



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
LONG RANGE PLANNING DIVISION**

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

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

April 19, 2016

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 #6

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

Staff is requesting the Board review and tentatively approve or receive and file the following:

Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program

- 1) Approve the updated TIM Fee Project List (Attachment 16B) and the TIM Fee Program Nexus Report (Attachment 16C).

Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

- 2) Approve the updated CIP (non-TIM Fee Funded and TIM Fee Funded) project list and timeline for construction (Attachment 16D) and approve the Unfunded CIP project list (Attachment 16E).

CIP and TIM Fee Program

- 3) Approve the proposed General Plan Amendment to the Transportation and Circulation Element related to the update of the CIP and TIM Fee Program (Attachments 16F and 16I).
- 4) Receive and file a status report on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
- 5) Receive and file the updated project schedule (Attachment 16G).

Public Comments

- 6) Receive and file responses to recent public comments.

BACKGROUND

The CIP is the planning, prioritization, scheduling and construction mechanism. The TIM Fee program is one of the funding mechanisms for CIP projects required as a result of growth. An extensive background on the CIP and TIM Fee Programs was provided as part of the September 22, 2015, December 7, 2015 and February 23, 2016 Board study session materials (See attachments 9A, 13A and 15A).

At the last Board Study Session, held on February 23, 2016, the Board took the following tentative actions:

- 1) Approved apportioning 45% of forecasted future grant funding toward non-TIM Fee CIP projects and 55% toward the TIM Fee Program with the following allocation: 31% for external (pass-through trips), 9% toward affordable housing allocation, and 15% toward the Non-Residential Offset.
- 2) Approved Option 3 (100% TIM Fee offset) for secondary dwelling units.
- 3) Approved TIM Fee Intersection Improvements line item adjustment, resulting in an additional \$45,000,000 reduction to the draft TIM Fee Program.
- 4) Approved including costs to acquire right-of-way for the following County Club Drive segments: A) Between Silva Valley Parkway and Tong Road (\$2,442,000), and; B) Between El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Silva Valley Parkway (\$2,840,000).
- 5) Received and filed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Programmatic EIR for the Major CIP and TIM Fee Program Update.
- 6) Received and filed a brief summary of the land use allocation process.
- 7) Received and filed the Public Outreach Summary and Report.

DISCUSSION

Staff is recommending the Board review and tentatively approve or receive and file the items below.

TIM Fee Program

1. Board Direction Requested: Approve TIM Fee Project List and TIM Fee Program Nexus Report

As discussed at the February 23, 2016 Board Study Session, the proposed TIM Fee project list (Attachment 16B) was developed by identifying what roadway improvements would be required over a 20-Year period (through 2035) as a result of new growth pursuant to the County's General Plan. Technical Memorandum 2-3 was revised as a result of updated analysis required for the new General Plan as of December 2015 (Attachment 16H). The updated analysis resulted in the addition of one new road project on Missouri Flat Road from China Garden to SR 49 and the deletion of the Green Valley Road project from Deer Valley East to Lotus Road.

The updated TIM Fee Program Nexus Report (Attachment 16C) reflects the direction of the Board on items such as:

- use of future grant funds for the TIM Fee Program,
- adjustment of the TIM Fee Intersection Improvements line item,
- reduction of some right-of-way, sidewalk and curb and gutter costs,

- number and configuration of TIM Fee Zones,
- combination of TIM Fee Zones 2 and 3,
- addition of the mixed use units as required by the updated General Plan, and
- requirement that all TIM Fee Zones pay their fair share.

Board direction has resulted in the draft TIM Fees being further reduced.

Options:

- 1) *Approve the updated TIM Fee project list (Attachment 16B) and accompanying TIM Fee Program Nexus Report (Attachment 16C).*
- 2) *Direct staff to incorporate additional considerations to the TIM Fee Program and return to the Board for approval.*

Staff Recommendation: *Option 1: Approve the updated TIM Fee project list and accompanying TIM Fee Program Nexus Report.*

CIP

2. Board Direction Requested: Approve the updated CIP (non-TIM Fee Funded and TIM Fee Funded) Project List and timeline for construction (Attachment 16D) and approve the Unfunded CIP Project list (Attachment 16E).

As discussed in the December 2015 and February 2016 Board study sessions, 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 CIP provides a means for the Board to determine the capital improvement projects and funding priorities over a 20-Year horizon as required by the General Plan.

The 2015 CIP was adopted on June 16, 2015. The 2015 CIP included TIM Fee funded projects as well as improvements funded without any TIM Fee funding. The draft 2016 CIP includes the TIM Fee funded projects list and non-TIM Fee funded projects as shown in Attachment 16D. The estimated costs and revenue sources are identified. The proposed 2016 CIP Book will also include the “Unfunded” CIP project list (Attachment 16E).

The “Unfunded” list was compiled using various sources, including:

- Projects in the current CIP or TIM Fee programs that are no longer eligible for TIM Fee 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*.

For further clarification, the “Unfunded” list includes projects that were suggested by the public; these suggested projects may be partially included in the proposed CIP or TIM Fee projects.

The schedule for construction of the projects is included in the updated project lists. Construction for each CIP project is scheduled in the five-year CIP, the ten-year CIP or the twenty-year CIP. The placement of projects in each time frame was determined by the need for the project to implement the General Plan and ensure the appropriate level of service (LOS) on the County road network meets the requirements of General Plan Policy TC-Xd. Staff will return in June with a detailed proposed 2016 CIP book.

As directed by the Board in December, the top two non-TIM Fee projects were added to the draft CIP project list: #71319: US 50/Camino Area Local Road Improvements – EDC Share and #GP137 and White Rock Road Widening (2 to 4 lanes) – Manchester Drive to Sacramento County line.

