



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
LONG RANGE PLANNING DIVISION

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

Phone (530) 621-4650, Fax (530) 642-0508

December 7, 2015

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Claudia Wade, Senior Civil Engineer
Natalie Porter, Traffic Engineer

Subject: Major Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM)
Fee Update – Board of Supervisors (Board) Study Session #4

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

Staff is requesting direction on several items for the TIM Fee Program (items 1-7) and overall CIP (item 10) as listed below. Staff recommendations have been provided for items requiring direction and further discussion. Staff is also asking the Board to receive and file items 8 and 9 for the TIM Fee Program, and the public outreach report (item 11). Further detail is provided below.

TIM Fee Program:

- 1) Determine TIM Fee Zone Geography and TIM Fee Zones
Staff Recommendation: Smoothed 8 Zone TIM Fee Geography with Zones 2 and 3 merged.
- 2) Approve TIM Fee Project List
Staff Recommendation: Approve TIM Fee Project List as presented in Attachment 13B.
- 3) Provide direction on inclusion or removal of right-of-way, sidewalk, and curb and gutter from the TIM Fee Program and Frontage Improvements Ordinance
Staff Recommendation: Remove right-of-way, sidewalk, and curb and gutter from TIM Fee Program Projects where feasible (as shown in Attachment 13C) and proceed with a Frontage Improvements Ordinance (Attachment 13D).
- 4) Provide direction on the percentage allocation of El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) State/Federal Grant Projection
Staff Recommendation: Apportion 45% of forecasted future grant funding towards non-TIM Fee CIP projects and 55% towards the TIM Fee Program with the following allocations: 31% for external (pass-thru trips), 9% toward affordable housing allocation, and 15% towards the Non-Residential Offset. Refer to the updated TIM Fee Program Nexus Report (Attachment 13E).
- 5) Provide direction on relief for secondary dwelling units
Staff Recommendation: Allow for applicants to apply for relief via the TIM Fee Offset Program for Developments with Affordable Housing Units (Board Policy B-14).

- 6) Adopt Resolution of Intention (ROI) to amend the General Plan
Staff Recommendation: *Adopt ROI and direct staff to proceed with General Plan Amendment (Attachment 13F)*
- 7) Provide direction for TIM Fee revenue annual transfer of funds from Zone 8 and Zones 1-7 to ensure fair share funding of roadway improvements
Staff Recommendation: *Require all TIM Fee Zones to pay their fair share payments of roadway improvements and complete the appropriate fund balance transfers at the end of the fiscal year.*
- 8) Receive and file Draft TIM Fee Ordinance and Resolution (Attachments 13G and 13H)
- 9) Receive and file TIM Fee Program Environmental Constraints Analysis (Attachment 13I)

CIP

- 10) Approve in concept the draft CIP (non-TIM Fee Funded) project list (Attachment 13J) and discuss and provide direction on “Unfunded” CIP Projects (Attachment 13K)
Staff Recommendation: *Approve in concept the proposed CIP Project list as shown in Attachment 13J and add #71319 U.S. 50/Camino Area Local Road Improvements (EDC Share) and #GP137 White Rock Road Widening (2 to 4 lanes) – Manchester Drive to Sacramento County line projects to the overall CIP Project list. Approve in concept the Unfunded CIP Project list, as shown in Attachment 13K, without the two projects listed above. In addition, approve in concept the addition of projects 3-7 to the CIP upon receipt of funding.*

CIP/TIM Fee Program:

- 11) Receive and file Public Outreach Summary and Report (Attachment 13L)
- 12) Discuss Project Schedule Information

BACKGROUND

An extensive background on the CIP and TIM Fee Programs was provided as part of the September 22, 2015 Board hearing materials (See attachment 9A). In summary, the CIP is the planning, prioritization, scheduling and construction mechanism, while the TIM Fee program is one of the funding mechanisms for getting needed CIP projects built within the County. The CIP includes TIM Fee and non-TIM Fee projects to be constructed over the next 20 years.

