 Baseline Road Network (no-build)

This scenario reflects the County's approved General Plan and assumes growth occurring at approximately 1 percent annual average growth rate over the 20-Year planning horizon (2015-2035) with 75% of the growth anticipated in the Community Regions and 25% of the growth outside the Community Regions. This assumption was the starting point as authorized by the Board on April 8, 2014.

2035 TGPA-ZOU Land Use Scenario assuming 2015 Baseline Road Network (no-build)

This scenario reflects the TGPA-ZOU, again assuming growth occurring at approximately one (1) percent annual average growth rate over the 20-Year planning horizon (2015-2035) with 75% of the growth anticipated in the Community Regions and 25% of the growth outside the Community Regions. This assumption was the starting point as authorized by the Board on April 8, 2014. Given that the TGPA-ZOU is currently going through the environmental review process, inclusion of this scenario is simply for information purposes at this time.

Traffic Forecasting Analysis

Though existing roadway deficiencies are based solely on actual traffic counts, future deficiencies are determined through modeling. The operative analysis tool for developing or updating traffic impact fee programs consistent with AB1600 requirements is a transportation demand model. The updated El Dorado County TDM was applied for this purpose.

Although “raw” traffic model link volumes provide the basis for the model calibration and validation process, a post-processing step is required before “raw” model outputs are considered suitable as inputs for engineering and planning applications. Post-Processing is the practice of reconciling TDM output for the forecast year by correcting for known deviations between the model base year and traffic counts. Post-processing adjustments were performed for all travel model forecasts developed for the TIM Fee analysis. The recommended procedure is based on the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 255, 1982. NCHRP-255 adjustments entail using model generated link-based growth factors (computed variation between base year and forecast year model volumes) to adjust baseline traffic counts to reflect future conditions. For each count location, traffic growth estimates were generated using both the Ratio and the Difference method and taking the average between the two methods. The “raw” and post-processed model volumes developed for the TIM Fee analysis are provided in Attachment 8E.

All analysis scenarios reflect AM/PM peak hours during average weekday (Tuesday-Thursday) traffic conditions. Peak hours are confined to the weekday peak commute hour periods of 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM in the morning and between 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM in the afternoon. These forecasts do not reflect peak season or peak weekend traffic conditions, which are primarily dominated by interregional traffic. Such weekend traffic periods are not appropriate for analysis of a local fee program.

State highway LOS was determined using the methodologies for freeway and multilane highways and two-lane highways outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010, Chapters 14 and 15. For freeway and multilane highways the calculation of the density of the traffic stream determines LOS. Density measures the average proximity of vehicles to each other in the traffic stream in passenger cars per lane per mile of roadway. For two-lane highways, LOS is dependent on the class of the roadway. Class I two-lane highways are highways where motorists expect to travel at high speeds. Class II two-lane highways are lower speed highways and serve scenic routes or areas of rugged terrain. Class III two-lane highways serve moderately developed areas with higher densities of local traffic and roadside access. For

Class II highways, LOS is determined based on the percent time spent following (PTSF). PTSF is calculated as the percentage of vehicles traveling at headways of less than three seconds. For Class III highways, the percent of vehicles traveling at free-flow speed conditions is used to determine LOS. The latter reflects the ability of vehicles to travel at the posted speed limit.

For local County roadways, LOS was determined using peak hour directional capacity thresholds based from the HCM 2010 relative to the LOS standards established in the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan.

Scenario Summary

A summary of all deficient roadway segments for the 2015 Baseline, 2035 General Plan with 2015 Baseline Road Network, and 2035 TGPA-ZOU with 2015 Baseline Road Network scenarios is shown in **Table 2**. Under existing conditions, all local roadway segments analyzed were shown to operate within County standards except Green Valley Road segment west of Sophia Parkway. All state facilities were also determined to operate within the established General Plan LOS standards. Under 2035 conditions, three segments of US 50 and six (6) local roadway segments were projected to exceed LOS standards. Results assuming the TGPA-ZOU were similar to the General Plan operations with exception for Missouri Flat Road.