Options:

- 1) *Approve the updated proposed CIP project list and timeline for construction as shown in Attachment 16D, and approve the Unfunded CIP project list as shown in Attachment 16E.*
- 2) *Direct staff to return for additional discussion and considerations as discussed at the April 19, 2016 Board Study Session.*

Staff Recommendation: *Option 1: Approve the updated proposed CIP project list and timeline for construction as shown in Attachment 16D, and approve the Unfunded CIP project list as shown in Attachment 16E, with any changes as discussed at the April 19, 2016 Board Study Session.*

CIP/TIM Fee Program

- 3. Approve the proposed General Plan Amendment as presented to the Transportation and Circulation Element related to the update of the CIP and TIM Fee Program (Attachments 16F and 16I).**

The major update to the CIP and TIM Fee Programs has necessitated changes to the Transportation and Circulation Element (Element) of the General Plan. These changes are proposed in order to ensure the CIP and TIM Fee Programs are consistent with the General Plan. These proposed changes also include clean-up items, clarifications, and corrections to the Element and Figure TC-1. The minor changes to Figure TC-1 are detailed in Table 1 below and Attachment 16F. For comparison purposes the proposed Figure TC-1 and the existing Figure TC-1 are included as Attachment 16I.

Table 1
Summary of Revisions to General Plan Figure TC-1

Roadway / Location of Proposed Change	Proposed Changes
Bass Lake Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change from “Future Road” to existing road (i.e., change from dashed line to solid line) near intersection with Serrano Parkway • Remove old alignment of Bass Lake Road (near Serrano Parkway) • Change from 4-Lane Undivided Road to Major 2-Lane Road from Country Club Drive (realignment) to Silver Springs Parkway
Cameron Park Drive	Change from 4-Lane Divided Road to Major 2-Lane Road from Oxford Road to Hacienda Road
Country Club Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Major 2-Lane Road from Silva Valley Parkway to El Dorado Hills Boulevard (Conceptually Proposed Alignment) • Update alignment of roadway between Bass Lake Road and Silva Valley Parkway (Conceptually Proposed Alignment) • Change from 2-Lane Regional Road to Major 2-Lane Road from Cameron Park Drive to Bass Lake Road
Diamond Springs Parkway	Update alignment of future roadway, per most recent draft plans (Established Alignment)
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	Change from 4-Lane Divided Road to Major 2-Lane Road from Governor Drive/St Andrews Drive to Francisco Drive
Francisco Drive	Change from 4-Lane Divided Road to Major 2-Lane Road from El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road
Green Valley Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to blue Major 2-Lane Road from Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road • Change from 4-Lane Divided Road to Major 2-Lane Road from just east of Silva Valley Parkway to Deer Valley Road (West)
Headington Road	Add extension project as future Major 2-lane Road from Missouri Flat Road to El Dorado Road. (Conceptually Proposed Alignment)
Latrobe Connection	Add Major 2-Lane Road from County Line to Golden Foothills Parkway
Latrobe Road	Change from 6-Lane Divided Road to 4-Lane Divided Road from White Rock Road to just south of Suncast Lane
Ray Lawyer Drive	Add adopted extension of Ray Lawyer Drive between Forni Road and SR 49 (Established Alignment)
Serrano Parkway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change from “Future Road” to existing road (i.e. change from dashed line to solid line) near intersection with Bass Lake Road • Change from Major 2-Lane Road to 4-Lane, Divided Road from Silva Valley Parkway to Villaggio Drive, based on current configuration
Silva Valley Parkway	Change from 4-Lane Divided Road to Major 2-Lane Road from Harvard Way to Green Valley Road
SR 49	Change to the blue Major 2-Lane Road throughout unincorporated County
US 50 / Red Hawk Parkway	Remove “Proposed New US 50 Interchange Location” icon
US 50 / Silva Valley Parkway	Change from “Proposed New US 50 Interchange Location” to 4-Lane, Divided Road, including new alignment near US 50

**Table 1
 Summary of Revisions to General Plan Figure TC-1**

Roadway / Location of Proposed Change	Proposed Changes
White Rock Road	Change White Rock Road from County Line to US 50 to the Capitol Southeast Connector Corridor
Map Legend	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change title from “2025 Level Improvements” to “2035 Circulation System” • Reorder legend items • Minor changes to line types, colors, and legend items • Divided item for “Future Road” into two different items: “Future Road – Established Alignments” and “Future Road – Conceptually Proposed Alignments” • Change item labeled “2-Lane Regional Road (Potential Spot Improvements)” to “Major 2-Lane Road”
Source Note	Change from “July, 2004” to “July, 2004 (Amended [date amended])”
Add Table	Added “2035 and Potential Future Roadway Facility” Table
Map Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove note that starts “Note: This is a reduced version...” • Add standard map disclaimers

Additionally, minor changes and clarifications to text in the Element are proposed and are detailed in Table 2 below and Attachment 16F. Edited or additional text is highlighted in Table 2.