On February 10, 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. The Board confirmed the following:

- 1) Project purpose and goals
 - a. Develop a legally-defensible CIP that is consistent with the General Plan and supports its implementation.
 - b. Develop a legally-defensible TIM Fee Program that supports CIP implementation and is consistent with the Mitigation Fee Act (Assembly Bill 1600).
 - c. Reduce the TIM Fees to the extent possible while still achieving the goals above.
 - d. Adopt new CIP and TIM Fee Program by first quarter 2016.

- 2) Baseline assumptions (see below for additional information).
- 3) TIM Fee zone geography options (see below for additional information).
- 4) Approach to public outreach.
- 5) Project schedule.

On May 5, 2015, the Board took the following actions:

- 1) Received and filed information on the traffic analysis methodology, existing and future deficiency analysis results, alternative funding, and summary of initial public outreach and focus groups.
- 2) Confirmed that the four TIM Fee Zone geography options presented are appropriate for further analysis.
- 3) Directed staff to select one parcel in each existing Zone and demonstrate at a future Board meeting how the TIM Fee rate for said parcel would be affected in each Zone change scenario.
- 4) Provided input on the land use categories.
- 5) Directed staff to proceed with the 2035 General Plan Land Use Scenario for the purposes of creating a draft CIP list and preliminary TIM Fee structure.

On September 22, 2015, staff provided the following information for the Board to receive and file for further discussion in the December Board Study Session:

- 1) Proposed 2035 TIM Fee project list.
- 2) Proposed 2035 TIM Fee project component assumptions.
- 3) Status of proposed CIP project list.
- 4) Alternative funding sources.
- 5) Updated project schedule.
- 6) Draft TIM Fee structure.
- 7) Proposed California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document for the TIM Fee Program.

DISCUSSION

Staff is recommending the Board provide direction on items 1 through 7 and 10 listed below. Staff has included items 8, 9, 11 and 12 for the Board to receive and file. The information provided below provides background on the 12 items, as well as options and staff recommendations. References to attachments from the September 22, 2015 Board Study Session (version 9 of this Legistar item) are included in this discussion.

1. Board Direction Requested: Determine TIM Fee Zone Geography and TIM Fee Zones TIM Fee Zone Geography

Attachment 9M contains the preliminary draft TIM Fee Structures for four alternative TIM Fee Zone geographies. Further discussion was also provided in the staff report for the September 22, 2015 Board Study Session (see Attachment 9A). The four alternative TIM Fee Zone geographies are as follows:

1. Best Fit (Existing)
2. Smoothed (8 Zones)
3. Population Based (5 Zones)

4. Fee Based (4 Zones)

Because the Best Fit Scenario (existing) attempts to place TIM Fee zones over Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) that were modified with the updated Travel Demand Model (TDM), this scenario does not accurately align the TIM Fee Zones with TAZs, and is therefore not an optimal scenario to use for the TIM Fee Program. The Smoothed Zone provides a better reflection of TIM Fee Zones in accordance with the new TAZs used for the TDM. The population and fee based scenarios (3 and 4) resulted in some zones increasing in fees, and therefore do not appear to be optimum options.

Options:

- 1) *Alternative 1: Zone Geography 1 - Best Fit*
- 2) *Alternative 2: Zone Geography 2 - Smoothed*
- 3) *Alternative 3: Zone Geography 3 - Population Based*
- 4) *Alternative 4: Zone Geography 4 - Fee Based*

Staff Recommendation: *Option 2): Alternative 2 - Smoothed 8 Zone Scenario that retains the current 8 zone structure but better aligns Fee zones with the TDM's TAZs.*

Smoothed Scenario – Merging or Unmerging Zones 2 and 3

If the Board determines that the Smoothed Scenario is appropriate, a follow up discussion is required to determine if TIM Fee Zones 2 & 3 should be merged or unmerged. As discussed during the September 22, 2015 Board Study Session, the 2006 TIM Fee Program combined Zones 2 and 3 since they have very similar characteristics, shared infrastructure, and straddle U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50). No other fee zones were merged in the 2006 Program. See Attachment 9A for the full discussion.

If TIM Fee Zones 2 and 3 are merged, both TIM Fee Zones result in lower residential fees. If Zones 2 and 3 are unmerged, TIM Fee Zone 2 residential fees increase, and TIM Fee Zone 3 residential fees decrease. One of the reasons for this occurrence is that two of the most expensive TIM Fee Road projects (Cameron Park Interchange and Ponderosa Interchange) are both located in Zone 2.