Table 2. Summary for Deficient Roadways by Scenario

Facility Type	Baseline Roadway	2035 General Plan Roadway	2035 TGPA-ZOU Roadway
State Highways	None	1. US 50 (El Dorado/ Sacramento County Line to Latrobe Road) 2. US 50 (Latrobe Road to Bass Lake Road) 3. US 50 (Bass Lake Road to Cambridge Road)	1. US 50 (El Dorado/ Sacramento County Line to Latrobe Road) 2. US 50 (Latrobe Road to Bass Lake Road) 3. US 50 (Bass Lake Road to Cambridge Road)
	Total: 0 segment	Total: 3 segments	Total: 3 segments
Local Roads	1. Green Valley Road (west of Sophia Parkway)	1. Cameron Park Drive (south of Hacienda Drive) 2. Green Valley Road (west of Sophia Parkway) 3. Green Valley Road (west of Lotus Road) 4. Latrobe Road (north of Golden Foothill Parkway) 5. White Rock Road (west of Windfield Way) 6. White Lock Road (at El Dorado/Sacramento County Line)	1. Cameron Park Drive (south of Hacienda Drive) 2. Green Valley Road (west of Sophia Parkway) 3. Green Valley Road (west of Lotus Road) 4. Latrobe Road (north of Golden Foothill Parkway) 5. Missouri Flat Road (south of China Garden Road) 6. White Rock Road (west of Windfield Way) 7. White Rock Road (at El Dorado/Sacramento County Line)
	Total: 1 segment	Total: 6 segments	Total: 7 segments

Based on the comparative analysis of the “old” vs. “new” travel model forecasts at each interchange’s ramps and over-crossing segments, the results re-confirm the findings of previously developed operation based traffic studies that improvements are needed for the interchanges listed below (as also identified by studies completed as part of the 2006 20-Year TIM Fee Program).

- El Dorado Hills Boulevard Interchange
- Silva Valley Parkway Interchange (by virtue of deficiencies at both El Dorado Hills and Bass Lake Road interchanges)
- Bass Lake Road Interchange
- Cambridge Road Interchange
- Cameron Park Drive Interchange
- Ponderosa Road Interchange
- El Dorado Road Interchange

At this time, based on decreased traffic volumes, the data does not show that further improvements are required at the Missouri Flat Interchange. Based on a parallel study, Missouri Flat Area Master Circulation & Financing Plan (MC&FP) Phase II, further analysis will be performed to determine if and when additional improvements will be required at the Missouri Flat Interchange.

Attachment 8I includes an exhibit which demonstrates the LOS on major County roadways for existing (2015) conditions and at the future 2035 conditions based on the existing General Plan land use and for the TGPA-ZOU scenario. The data and maps illustrate that there are very minor differences between the two future scenarios.

5) 2035 Land Use Scenarios

When the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update project was scoped in early 2014, staff assumed the TGPA-ZOU project would be complete prior to the Major Update project commencing. As such, the Major Update project scope of work and budget assumed a single adopted land use scenario upon which to build the new CIP and TIM Fee programs. Since the TGPA-ZOU is still in process, staff informed the Board on February 20, 2015 that both the 2035 General Plan Land Use Scenario and 2035 TGPA-ZOU Land Use Scenario be analyzed concurrently to the extent possible pursuant to the existing scope of work and budget. The effort to simultaneously analyze both scenarios was intended to:

- maintain momentum while the Board considers a determination regarding the adoption of the TGPA-ZOU;
- help inform the Board of the fee implications of adopting the TGPA-ZOU; and,
- allow the simultaneous analysis of the TGPA-ZOU TIM fee structure if and when the Board takes action to adopt the TGPA-ZOU – allowing a seamless transition with no delays.