Table 2
Summary of Revisions to General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element

Location of Proposed Change	Current Language	Proposed Language
Page 61	<p><u>Impact Fee Programs</u></p> <p>“The County has four traffic impact mitigation fee programs that are used to fund capital improvements to the road system to mitigate traffic impacts resulting from development. These programs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Slope Area of Benefit Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program: this program was originally adopted in 1991. The Board adopted major revisions to the program in August 1996. • Transportation Impact Fee Program for the State System’s Capacity and Interchanges: this program was adopted in August 1996. • El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Area Road Impact Fee Program: this program was originally adopted in 1984. The Board adopted major revisions to the program in August 1996 and December 2000. <p>Interim Transportation Impact Fee for Highway 50 Corridor Improvements: this program was adopted in October 2002.</p>	<p><u>Impact Fee Program</u></p> <p>“The County has a countywide traffic impact mitigation (TIM) fee program that is used to fund capital improvements to the local and State road system to mitigate traffic impacts resulting from development. This program originated as several individual fee programs, which were adopted between 1984 and 2002. The countywide TIM Fee program incorporates former fee programs, including the West Slope Area of Benefit Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program, the Transportation Impact Fee Program for the State System’s Capacity and Interchanges, the El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Area Road Impact Fee Program, and the Interim Transportation Impact Fee for Highway 50 Corridor Improvements.”</p>
Page 61 – 62	<p>“The Circulation Map (Figure TC-1) depicts the proposed circulation system to support existing, approved, and planned development in unincorporated El Dorado County through 2025.”</p>	<p>“The Circulation Map (Figure TC-1) depicts the proposed circulation system to support existing, approved, and planned development in unincorporated El Dorado County through 2035.”</p>

**Table 2
 Summary of Revisions to General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element**

Location of Proposed Change	Current Language	Proposed Language
Page 62	<p>“Regional highways are shown on the Circulation Map in the following two forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established alignments: depicted by solid lines on the map. These include existing highways where the centerline is the precise centerline and future highways where the Board of Supervisors, a City Council, or the subdivision process has established a precise alignment. • Conceptually proposed alignments: depicted by dashed lines indicating future facilities, the precise alignments of which have yet to be determined.” 	<p>“Regional roadways are shown on the Circulation Map in the following three forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing roadways: depicted by solid lines on the map. • Established alignments: depicted by dashed lines on the map. These include future roadways where the Board of Supervisors, a City Council, or the subdivision process has established a precise alignment. • Conceptually proposed alignments: depicted by center lines with background shading indicating future facilities, the precise alignments of which have yet to be determined.
Page 62	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure TC-1 contains a table of the 2035 and Potential Future Roadway Facilities (post-2035) for select locations. The 2035 roadway widenings shown on the table are needed to support planned growth consistent with the current General Plan land use, and the potential future facilities (post-2035) are identified for longer-range planning purposes.
Page 63	N/A	<p>Add the following paragraph under the “Other Facilities” heading: “In addition to other highway facilities, the Circulation Map includes the Capital Southeast Connector, a future regional multi-modal facility. The Capital Southeast Connector shall be consistent with the most current Capital Southeast Connector JPA-approved “Project Design Guidelines,” provided that the Project Design Guidelines will not be applied to diminish or alter the rights of County approved projects or the County’s land use authority.”</p>

**Table 2
 Summary of Revisions to General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element**

Location of Proposed Change	Current Language	Proposed Language
Page 67 Table TC-1	Table Title is “GENERAL ROADWAY STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT BY FUNCTIONAL CLASS”	Change Table Title to “GENERAL ROADWAY STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT BY ROAD CLASSIFICATION”
Page 67 Table TC-1	Column heading “Functional Class”	Change Column heading to “Road Classification”
Page 69 Policy TC-1u	“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 US 50.”	Delete policy due to the inclusion of the Latrobe Connection on Figure TC-1.
Page 69 Policy TC-1y	“Development through 2025, within Traffic Analysis Zones 148 and 344, shall be conditioned so that a cap of 10,045 full-time employees is not exceeded, unless it can be demonstrated that a higher number of employees would not violate established level of service standards.”	Delete policy due to the inclusion of the Latrobe Connection on Figure TC-1. The Latrobe Connection provides additional roadway capacity to and from the El Dorado Hills Business Park, such that the level of service standards in Policy TC-Xd would not be violated through the General Plan horizon year of 2035.
Page 84 Measure TC-V(1)	“Work with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), Sacramento County, and the City of Folsom to identify potential alignments for the new arterial roadway from the west side of El Dorado Hills Business Park to US Highway 50. [Policy TC-1u]”	Delete implementation measure due to the inclusion of the Latrobe Connection on Figure TC-1.

Staff is proposing the addition of a new table to Figure TC-1 to identify potential future roadway facilities (post-2035). When the General Plan was adopted in 2004, the circulation system shown on Figure TC-1 was based on a growth rate of approximately 3% per year. In 2014, the Board directed Long Range Planning (LRP) to adjust the growth rate to 1.03% per year, which is better aligned the County’s historical growth rate. As a result, some of the facilities shown on the existing Figure TC-1 are larger than what will be required by 2035. LRP is proposing to change Figure TC-1 to reflect the 2035 circulation system and add the “2035 and Potential Future Roadway Facility” Table to Figure TC-1. The table displays the future facility size for roadways which need fewer lanes by 2035 than what is currently shown on the existing Figure TC-1. The potential future facility list is generally consistent with the existing Figure TC-1 and would be for longer-range planning purposes.

2035 and Potential Future Roadway Facilities

Roadway	Segment	2035 Facility	Potential Future Facility
Bass Lake Road	US 50 to Silver Springs Parkway	Major 2-Lane	4-Lane Divided
Cameron Park Drive	Hacienda Drive to Meder Road	Major 2-Lane	4-Lane Divided
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	Governor Drive/St Andrews Drive to Francisco Drive	Major 2-Lane	4-Lane Divided
Francisco Drive	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road	Major 2-Lane	4-Lane Divided
Green Valley Road	Silva Valley Parkway to Deer Valley Road (West)	Major 2-Lane	4-Lane Divided
Latrobe Connection (Carson Crossing Drive)	Golden Foothills Parkway to El Dorado County Line	Major 2-Lane	4-Lane Divided
Latrobe Road	White Rock Road to Suncast Lane	4-Lane Divided	6-Lane Divided
Silva Valley Parkway	Harvard Way to Green Valley Road	Major 2-Lane	4-Lane Divided
White Rock Road	Latrobe Road to US 50	4-Lane Divided ¹	6-Lane Divided ¹

¹ White Rock Road is the eastern end of the Capitol Southeast Connector Corridor.