After discussing this topic with the Board on September 22, 2015 and with the focus groups and public workshops, many believed that the merging zones 2 and 3 would result in a more balanced and equitable program.

Options:

- 1) *Merge Zones 2 and 3 (i.e., maintain the status quo of the current TIM Fee Program)*
- 2) *Keep Zones 2 and 3 separate.*

Staff Recommendation: *Merge zones 2 and 3 (i.e., maintain the status quo of the current TIM Fee Program).*

2. Board Direction Requested: Approve TIM Fee Project List

As discussed at the September 22, 2015 Board Study Session (Attachment 9A), the proposed TIM Fee Project list (Attachment 9C) was developed by identifying what roadway improvements would be required over a 20-Year period (through 2035) as a result of growth.

A discussion also took place regarding the potential removal of the Cameron Park Interchange (CPI) project. The project is estimated to cost approximately \$90,000,000, coupled with significant right-of-way issues, making it very difficult to program, fund and construct. If the Board wants to remove this project from the TIM Fee project list, the Board must vote (by 4/5 majority) to allow this interchange to operate at Level of Service (LOS) F.

The U.S. 50/CPI improvements are necessary from an LOS perspective, but may not provide a reasonable cost/benefit ratio, particularly given its impacts to surrounding land uses and TIM fees. The high cost for the CPI is largely due to the high right-of-way costs in the area and the need to acquire commercial properties with existing businesses to accommodate the project footprint. Attachment 9N provides a preliminary outline of the right-of-way needs for the improvement of the CPI.

After discussion with the Board and through the public outreach conducted in late September, staff recommends keeping the CPI project in place for now, but requests that the Board direct staff to conduct an alternatives analysis once the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update is complete to determine a more viable, lower cost alternative than the \$90,000,000 project in the current Project Study Report. If a viable alternative is identified, it can be incorporated in to the CIP and TIM Fee during a future annual update.

Options:

- 1) Adopt the proposed TIM Fee Project list as shown in Attachment 13B and continue with the current CPI improvement provided in the existing Project Study Report.*
- 2) Adopt the proposed TIM Fee Project list as shown in Attachment 13B and direct staff to conduct an alternatives study to determine a more viable improvement for CPI once the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update is complete.*
- 3) Adopt the proposed TIM Fee Project list as shown in Attachment 13B and proceed with a General Plan Amendment via a 4/5 vote by Board to remove the CPI project from the TIM Fee list.*

Staff Recommendation: *Adopt the proposed TIM Fee Project list as shown in Attachment 13B and direct staff to conduct an alternatives study to determine a more viable improvement for CPI once the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update is complete.*

3. Board Direction Requested: Inclusion or removal of right-of-way, sidewalk, curb and gutter from the TIM Fee Program

As discussed during the September 22, 2015 Board Study Session, the existing TIM Fee Program includes right-of-way costs and frontage improvements (sidewalk, curb and gutter) for some projects. Staff's preliminary recommendation is to remove sidewalk, curb and gutter, and right-of-way from the TIM Fee Program in locations where future development could provide right-

of-way and construct frontage improvements at their own cost and without reimbursement. See Attachment 13C for an overview of alternatives in removing right-of-way and/or sidewalks from project costs.

If the Board agrees with this recommendation, an ordinance requiring development to construct its frontage improvements and dedicate right-of-way would be necessary. This practice is consistent with many other local jurisdictions, including Placer County. A draft of the proposed Frontage Improvements Ordinance has been provided as Attachment 13D for the Board to receive and file. The ordinance would be processed along with the CIP and TIM Fee Update project.

The benefits to removing right-of-way, sidewalk, curb and gutter are:

- Overall TIM Fee Program costs could be reduced by approximately \$18,900,000.
- Developers could be required to provide necessary right-of-way to the County and/or pay for frontage improvements as part of the project approval and development process, rather than leaving these items in the TIM Fee Program and spreading these costs across all new development subject to the TIM Fee.

The potential downside to removing right-of-way, sidewalk, curb and gutter are:

- If the County constructs a TIM Fee road project, different funding sources may potentially need to be secured.
- Certain development projects may incur increased costs.

