



Jim Mitrisin <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>

---

## Fwd: BIA Request for Continuance of TIM Fee Update

---

The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>  
To: James Mitrisin <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jun 25, 2018 at 5:04 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jeff Short** <Jeff@northstatebia.org>  
Date: Mon, Jun 25, 2018 at 5:02 PM  
Subject: BIA Request for Continuance of TIM Fee Update  
To: The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>  
Cc: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, BOS Two <bostwo@edcgov.us>, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, The BOSFIVE <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Karen Feathers <karen.feathers@edcgov.us>, "rafael.martinez@edcgov.us" <rafael.martinez@edcgov.us>

Chair Ranalli,

Attached, please find the North State BIA's letter requesting a 30 day continuance of the proposed TIM fee schedule changes.

Thank you,

--

Jeff Short

North State Building Industry Association

Legislative Advocate

D: 916-751-2758

C: 916-751-6690

[jeff@northstatebia.org](mailto:jeff@northstatebia.org)



 **BIA Letter re TIM Fee Schedule 6.22.18.pdf**  
210K



June 25, 2018

Honorable Michael Ranalli  
Chair, El Dorado County Board of Supervisors  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Chair Ranalli,

Thank you for delaying the hearing for the TIM fee changes on June 5<sup>th</sup> to give the BIA some additional time to study this complex and potentially industry-shifting issue. We also want to thank Andrew Gaber and Katie Jackson from the County Department of Transportation for coming to the BIA meeting last week to provide additional information. While we were disappointed in how late into the process these changes were brought to our attention, we appreciate the generally positive, collaborative relationship we have with El Dorado County.

This partnership is what led to the 2016 TIM Fee updates, which our members and County staff worked on over the course of many meetings. The ultimate product of that cooperation was a TIM fee schedule that was agreeable to all affected parties. It is unfortunate that the proposed increase in Zone 8 essentially erases those changes, made less than two years ago.

We are however, encouraged by the direction of the Board given in relation to the recent proposed increase of the El Dorado Hills park fee, to convene a working group of all stakeholders to address the high and escalating fees in El Dorado County. A meeting such as this could address many of the issues facing El Dorado County generally and our industry specifically, including home affordability, achieving RHNA goals, and the ability of our members to continue providing housing so that other facilities can be built as well.

But looking specifically to the issue at hand, our members have many questions about the need and methodology of the proposed TIM fee update. While these changes may very well be appropriate, our first real detailed meeting took place just last week and the industry has not yet been in a position to look at how the proposed fee levels were determined. We suspect that a shift from measuring traffic by daily trips to measuring at its PM peak may have played a large role in the increase to the TIM fee in Zone 8 specifically. If this is the case, we may recommend reverting to the way traffic was measured when the 2016 update was completed. We also have not yet been able to do our own research on what the Highway Capacity Manual, also published in 2016, means for our local TIM Fees. Additionally, we have questions about

North State Building Industry Association

(916) 677-5717

18-0733 Public Comment Rcvd 6-26-18

how large a role various assumptions about external traffic and growth played in the County's new proposed fee schedule.

At this point, it is our hope that the Board of Supervisors will grant a 30 day extension so that these relevant issues can be explored before the Board creates a formal and lasting policy change.

We understand why staff is describing this as a minor and technical change, but an increase of this magnitude may have far-reaching policy implications for our membership. Our members need more time to study concerns such as those presented above more fully. We are also hopeful that an additional month will allow the County to begin putting together a working group to address the overall fee regime, so that whatever changes are necessary to the TIM fee schedule can be made with a more holistic view in mind.

We understand that there are challenges that come with not approving the change today. We wanted to express our acknowledgement of this and support for projects outside the TIM fee schedule but in the Capitol Improvement Program. Any changes to the CIP based on a later alteration of the TIM fee schedule can be approved by the Board of Supervisors with just a few days notice.

If the Board should decide to move ahead at this time with the new fee schedule, we would still ask the Board to agendize a review and possible reconsideration of that schedule before implementation, but no fewer than 30 days from today, for us to present our findings as it relates to the need and methodology of these fee changes.

As a final note, and regardless of what decision the Board makes, we hope to continue our collaborative relationship with the County in the future. Our goal moving forward is to work with the Board, staff, and other members of the community to continue building an El Dorado County we can all be proud of.

Sincerely,



Chris Norem  
Director of Governmental & Political Affairs  
North State Building Industry Association

Cc: Supervisors Hidahl, Frentzen, Veerkamp, Novasel  
Don Ashton, Chief Administrative Officer  
Rafael Martinez, Director of Transportation