Options:

- 1) Approve the proposed General Plan Amendment to the Transportation and Circulation Element related to the update of the CIP and TIM Fee Program.
- 2) Approve the proposed General Plan Amendment to the Transportation and Circulation Element and direct staff to return for additional direction as discussed at the April 19, 2016 Board Study Session.

Staff Recommendation: Option 1: Approve the proposed General Plan Amendment to the Transportation and Circulation Element related to the update of the CIP and TIM Fee Program.

4. Receive and file a status report on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

As discussed at the February 23, 2016 meeting, the NOP for the Programmatic EIR was released on February 5, 2016. A public scoping meeting was held on March 3, 2016 in the Planning Commission Hearing Room. The 30-day comment period closed on March 7, 2016. Staff received four comment letters and one verbal comment. The County’s environmental consultants are working on the document and anticipate a release of the Draft EIR in April.

Staff Recommendation: Receive and file the status report on the Programmatic EIR.

5. Receive and file the updated project schedule (Attachment 16G).

The schedule has been updated to reflect the changes associated with the inclusion of the amended General Plan, as well as to incorporate the lead time requirements for Board items.

Staff Recommendation: Receive and file the updated project schedule.

Public Comments

6. Responses to Public Comments

During and since the Board Study Sessions held on December 7, 2015, members of the public suggested that certain assumptions that the County has used to determine the TIM Fee are incorrect, and offered other suggestions for improvement in the calculation of the fee. An additional letter commenting on a proposed CIP project was received. The statements are listed below with staff responses.

A. Existing Deficiencies and the County’s Interpretation of Measure Y

It was stated that the handling of existing deficiencies and the County’s interpretation of the Measure Y voter initiative passed in 1998 and amended in 2008 are incorrect. The argument was made that since existing residents will use new roads, existing residents should pay a portion of the cost for the new road.

The County’s current and draft updated TIM Fee program is based on requirements set forth via Measure Y and the General Plan. The TIM Fee program is created based on a “but for” logic: but for new development, certain roads would not need to be built or widened. Since new development causes the need for new or widened roads, new development pays for the full cost of those improvements. An argument made in favor of Measure Y that was included on the ballot directly addresses this issue:

The County's logic is that since current residents will be using these newly widened roads then they must pay something too. This ignores the fact that our roads wouldn't need to be widened if it weren't for new development. Measure Y requires new development to pay 100% of its way.

General Plan Policy TC-X (along with the other TC-X policies) was adopted to implement Measure Y, states:

...Developer-paid traffic impact fees combined with any other available funds shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the County...

Additionally, General Plan Policy TC-Xf states:

At the time of approval of a tentative map for a single family residential subdivision of five or more parcel that worsens (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the County shall do one of the following: (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the development plus forecasted traffic growth at 10-years from project submittal; or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County's 10 year CIP.

Kittleson & Associates, Inc. (KAI) has performed an existing deficiencies analysis on the roadway network; see previous Attachment 9D and the updated Draft Technical Memorandum 2-3 (Attachment 16H). It is KAI's finding that the only existing deficiency at this time occurs on Green Valley Road from the County line to Sophia Parkway. This deficiency is being addressed with a programmed construction project by the City of Folsom that will widen Green Valley Road from East Natoma Street to Sophia Parkway from 2 to 4 lanes and construct Class II bike paths (SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Project ID# SAC 21280). This is scheduled for completion by 2020. The funding included in the TIM Fee Program for this project is the fair share portion for future growth to mitigate its impact to Green Valley Road at the County line.

Neighboring jurisdictions apply the same methodology to address existing deficiencies. For example:

1. Placer County General Plan Traffic Impact Fee Program

Existing Deficiencies¹

Although there are some "existing deficiencies" (where roadways or intersections need improvements to meet design standards or for safety reasons), all of the "capacity improvements" in Table A-2 are needed to accommodate future development. **Traffic generated by existing development would use these new or widened roadways that are funded by the traffic impact fees, but these capacity improvements are not needed to accommodate existing development levels. Consequently, existing development should not have to pay for any roadways beyond those needed to correct existing deficiencies.**

¹ Technical Memorandum, *Placer County General Plan Proposed Traffic Impact Fee Program and Nexus Analysis*, 1995

Placer County does include projects in their Traffic Impact Fee Program to fix roadway standard deficiencies – where roadways or bridges do not meet the County’s roadway design standards for width, shoulders, curvature, sight distance, etc. Those types of projects do include an existing deficiency amount that cannot be funded from the Traffic Impact Fee Program. El Dorado County does not propose any roadway standard deficiency projects; all projects in the proposed update to the TIM Fee program are included to address capacity needs of new development. Technical Memorandum 2-3 is the basis of the technical analysis to determine existing and future deficiencies in El Dorado County.

2. Sacramento County Transportation Development Fee (SCTDF)

Existing Deficiencies²

“Fee Calculation for roadways and intersections that currently operate at LOS E or better conditions, the entire cost of the capacity improvements (minus funding from other sources) are allocated to the SCTDF Program. For existing deficiencies (roadways that currently operate at LOS F), the cost of the improvement that is allocated to the SCTDF Program is equal to the percentage of the total change in volume/capacity (v/c) ratio due to the improvement that is needed to return the v/c ratio to current levels.”

3. City of Rancho Cordova Citywide Transportation Impact Fee

The nexus study for the traffic mitigation impact fee program names the program as the Transportation Development Impact Fee or TDIF, however, in the City of Rancho Cordova *Development Related Processes and Fees*³, the fee is named the “Citywide Transportation Impact Fee” and in other documents it is referred to as the “Traffic Mitigation Impact Fee”.