Options:

- 1) *Leave all right-of-way. Sidewalk, curb and gutter costs to be eligible for reimbursement in the TIM Fee Program*
- 2) *Remove right-of-way, sidewalk, curb and gutter from feasible projects as demonstrated in Attachment 13C and proceed with a Frontage Improvement Ordinance (Attachment 13D).*

Staff Recommendation: *Remove right-of-way, sidewalk, curb and gutter from feasible projects as demonstrated in Attachment 13C and proceed with a Frontage Improvement Ordinance (Attachment 13D).*

4. Board Direction Requested: Percentage allocation of EDCTC State/Federal Grant Projection

Alternative funding for the CIP

Alternative funding for the CIP includes all federal, state, and local sources other than TIM Fee revenue. El Dorado County receives some federal and state transportation revenue directly from the funding agencies. Other federal and state transportation funding is programmed through the Regional Transportation Planning Agency and the Metropolitan Planning Organization; in the case of El Dorado County, those agencies are the EDCTC and Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), respectively. Federal and state transportation funding is typically programmed formulaically or through a competitive process.

As discussed at the September 22, 2015 Board meeting, EDCTC provided the County with a draft projection of available funds for the next 20 years as part of the Financial Element of the Draft El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan 2015-2035 for use in the CIP and TIM Fee Update (Attachment 9J).

The grant revenue estimate for the updated program is based on a conservative assumption that the County will get only 86% of the total EDCTC projected revenue, even though the unincorporated area contains 93% of the West Slope's population. Based on the last 11 years of revenue history for the TIM Fee, the County could anticipate \$196,000,000 in grant funding over the next 20 years. In an effort to be conservative, the draft TIM Fee structure only assumes that the County will receive \$188,000,000, and of that amount only \$103,142,000 (55% of \$188,000,000) will be applied to the TIM Fee Program. The 55% proposed is based on the historical use of grants towards the TIM Fee Program.

Attachment 9K, Draft Technical Memorandum 3-2: *Project Policy Guidance and Technical Assumptions*, provides a full discussion on the alternative funding. Based on direction provided by the Board on December 7, 2015, Technical Memorandum 3-2 will be updated and presented at the January 2016 Board Study Session. Outside of the TIM Fees, other local funds are primarily derived from contributions from the Missouri Flat Master Circulation and Financing Plan (MC&FP).

Reduction of Contribution towards TIM Fee Program

On September 22, 2015, staff presented a scenario that assumed that 64% of the projected grant revenue would be apportioned to the TIM Fee Program and 36% would be apportioned for non-TIM Fee funded CIP Projects. The 64% was selected as an approximation of the existing program assumptions. The 64% for the TIM Fee Program had the following breakdown:

- 31% for external (pass through) trips
- 11% towards affordable housing
- 22% towards non-residential offset (provides 60% reduction of fees for non-residential projects)

Based on historical federal/state funding use on TIM Fee projects, staff recommends reducing the grant revenue apportioned to the TIM Fee Program from 64% to 55%. In order to make this reduction, a change in allocation has to occur from the only two categories that can be modified: non-residential offset and affordable housing. The 31% dedicated to external (pass thru) trips is based on the required contribution as a result of the TDM analysis; this allocation cannot be modified, as the County cannot require new development to pay for pass through trips.

A commitment was made with the 2006 housing element update that \$20,000,000 would be allocated towards affordable housing. A total of \$2,300,000 has been spent or committed to date, leaving a remainder of \$17,700,000 balance. The balance is required to remain in the TIM Fee Program as part of the commitment made in 2006. Adjusting the allocation to reflect the \$17,700,000 balance would allow for a 2% reduction.

More flexibility exists in the adjustment of the state/federal grant allocation towards the non-residential fee offset. In 2006, the Board directed that a portion of the forecasted grant revenue be used to reduce the costs of non-residential TIM Fees to meet the Board's various policy objectives, including their goal to keep the commercial rates at a more competitive level.

The proposed fee program demonstrates a significant lowering of the non-residential categories, which still meets the goals of the Board from 2006. Because there is not much flexibility from affordable housing, and none from the pass through trips, staff recommends reducing the non-residential subsidy by 7%.