The deficiencies analysis for the existing and both the General Plan and TGPA-ZOU 2035 scenarios were completed (as presented on Attachment 8E). Due to the impending delay to the TGPA-ZOU, both scenarios cannot be run, and only one can continue with the existing budget. From this point forward, further analysis in developing a draft CIP, draft TIM Fee structure, and all other required documentation can only be completed using one (1) 2035 land use scenario without changes to the scope of work, budget and/or project timeline.

Staff has identified the following options for the Board's consideration:

1. Continue to develop a preliminary fee structure for both the TGPA-ZOU and General Plan Land Use Scenarios simultaneously with an estimated additional cost of \$50,000. This alternative would use the remaining contingency in the contract and require a budget amendment of approximately \$26,000 (funded by TIM Fees and Road Fund). A minor schedule delay of one (1) to two (2) months would be incurred.
2. Continue with the 2035 General Plan Land Use Scenario. If the TGPA-ZOU is adopted prior to the scheduled January 2016 completion of project, choose and proceed with one of the four scenarios discussed below (any of which would be funded by TIM Fees and Road Fund):
 - a. Consider one (1) TIM Fee Zone geography: Contract amendment for approximately \$27,500 (deduct any remaining contingency), with an approximate one to two month delay, to create a CIP and TIM Fee Schedule based on the amendment to the General Plan.
 - b. Consider one (1) TIM Fee Zone geography: Staff to complete the work, with a delay considerably longer than two (2) months, to create a CIP and TIM Fee Schedule based on the amendment to the General Plan.
 - c. Consider four (4) TIM Fee Zone geographies: Contract amendment for approximately \$50,000 (deduct any remaining contingency), with an approximate one to two month delay, to create a CIP and TIM Fee Schedule based on the amendment to the General Plan.
 - d. Consider four (4) TIM Fee Zone geographies: Staff to complete the work, with a delay considerably longer than two (2) months, to create a CIP and TIM Fee Schedule based on the amendment to the General Plan.
3. Stop work until the TGPA-ZOU has reached completion and the Board has made a decision regarding its adoption.
4. Assume the TGPA-ZOU Land Use Scenario instead of the existing General Plan Scenario.

Staff recommends option #2 - moving forward with the 2035 General Plan Land Use Scenario. This scenario represents the current voter-approved General Plan and will allow the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update project to continue progressing forward (i.e. begin with a draft CIP list, preliminary TIM Fee Structure, and nexus studies). Concurrent with the Board's decision relating to the TGPA-ZOU, staff will request direction from the Board regarding which of the four scenarios within option #2 (2.a. – 2.d.) would be appropriate for the completion of the Major CIP and TIM Fee update.

6) Alternative Funding

Alternative funding for the CIP includes all federal, state, and local sources other than TIM Fee revenue. The federal and state funding is part of regional funding that comes through SACOG and is programmed in El Dorado County through the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC). EDCTC is currently developing an updated projection of available funds for the next 20 years for use in the CIP and TIM Fee Update. This updated projection should be available in May. Local funds are primarily derived from contributions from the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians and from the MC&FP. Estimates for these sources will also be available in May. Further discussion on Alternative Funding will be done at the July Board study session.

7) Summary of the Initial Public Outreach and Focus Groups

The public outreach effort consists of multiple channels of engagement to ensure maximum participation by residents, business owners, developers and other focus groups. See Attachment 8J, which provides an illustration of the outreach process. The process includes development and maintenance of a project specific website, proactive social media, a series of topic specific focus groups/roundtable discussions, public workshops, and Board study sessions. The outreach is targeted and tiered for maximum effectiveness.