Existing Deficiencies⁴

“For a roadway that currently operates at LOS D or better conditions but that would operate at LOS E or F conditions under “2035 traffic demand without thru trips”, the entire cost of the capacity improvement was allocated to the TDIF Program. For existing deficiencies (roadways that currently operate at LOS E or F), the cost of the improvement that is allocated to the TDIF program is equal to the percent of total cost that is needed to return the roadway to existing congestion levels.

B. Caltrans Traffic Impact Study Guidelines

It was stated that the methodology for the TIM Fee calculation should follow the fair share funding formula in the *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies* (Caltrans, 2002). Staff does not agree with this assertion for the following reasons:

² *Final Report Update Sacramento County Transportation Development Fee Program*, Revised March 2010

³ *Development Related Processes and Fees*, City of Rancho Cordova, Last Updated April 2013

⁴ *Update to the 2035 Transportation CIP and the Nexus Study for the Development Impact Fee Program*, December 2013

- The Major CIP/TIM Fee Update is not a Traffic Impact Study (TIS). A TIS is a project-specific study which typically analyzes an individual development project or roadway project. The purpose of a TIS is to identify specific impacts for an individual project. The Major CIP/TIM Fee Update is a planning document and nexus study which analyzes the cumulative effects of approved multiple development projects and multiple roadway projects, consistent with El Dorado County’s General Plan land use.
- The Caltrans guide is not necessarily applicable to local roadways. The *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies* states (page 1) “The applicability of this guide for local streets and roads (non-State highways) is at the discretion of the effected jurisdiction.”
- Additionally, in Appendix B of the Caltrans guide (also included as page 3 of public comments submitted at the February 23, 2016 Board Study Session) states, “The methodology below is neither intended as, nor does it establish, a legal standard for determining equitable responsibility and cost of a project’s traffic impact.”

Instead, the methodology used for the Major CIP/TIM Fee Update is consistent with the legal requirements set forth in Government Code §§ 66000-66025 (the "Mitigation Fee Act"), El Dorado County’s General Plan policies, and state-of-the-practice methodology for fee programs.

C. School Enrollment & Technological Advances

It was stated that school enrollment is declining and as such, our projections for the future relative to school-related traffic are too high. It was also stated that people working from home, automated/flying cars and other technological advances will further decrease the need for new/improved roads.

Staff and their consultants have provided data on school enrollment in El Dorado County that does show a small decrease between the 2012/13 and 2013/14 school years. However, enrollment has held steady through the 2014/15 school year. See data posted on the project website: <http://www.edcwesternslopeupdate.com/document-library.html>.

School enrollment and educational employment is accounted for in the County’s travel demand model (TDM). The model assumes modest growth in schools through 2035. Educational employment growth is assumed to be only 3.8% of all employment growth in the County’s western slope. Additionally, K - 12 enrollment rates are assumed to be lower than the historical trend. For example, the base year (2010) model has 0.43 students per household; the K - 12 enrollment rate for the projected new households through 2035 is 0.31 students per household.

Autonomous vehicles are the subject of many recently published research papers. The Transportation Research Board’s “*Effects of Autonomous Vehicle Ownership on Trip, Mode, and Route Choice*”⁶ indicates that autonomous vehicles have the potential to avoid parking fees,

⁶ *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 2493, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., 2015, pp. 29-38, DOI:10.3141/2943-04

cause a decrease in transit ridership, and increase vehicle trips. Additionally, the Victoria Transport Policy Institute's "*Autonomous Vehicle Implementation Predictions*"⁷, states, "This report explores the impacts that autonomous (also called self-driving, driverless or robotic) vehicles are likely to have on travel demands and transportation planning... the analysis indicates that some benefits, such as independent mobility for affluent non-drivers, may begin in the 2020's or 2030's, but most impacts, including reduced traffic and parking congestion (and therefore road and parking facility supply requirements), independent mobility for low-income people (and therefore reduced need to subsidize transit), increased safety, energy conservation and pollution reduction, will only be significant when autonomous vehicles become common and affordable, probably in the 2040's to 2060's, and some benefits may require prohibiting human-driven vehicles on certain roadways, which could take longer.

Additionally, the census data provided on the project website and at our public workshops indicates that telecommuters have not significantly increased over the last ten years (Attachment 16J). Staff does agree that technological advances may decrease the need in the future for additional improvements. The major updates to the CIP and TIM Fee Programs are scheduled every five years. The major update evaluates the land use and the potential changes to inputs for the calculation of the TIM Fee and adjusts for any significant changes. It would not be prudent to make adjustments on technological advances that have yet to be proven to decrease vehicle trips.

D. Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Rates

It was stated that the ITE trip generation counts are not appropriate for rural areas, and should be tailored to our jurisdiction (by use of surveys, etc.) to account for our rural nature.

The *ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, 2012* was used for initial input for the TDM. It is state of the practice to use the average trip generation rates for particular uses when calibrating a regional model. The *ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition* represents the ninth full edition and incorporates data from the previous eight editions as well as supplementary informational reports. The average trip generation rates represent weighted averages from studies conducted throughout the United States and Canada since the 1960's.