The results of these amendments are reflected in the updated TIM Fee program nexus report (Attachment 13E), which includes all TIM Fee program costs and assumptions which have been updated from the document provided on September 22, 2015.

Options:

- 1) *Apportion 64% of the projected grant revenue to the TIM Fee Program, maintaining the following allocations: 31% towards External Trips, 11% towards affordable housing, and 22% towards non-residential offset (provides 60% reduction of fees for non-residential projects). Apportion remaining 36% of the projected grant revenue to the non-TIM Fee funded CIP projects.*
- 2) *Apportion 55% of the projected grant revenue to the TIM Fee Program with the following revised allocations: 31% towards External Trips, affordable housing allocation reduced from 11% to 9% (\$17,650,000 instead of \$20,000,000), and non-residential offset reduced from 22% to 15% (\$28,129,500 instead of \$41,256,600, bringing down offset from 60% to 40.9%). Apportion remaining 45% of the projected grant revenue to the non-TIM Fee funded CIP projects.*
- 3) *Apportion a different percentage, between 55% and 64%, of the projected grant revenue to the TIM Fee Program. If the Board determines a percentage between 55% and 64%, staff will return with the corresponding TIM Fee Program.*

Staff Recommendation: *Apportion 55% of the projected grant revenue to the TIM Fee Program with the following allocations: 31% for External (pass-through trips), 9% toward affordable housing, and 15% towards the Non-Residential Offset. Apportion remaining 45% of the projected grant revenue to the non-TIM Fee funded CIP projects.*

5. Board Direction Requested: Provide relief for secondary dwelling units

Secondary dwelling units were accounted for in the impact analysis and fair share contributions towards the mitigation of impacted roadways. Because these units are included in the analysis, the fees for secondary dwelling units cannot simply be waived. However, applicants can consider using the *TIM Fee Offset Program for Developments with Affordable Housing Units*, (Board Policy B-14) towards the offset and/or waiver of their TIM Fees. The Board can also use a portion of the projected Federal/State grant funds to reduce the costs of secondary dwellings. In doing so, the allocation to non-residential would be the only area this funding could come from.

Options:

- 1) *Continue to allow applicants to apply for relief via the TIM Fee Offset Program for Developments with Affordable Housing Units.*
- 2) *Designate a portion of the projected Federal/State grant funds to reduce the costs of secondary dwellings.*

Staff Recommendation: *Continue to allow applicants to apply for relief via the TIM Fee Offset Program for Developments with Affordable Housing Units as codified in Board Policy B-14.*

6. Board Direction Requested: Adopt ROI to amend the General Plan

The General Plan states that “The Circulation Map (General Plan Figure TC-1) depicts the proposed circulation system to support existing, approved and planned development in unincorporated El Dorado County through 2025.” Attachment 13B includes the list of road and circulation improvement projects to be constructed over the next 20 years that will accommodate forecasted growth through 2035. Existing General Plan Policy TC-1u states: “The County shall amend the circulation diagram to include a new arterial roadway from the west side of the El Dorado Hills Business Park to U.S. 50.” In order to remove the employment cap on the El Dorado Hills Business Park and implement Policy TC-1u, Figure TC-1 must be updated.

See Attachment 13G for the proposed ROI. Upon Board adoption, staff will set a public hearing to consider proposed amendments to the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element to ensure consistency between the General Plan, the CIP and the TIM Fee Program, and to recognize the Capitol Southeast Connector Project, including but not limited to:

- Figure TC-1 and related text
- Impact Fee Program section (page 59)
- Policy TC-1t
- Policy TC-1u and Measure TC-V(1)
- Policy TC-1y

Options:

- 1) *Do not amend the road list as provided in the 2012 TIM Fee Program, and disregard the ROI*
- 2) *Adopt the ROI to proceed with General Plan Amendment*

Staff Recommendation: *Adopt ROI and direct staff to proceed with General Plan Amendment (Attachment 13F)*

7. Board Direction Requested: Provide Direction for TIM Fee Revenue transfer of funds from Zone 8 and Zones 1-7

There are numerous calculations that are used in determining the appropriate fee to collect for each TIM Fee Zone. First, an estimate is developed for each proposed TIM Fee project, which represents how much it will cost to plan and build the project. The projected cost may be adjusted to account for any non-TIM fee revenues (such as the MC&FP) that may apply to each project. The total cost for all of the proposed TIM Fee projects is then spread to each of the eight fee zones proportionally, based on the traffic volumes for each specific project from each of the

zones. For example, if a project costs \$12,000,000 and Zone 5 contributes 10% of the traffic using the road where that project is located, then Zone 5 is responsible for 10%, or \$1,200,000 of the project cost.