On February 20, 2015, a detailed discussion explaining the overall approach to outreach was provided to the Board. The comprehensive public engagement program is designed to engage multiple population segments via a diverse set of outreach channels. The idea is to provide a mechanism that best suits each unique group of people. The tools that will be used concurrently for each phase of the project include:

- Focus groups to explore topic or interest specific issues that relate to the development of the TIM fees and CIP. These are an essential component of our program and will help staff and the consultant team to identify key issues and concerns early in the process to help them be prepared to better address those concerns moving forward.
- Web based communication to maximize participation by individuals and groups who prefer electronic communications tools and are users of computers or mobile devices. This includes regular eNewsletters, social media and web-based interactive workshops throughout the process.
- Development of web-based tools that allow the public to provide specific input on perceived congestion and safety issue locations from home. This input will be compared with the consultants' technical analysis of roadway deficiencies and CIP locations.
- Media relations to reach broad County-wide audiences who follow government affairs by print or online news.
- Traditional workshops in multiple locations to ensure geographically diverse participation.
- Multiple presentations and study sessions with the Board to ensure staff and the consultant team are moving forward with Board support and direction.
- Complete documentation of each phase of the outreach effort to provide the Board and the public with a record of all input received.

Focus Groups/Roundtable Discussions

Staff and the consultant team (KAI, Urban Economics and Flint Strategies) has developed a series of two (2) rounds of focus groups/roundtable discussions to vet key issues and concerns that relate to the development of the fees. Originally, based on the presentation to the Board on February 20, 2015, it was determined that there would be four (4) groups (for a total of eight [8] meetings) consisting of:

- Local Businesses/Economic Development Interests (chambers of commerce, tourism and film authorities, agriculture, recreation, and eco- and agri-tourism industry)
- Building Industry/Developers/Real Estate Interests
- Residential and Community Interests (homeowner associations, community alliances/associations, etc.)
- Local Agencies/Public Safety
 - El Dorado Irrigation District
 - Fire Protection Districts
 - County Sheriff
 - City of Placerville
 - Transportation – Caltrans, EDCTC, El Dorado County Transit Authority

However, due to the overwhelming response of people interested in participating, a fifth focus group was formed for Residential and Community Interests and two (2) additional meetings were added. A total of 65 participants form the five (5) focus groups.

The first round of focus groups took place on March 26 and 27, 2015. Its purpose was to establish the purpose of the Major Updates, the process for developing the fees, and promoting opportunities for public engagement. This also provided an opportunity to identify key issues and concerns that need to be addressed as part of the Major Updates. Attachment 8F provides a summary of the public outreach process. Attachment 8G provides a comprehensive report relating to the Phase 1 of the outreach.

Public Workshops

As part of the outreach three (3) rounds of public workshops will provide an opportunity for residents and all interested parties to share concerns and pose questions relative to the Major Updates. The workshops will be held in two separate locations in the County, for a total of six (6) workshops. The workshops will generally consist of:

- Presentation, including overview of the purpose, structure, and parameters of the Major Updates
- Facilitated discussion/Q&A regarding the process and concerns
- Review of comments received
- Overview of next steps and further opportunities for public input

The first round of public workshops was conducted on April 8 and 9, 2015. Attachment 8F provides a summary of the public outreach process. Attachment 8G provides a comprehensive report relating to Phase 1 of the outreach.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending that the Board:

- 1) Receive and file information relating to the traffic analysis methodology (Attachment 8B)
- 2) Confirm that the four (4) TIM Fee Zone geography options presented are appropriate for further analysis (Attachment 8C)
- 3) Provide input on the land use categories (Attachment 8D)
- 4) Receive and file information on the existing and future deficiency analysis results (Attachment 8E)
- 5) Provide staff direction on proceeding forward with the 2035 General Plan Land Use Scenario, as summarized in Attachment 8E, for the purposes of creating a draft CIP list and preliminary TIM Fee structure.
- 6) Receive and file information on alternative funding
- 7) Receive and file the summary of the initial public outreach and focus groups (Attachments 8F and 8G)

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no change to Net County Cost associated with this agenda item.

CLERK OF THE BOARD FOLLOW UP ACTIONS:

N/A

NEXT STEPS

Staff and consultant team will prepare for the July Board study session to discuss a draft CIP project list and costs, discussion of options to reduce overall CIP costs. Staff will also prepare for a second round of focus groups and public workshops in August.

CONTACT

Claudia Wade, Sr. Civil Engineer
Community Development Agency, Long Range Planning Division