Each subsequent edition undergoes revisions to reflect the changes in either land use codes, independent variables, land use descriptions or new collected data. The *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, User's Guide and Handbook* has the following discussion:

"Data Age... there was concern that the data collected before the first major energy crisis in 1973 may differ from the post-energy crisis data. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) analyzed the database from the third edition (1982) of *Trip Generation* and stated, "Based on statistical tests such as T-tests and F-ratios, it was concluded that there were no significant differences between the mean trip rates of older

⁷ *Autonomous Vehicle Implementation Predictions*, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, presented at the 2015 Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting, 15-3326

data (pre-1973) and new data (post-1973) for all land uses analyzed.”⁸ ITE staff performed additional analyses comparing pre- and post- 1980 data for the restaurant land uses (931, 932, 933) for the *February 1995 Update to the Fifth Edition*. Again, it was found that there were no significant differences between the mean trip rates of the older data and the newer data and that all data points were retained in the database to maximize the sample sizes of the given land uses. Prior to the release of the eighth edition of *Trip Generation*, ITE examined the data that were contained in the banking land use – Drive-in Bank (912) - to determine if changes in travel patterns resulting from recent technological advances in the banking industry had a significant impact on the trip generation rates. This analysis concluded that pre- and post-2000 trip generation data were significantly different. As a result, all data from the years prior to the year 2000 were removed from the database for the two banking land uses – Walk-in Bank (911) and Drive-in Bank (912). It is anticipated that additional analyses will be performed for future updates to continue monitoring variations based on the age of the data.”

As discussed, ITE regularly assesses the validity of trip generation data and makes changes, if needed.

El Dorado County’s TDM uses the CUBE software platform. One of the characteristics of the software is the input requirement of socioeconomic data such as number of persons in the household, number of workers, and income classification. This input data was derived from sources such as the 2010 US Census data and shapefiles, the latest SACOG Sacramento Area Household Travel Survey, and the 2008 SACOG Small Area Data Set. This socioeconomic data is applied to the typical trip generation rates to provide daily rates in character with the local land use. A sample of six traffic analysis zones (TAZ’s) in El Dorado Hills and six traffic analysis zones in the Grizzly Flat/Somerset area were compared from the TDM. The resulting average daily trip generation rate for the El Dorado Hills TAZ’s equaled 9.26 trips per day per single family dwelling unit. The average daily trip generation rate for the Grizzly Flat/Somerset TAZ’s equaled 6.07 trips per day per single family dwelling unit. Additionally, the TDM’s average trip generation rate for the age-restricted Four Seasons community in El Dorado Hills is 6.93 trips per day per single family dwelling unit, reflecting the lower trip generation characteristics of age-restricted communities.

In summary, the El Dorado County TDM includes data from the ITE *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, 2012* as an initial input, then the TDM makes adjustments based on local socioeconomic data to produce trip generation rates that reflect the local land use, transportation and population characteristics.

E. High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes

It has been stated that the HOV lanes are always empty and should be converted to High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. It was also stated that the HOV and auxiliary lanes are not included in our model.

⁸ Kellercro, *Development and Application of Trip Generation Rates*, Washington, DC, USA: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 1985. ITE *Trip Generation Manual*, ninth edition.

Caltrans PeMS counts show the HOV lanes on US 50 are utilized. HOV lanes are designed to be free of congestion and sometimes appear to be empty, especially when compared with adjacent, congested, general purpose lanes. The draft TIM Fee program does not include any new HOV lanes.

HOT lanes were established by Assembly Bill 1467 (Nunez) and approved by the Governor on May 19, 2006. The bill authorizes that, until January 1, 2012, Regional Transportation Agencies, in cooperation with the Department of Transportation may apply to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to develop and operate HOT lanes, including the administration and operation of a value pricing program and exclusive or preferential lane facilities for public transit. The number of projects that may be approved is limited to four, two in Northern California and two in Southern California. There are currently three authorized projects with HOT lanes in California, one in the Bay area under the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The MTC opened their new express lanes on I-580 in February. There are two HOT lane projects in Southern California, the first is under the Riverside County Transportation Commission on I-15 and the other is under the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority on I-110. The I-110 project started operation in November 2012 and the I-15 project is scheduled to begin construction in 2018. At this time, additional HOT lanes have not been authorized in California.

HOV and auxiliary lanes are included in the County's TDM. When calculating the LOS in the mixed-flow lanes on US 50, the volume and capacity of the HOV lane is excluded. The volume and capacity of the auxiliary lanes are included. This methodology is consistent with the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2010).

F. Vacancy Rate

It has been stated that El Dorado County incorrectly uses one county-wide average for vacancy rates.

The March 14, 2013 Bay Area Economics (BAE) memo titled "2035 Growth Projections" used the county-wide average for vacancy rates based on the 2010 census. However, the input files for the TDM are based on vacancy rates for census block groups. The census block groups are rolled up to individual TAZ's. The vacancy rates are based on the 2010 US Census and documented in the *El Dorado County Travel Demand Model 2012 Update Land Use Final Report* (Kimley-Horn, 2013), previous Attachment 15C.

G. Land Use Assumption for Multi-Family Housing

A question was asked regarding why the Major CIP/TIM Fee Update's land use assumption includes 3,700 new multi-family units over the next 20 years. In short, this is to adequately plan for the County's current and projected future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), as required by the State of California, through the CIP/TIM Fee Update's 2015-2035 horizon.

RHNA Overview

The RHNA is part of state-mandated Housing Element law (Government Code Sections 65580 et seq.) The RHNA establishes the total number of housing units that each city and county must plan for within an eight-year planning period. Each city and county must update its Housing Element to demonstrate how the jurisdiction will meet the expected growth per the RHNA. Housing Element law specifies that jurisdictions must identify “adequate sites” (vacant and surplus lands with adequate infrastructure that are appropriate for residential development) to accommodate this growth. If a jurisdiction fails to identify adequate sites, Housing Element law requires the jurisdiction to rezone sites as necessary to accommodate its RHNA.

RHNA Process

The State of California, through the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD), issued a Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) to SACOG’s six-county region for the January 1, 2013 to October 31, 2021 planning period. Per this RHND, the region must accommodate 104,970 total housing units over this eight year planning period; this total is broken down into four income distribution categories: very low, low, moderate and above moderate. HCD calculated this regional determination using information provided by the California Department of Finance.