The total of the allocations for each of the individual projects included in the proposed Fee Program are then summed for each zone, giving a total amount that is the responsibility of new development within that zone. Added to this is a pro-rated share of the non-location specific program costs, such as the transit improvements and the costs for fee program development.

The total costs for each zone are then converted to the proposed initial fee rates based on the total cost for the zone, divided by the projected growth in the zone using the five different land use categories used in the TDM (single family residential, multi-family residential, retail jobs, service jobs, and other jobs) and the applicable trip generation rates for each use (ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th edition). The fee rates proposed within each zone provide a reasonable relationship between the fee and the share of the roadway improvement requirements attributable to development within that given fee zone.

When the 20-Year TIM Fee Program was developed in support of the 2004 General Plan, the one exception to the TIM Fee calculations was that of Zone 8 – El Dorado Hills. The Board at that time directed that Zone 8 was to be treated in a way that mirrored the El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Area Road Improvement Fee (RIF) Program. In that program, Zone 8 was 100% responsible for the costs of the roads within that zone. Recognizing this increased responsibility, the costs of road projects outside of the boundaries of Zone 8 were not to be allocated to the zone, but rather, to all the other seven zones. The one exception was the U.S. 50 mainline projects, as these have clear benefit to all residential and non-residential users in the County. These costs were allocated to all eight fee zones based on the percentages of use by each zone.

In the previous TIM Fee program, since most of the roadway improvements expected to be constructed over 20 years were in the western portion of the County, the higher TIM Fees were also assigned to the western portion of the County. U.S. 50 interchange projects were the most expensive road improvements, and thus Zone 8 incurred a larger share of the costs. In the new TIM Fee Program, staff is recommending that the TIM Fee Zones all pay for their fair share components of all the projects. This will prevent any of the TIM Fee zones from subsidizing any of the other TIM Fee Zone fair share payments.

In order to ensure the revenue is appropriately captured by the TIM Fee Zones, an annual review will be made (at the end of the fiscal year) to make the appropriate transfer of revenue necessary to ensure that the fair share roadway improvement contributions are made.

Options:

- 1) *Maintain the collection and use of TIM fee money consistent with the current TIM Fee Program.*
- 2) *Require all TIM Fee Zones to pay their fair share payments of roadway improvements and complete the appropriate fund balance transfers at the end of the fiscal year.*

***Staff Recommendation:** Require all TIM Fee Zones to pay their fair share payments of roadway improvements and complete the appropriate fund balance transfers at the end of the fiscal year.*

8. Receive and file draft TIM Fee Ordinance and Resolution

Currently El Dorado County adopts the TIM Fee Program via Resolution. It is standard practice for other jurisdictions, including Placer County, to adopt a TIM Fee program which establishes the basic structure with an Ordinance. Staff proposes the Board adopt the TIM Fee Program via Ordinance, and adopt the fee schedule via Resolution. The Resolution would be easier to amend on a yearly basis for rate adjustments. See Attachment 13G for the proposed draft Ordinance and Attachment 13H for the proposed draft Resolution.

9. Receive and file TIM Fee Project List Environmental Constraints Analysis

The original scope of work identified a Mitigated Negative Declaration as the likely environmental document to provide a legally defensible TIM Fee program. However, after the traffic analysis was completed a new road segment was identified for inclusion in the TIM Fee program. The addition of a new road segment and the identification of an alignment for the Latrobe Road Connector necessitate a General Plan Amendment to update Figure TC-1 and appurtenant General Plan policies. Based on the traffic analysis and the need for General Plan Amendments, staff and the consultant team have determined that a Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is now the most appropriate document to prepare pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update. The EIR will require additional time to complete and will extend the project schedule by three months. Staff will return to the Board on December 15, 2015 with a proposed contract amendment to complete the Programmatic EIR.