SACOG must develop a RHNA that allocates a share of the regional determination to each of the cities and counties in SACOG’s six-county region. The RHNA establishes the total number of housing units that each city and county must plan for within the eight-year planning period. The RHNA is also broken down into the four income distribution categories. Each jurisdiction is responsible for providing sufficient zoning capacity to accommodate the projected housing need in each income category.

Each jurisdiction must update its Housing Element to demonstrate how it will meet the RHNA for each income category over the eight-year planning period. The State must then certify each jurisdiction’s Housing Element to determine compliance with State law. The County updated its Housing Element in 2013 to accommodate this RHNA and received state certification the same year.

El Dorado County’s RHNA

The County’s RHNA for the unincorporated west slope during the 2013-2021 planning period is 3,714 total units (3,948 minus approximately 234 units under construction at the time), of which approximately 1,515 are for the very low and low income categories (1,623 minus 108 units under construction at the time).

Accommodating new units for above moderate income earners is generally not difficult for jurisdictions like El Dorado County because new single family homes are the predominant product being built and often command prices that make them affordable to only above moderate income earners. Conversely, accommodating new units for very low and low income earners is difficult for many jurisdictions, particularly those like El Dorado County, which are very desirable places to live and where the market will bear relatively higher new home purchase costs.

Jurisdictions across the state often find the most or only feasible way to accommodate new units for very low and low income earners (and sometimes even moderate) is through multi-family development or similar higher density and/or more naturally affordable housing options, such as secondary dwelling units. The County’s Housing Element directly addresses this issue: “Because low-income households are severely limited in their ability to pay for housing, they typically need to rely on high-density or multi-family housing” (page 4-4). SACOG’s adopted RHNA also addresses this issue: “For the very low and low-income categories, jurisdictions generally are required to identify sites zoned at multi-family residential densities.”

The County’s current Housing Element accommodates new units for very low and low income earners as required by the RHNA. However, in future Housing Element updates, the County may find it challenging to adequately accommodate these new units, so planning ahead is prudent.

RHNA and the CIP/TIM Fee Update Process

The current RHNA is through mid-2021. The next RHNA will likely span 2021-2029. Since the County does not yet know what the new RHNA will be, assumptions must be made to ensure the CIP/TIM Fee update is created in a manner that will allow the County to: 1) accommodate both the current and future RHNA, particularly for very low and low income earners, and 2) implement the County’s adopted Housing Element.

The Housing Element includes a number of policies targeted toward supporting and increasing the supply of housing affordable to lower income households and removing governmental constraints to housing production. For example:

- Policy HO-1.25: The County shall encourage programs that will result in improved levels of service on existing roadways and allow for focused reductions in the Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee. Such programs may include, but not be limited to, analyzing the traffic benefits of mixed-use development.
- Policy HO-1.26 requires the County to ensure that public facilities (such as roads) be provided to affordable housing: “The County shall ensure that public services and facilities are provided to affordable housing projects at the same level as to market-rate housing. Incentives and/or subsidies shall be considered to support the production of housing for very low, low and moderate income households.”
- Policy HO-1.24 states “The County shall encourage Second Dwelling Units to provide housing that is affordable to very low, low and moderate income households.”

To accommodate both the current and future RHNA for very low and low income earners during the CIP/TIM Fee Update’s 2015-2035 timeframe and to implement the Housing Element, the County applied the current RHNA’s annual average of 189 units/year (1,515 total divided by 8 years) to the 20 year horizon of the CIP/TIM Fee Update. This results in projected need to accommodate approximately 3,788 units for very low and low income earners over the 20 year horizon.

The CIP/TIM Fee Update land use assumption was based on this projected need: it includes approximately 3,700 multi-family units to accommodate this projection, along with 800

secondary dwelling units, which also tend to be affordable for very low and low income earners (per HO-1.24 and Board Policy B-14). The secondary dwelling units are assumed to be on land zoned for single-family uses, primarily outside of the Community Regions. The CIP/TIM Fee Update land use assumption will also ensure the County is implementing the Housing Element, including policies listed above that require the County: “shall ensure that public...facilities are provided to affordable housing projects at the same level as to market-rate housing” and “shall encourage Second Dwelling Units to provide housing that is affordable to very low, low and moderate income households.”

H. US 50 Volume Levels in 2035

It was stated that the TDM is forecasting a decline in the number of trips on US 50 by 2035. The report referenced as evidence of this decline was a peer review memorandum by KAI, dated May 22, 2013. The comments in the peer review memorandum were addressed by Kimley-Horn prior to finalizing the TDM in 2014. Data from the TDM now shows that volumes on US 50 increase between 2010 and 2035 in the TDM. For example, for the US 50 segment from the County line to El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road, the volume for the westbound direction in the AM peak hour increases from 3,790 in 2013 to 5,070 in 2035. The volume for the eastbound direction in the PM peak hour increases from 4,749 in 2013 to 6,250 in 2035. See updated Draft Technical Memorandum 2-3 (Attachment 16H) for all the reported volumes from the TDM.

I. Structural Deficiencies and Bridges

It has been stated that the Cameron Park Drive interchange has a structural deficiency, and therefore the cost of replacement cannot be completely borne by new development.

The TIM Fee Program analyzes the traffic capacity of the roadways in El Dorado County and determines if additional roadway capacity is needed to meet the LOS standards required by our General Plan. Structural deficiency is not a consideration of highway capacity. Also, less than desirable vertical clearance is not a structural deficiency; it is a geometric deficiency. According to the latest Caltrans Bridge Inspection Report, both Cameron Park Interchange bridges need minor maintenance work to address deck concrete cracks. The bridges continue to have high Sufficiency Ratings. The Caltrans Permit rating for the structure allows 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13 axle vehicles to use the structure. If there was any question as to the adequacy of the structural integrity, a vehicle with larger than 2 or 3 axles would not be allowed to traverse the structure. Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (KAI) did perform an operational analysis on the Cameron Park Drive interchange intersections and determined there are no existing LOS deficiencies.