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has reviewed the draft TIM Fee project list and has provided an Environmental Constraints Analysis which is information that will be used for a Programmatic EIR. This constraints analysis has been provided as Attachment 13I. Rincon is also completing a constraints analysis for the non-TIM Fee funded CIP, which will be provided at the next Board Study Session in January 2016. This information will also be used as part of the Programmatic EIR.

CIP:

10. Board Direction Requested: Approve in concept the draft CIP (non-TIM Fee Funded) project list and discuss and provide direction on “Unfunded” CIP Projects

The CIP is a planning document that identifies all capital improvement projects (e.g., roads and bridges) a local government or public agency intends to build, replace or improve over a certain time horizon. CIPs typically provide key information for each project, including delivery schedule, cost and various revenue sources. The Community Development Agency’s (CDA) CIP provides a means for the Board to determine the CDA’s capital improvement projects and funding priorities over a 20-Year horizon.

The CDA’s 2015 CIP was adopted on June 16, 2015. The CIP includes TIM Fee funded projects as well as improvements without any TIM Fee funding. At this time the draft CIP includes the

TIM Fee funded projects list (Attachment 13B) and non-TIM Fee funded projects (Attachment 13J) that were included in the 2015 CIP. The estimated costs and revenue sources are identified. The schedule for the projects will be detailed during the next Board Workshop session.

The majority of the non-TIM Fee funded projects are bridge projects. El Dorado County has been very successful in obtaining Highway Bridge Project (HBP) funding for these projects. The latest SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program identifies over \$132,000,000 for the El Dorado County HBP program over the next 20 years. Both SACOG and EDCTC staff's advice is to address the HBP program as separate from the available funding sources for non-TIM Fee funded projects as discussed in item 4 above.

Based on the availability of funding sources and projects needing funding, the Board has the potential to add projects to the 2035 CIP list. These projects should be selected from the "Unfunded" CIP project list. Administration, Transportation and Long Range Planning Divisions of the CDA have discussed the prioritization of the non-TIM Fee funded projects in conjunction with the potential non-TIM Fee funding sources.

The "Unfunded" list was compiled using various sources, including:

- Projects in the current CIP or TIM Fee programs that are not proposed for funding under the updated TIM Fee program
- Projects suggested by the public through the El Dorado County Western Slope Update project website (www.edcwesternslopeupdate.com)
- Projects included in the *El Dorado County Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan 2010*
- Projects suggested by the *Green Valley Road Final Corridor Analysis Report, 2014*, *Diamond Springs-El Dorado Area Mobility and Liveable Community Plan, 2014* and *Cameron Park Community Transportation Plan, 2015*

Every suggestion that was received through the public outreach process is included in the 175+ item "Unfunded" list for consideration by the Board (See Attachment 13K). For each suggested project, staff included a brief explanation as to why it is or is not recommended for funding at this time.

Given the long list, staff prioritized projects based on several factors. The highest priority was given to projects that are in the current 2015 Annual CIP book, but are no longer eligible for TIM Fee funding. High consideration was also given for projects that are regional in nature and planned in conjunction with another public entity, such as the Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority or Caltrans, and potential safety projects. Projects were also considered priorities that are good candidates for grants (i.e., projects that address traffic operations, air quality, safe routes to school, non-motor circulation, and pavement rehabilitation), are identified as a recommended improvement in a planning study and addresses an existing or future problem (safety/operational/connectivity issue), are buildable, and can be included as part of a currently programmed improvement with an identified funding source. Projects on the "Unfunded" CIP list may be added to the CIP as funding becomes available.

The top ranked non-TIM Fee projects are:

1. #71319: U.S. 50/Camino Area Local Road Improvements – EDC Share
2. #GP137: White Rock Road Widening (2 to 4 lanes) – Manchester Drive to Sacramento County line
3. #72332: El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Francisco Drive Intersection Alignment
4. #71340: U.S. 50/El Dorado Hills Blvd. Interchange – Pedestrian Overcrossing
5. #GP182: Silva Valley Parkway/Golden Eagle Lane Intersection Signalization
6. #73307: Mother Lode Drive/Pleasant Valley Road Intersection Improvements
7. #GP173: Pleasant Valley Road Widening – Pearl Place to Big Cut Road in Diamond Springs

Staff recommends the Board add, at a minimum, the first two projects listed above to the CIP, identifying projected Federal and State funding available for non-TIM Fee Program projects as the funding source. Staff also recommends that the Board authorize the addition of projects 3-7 listed above to the CIP upon receipt of funding.

Options:

- 1) *Approve in concept the proposed CIP Project list as shown in Attachment 13J and adding #71319 U.S. 50/Camino Area Local Road Improvements (EDC Share) and #GP137 White Rock Road Widening (2 to 4 lanes) – Manchester Drive to Sacramento County line projects to the overall CIP Project list. Approve in concept the Unfunded CIP Project list, as shown in Attachment 13K, without the two projects listed above. In addition, approve in concept the addition of projects 3-7 to the CIP upon receipt of funding.*
- 2) *Approve in concept the proposed CIP Project list as shown in Attachment 13J with any changes as discussed at the December 7, 2015 Board Study Session.*

Staff Recommendation: *Approve in concept the proposed CIP Project list as shown in Attachment 13J and add #71319 U.S. 50/Camino Area Local Road Improvements (EDC Share) and #GP137 White Rock Road Widening (2 to 4 lanes) – Manchester Drive to Sacramento County line projects to the overall CIP Project list. Approve in concept the Unfunded CIP Project list, as shown in Attachment 13K, without the two projects listed above. In addition, approve in concept the addition of projects 3-7 to the CIP upon receipt of funding.*

CIP/TIM Fee Program:

11. Receive and file public outreach summary and report (Attachment 13M).

The second round of the public outreach was designed to engage the public and focus groups, giving them an opportunity to comment on and suggest projects for the CIP, review the methodology used to develop the TIM Fees and comment on the proposed changes to the TIM Fee program. This phase ran between May and September of 2015.

The project website continues to be a valuable tool to engage a larger County-wide audience. The site has been updated and includes all project deliverables for public review and two separate interactive workshops and tools to allow public comment on documents, suggestions for capital improvement projects and online participation for public workshops. Over 3,500

individual sessions have been tracked since launch between the website and the interactive mapping tool. The website has over a 1,000 active users and has had more than 4,300 page views. Due to several members of the public requesting that the interactive webtool remain open to provide comments on the CIP, the website stayed open an additional month. Staff also received phone calls from members of the public who own land in El Dorado County but live out of state, and are keeping track of the major update via the project website.

Attachment 13L provides a summary of the second round of focus group meetings and public workshops which took place in September. A third public workshop is scheduled for December 8, 2015.

12. Project Schedule

Since a Programmatic EIR will be required for the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update rather than a Mitigated Negative Declaration (as was originally scoped and budgeted), the project schedule will be extended by approximately three months, with final project approval now anticipated in June 2016. The updated project schedule will be included as an attachment to an upcoming Board Agenda Item requesting a contract amendment.

ALTERNATIVES

N/A

FINANCIAL IMPACT

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

CLERK OF THE BOARD FOLLOW UP ACTIONS

Clerk of the Board staff to obtain the Board Chair's signature on ROI to amend the General Plan, and return a copy of the fully-executed ROI to the Long Range Planning Division.

STRATEGIC PLAN COMPONENT

The Major CIP and TIM Fee Update would address existing levels of traffic congestion, improve existing infrastructure and fund needed road improvements necessary to maintain LOS standards as required by General Plan policies and as part of the Infrastructure component of the County Strategic Plan.

NEXT STEPS

Following today's Board Study Session, staff will present the draft information contained in this report to the public during a workshop scheduled for December 8, 2015. Staff will return to the Board in late January, 2016 with the following items:

- Updated information on the TIM Fee Program and overall CIP program based on direction provided by the Board on December 7, 2015.
- Request for direction on the prioritization of all CIP projects.
- Request for approval for the scope of work for the overall CIP Programmatic EIR which includes the updated TIM Fee CIP projects.
- Request for approval on proposed General Plan Amendments.

CONTACT

Claudia Wade, Senior Civil Engineer
Natalie Porter, Traffic Engineer
Community Development Agency, Long Range Planning Division