Additionally, when the County replaces a rural bridge, it will also widen the bridge to bring it up to County road width standards. Widening a bridge to standard lane widths increases the roadway operational capacity. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) points out that “On high-speed roadways with narrow lanes that also have narrow shoulders, the risk of severe lane-departure crashes increases. Drivers on rural two-lane highways may shift even closer to the centerline as they become less comfortable next to a narrow shoulder. At other times, they may shift closer to the shoulder edge and are at greater risk of driving off the paved portion of the roadway (and over potential edge drop-offs) as they meet oncoming traffic.” FHWA also

cites the reduction in speed, and therefore capacity, when the lanes widths are reduced from 12' to 11' or 10'.⁹

The documentation of the analysis plus additional information on the nexus for Bridge Replacement, Intersection Improvements and Transit is contained in Draft Technical Memorandum 2-3 (Attachment 16H).

J. Intersections

A question was raised regarding the nexus for and cost of the TIM Fee Intersection Improvements line item.

The TIM Fee Program is based on the capacity of road segments. Intersection improvements at the terminus of the road segments are incorporated into the cost estimate for proposed improvements. However, intersection capacity improvements can be needed that are not associated with a road segment that is forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS. To cover the potential operational improvements at intersections on the County's circulation system that is triggered by new development, the TIM Fee Intersection Improvements line item was established in 2006. At that time, it was assumed that traffic signals would be the improvement needed for intersections and the County would install six per year for twenty years. Historically since 2001, the County has completed on average just over one intersection project per year. Additionally, the capacity improvements needed included road widening to accommodate turn lanes, deceleration lanes or other channelization. The additional road work increased the cost of the intersection improvements to the average of \$1.8 million that staff is assuming in the proposed TIM Fee update.

The County has established an Intersection Needs Process that determine if an intersection should be included in the CIP. In 2010, CDA staff, then known as the Department of Transportation (DOT), created a "superset" list with possible locations of traffic signals or improvements that may need to be constructed within the 20 year General Plan and TIM Fee Program timeframe. The intersections on the superset list were placed into one of three tiers. The first tier intersections are those that meet at least three traffic signal warrants and are prioritized for construction based on specified criteria. The second tier intersections are those that do not meet at least three traffic signal warrants, but the potential is there for increased traffic volumes. These are monitored to determine when new development triggers a need. The third tier intersections are the remainder of the intersections list. The list is updated on an annual basis and evaluated using the latest County traffic counts (Attachment 16K).

K. White Rock Road Expansion

A letter was received from a local citizens group requesting the County not widen White Rock Road from the County line to Windfield Way (Attachment 16L).

Staff recognizes the concerns of the residents adjacent to White Rock Road regarding the expansion to a four lane roadway. However, White Rock Road has been planned as a four-lane

⁹ http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/geometric/pubs/mitigationstrategies/chapter3/3_lanewidth.cfm

divided facility since the 1990's and is reflected as such on the General Plan Figure TC-1. Prior to the 1990's, White Rock Road was planned as a six-lane divided facility.

ALTERNATIVES

N/A

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no change to Net County Cost associated with this agenda item. Funding for the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update is included in the adopted Fiscal Year 2015/16 budget and is provided by the TIM Fee Program and Road Fund. Updating the CIP and TIM Fee establishes County priorities for available funding and ensures that new development pays the relative costs of necessary infrastructure.

STRATEGIC PLAN COMPONENT

The Major CIP and TIM Fee Update will address 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

Staff will do the following:

- On June 2 (tentatively), staff will make an informational presentation to the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) on the major update to the CIP and TIM Fee Program.
- On June 7 (tentatively), staff will return to the Board for adoption of a 2016 Interim CIP Book. The purpose of the Interim CIP is to provide a work plan for the Transportation Division until the Major CIP and TIM Fee Update is adopted.
- On June 9 (tentatively), staff will hold a CIP/TIM Fee Informational Workshop with the Planning Commission.
- On June 14 (tentatively), staff will return to the Board for a 2016 CIP Workshop. Staff will request tentative approval of the Proposed 2016 CIP Book, which will provide details on the new CIP.
- In July, staff will present the CIP/TIM Fee Program to the Planning Commission. Staff will request that the Planning Commission: 1) Make a finding of consistency for the CIP with the General Plan, 2) Make a recommendation to the Board for approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment to the Transportation and Circulation Element, 3) Make a recommendation for approval of the Programmatic EIR, and 4) Receive and file the TIM Fee Resolution and Ordinance and Frontage Improvement Ordinance.
- In August/September, staff will return to the Board for: 1) Final adoption of the TIM Fee Program roadway list, 2) Final adoption of the TIM Fee Program Nexus Study, 3) Adoption of the 2016 CIP Book, 4) Final adoption of the TIM Fee Program, 5) Adoption of and first reading of the TIM Fee Ordinance, 6) Adoption of and first reading of the Frontage Improvement Ordinance, 7) Adoption of the TIM Fee Resolution, 8) Certification of the EIR, and 9) Adoption of the General Plan Amendment for the

Transportation and Circulation Element. Staff will also provide a draft TIM Fee Program Administration Manual.

- In September/October, staff will return to the Board for the second reading of the TIM Fee Ordinance and the Frontage Improvement Ordinance.
- In October/November, staff will return to the Board to approve the TIM Fee Program Administration Manual.

CONTACT

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