

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**February 7, 2012**

---

ATTENDANCE: Bruce Burnworth, City of Lincoln  
Andrew Gaber, Placer County Public Works  
Ken Grehm, Placer County Public Works  
Dave Palmer, City of Rocklin  
Scott Gandler, City of Roseville  
Rhon Herndon, City of Roseville  
Chris Kraft, City of Roseville  
Kathy Pease, City of Roseville

Celia McAdam, PCTPA  
Steve Propst, PCTPA  
Sue Sholtis, PCTPA

**Placer Parkway Corridor Policy**

Celia McAdam distributed updated language on the staff report to TAC members regarding the Placer Parkway Corridor width issue that incorporated Roseville comments. In reference to Item 2b on the memo, Kathy Pease inquired what the definition of increased net costs was. McAdam replied there is no formula and each proposal would be brought before the TAC for their recommendation and ultimately the SPRTA Board for decision.

Rhon Herndon inquired about deleting all of the wording in Item 1, citing the less is more approach. McAdam replied the purpose of this policy is to signal to the regulatory agencies that we are not deviating from existing agreement language.

TAC concurred with updated wording on the staff report regarding the Placer Parkway Corridor Policy, which will go before the SPRTA Board for consideration at its February 22 Board meeting.

**Tier II Fee Deferral Considerations**

Celia McAdam indicated the City of Roseville and County have brought up the issue of potential fee deferrals on the Tier 2 fee on the Placer Parkway project. Chris Kraft added developers noted they are paying for fees that will not be in place for a long time and inquired whether they could defer fees into the future. McAdam noted we have to collect these fees to build the Placer Parkway project.

The group discussed the pros and cons of deferrals, citing the interest in spurring economic development with concerns about how deferred funds could be guaranteed in the more distant future. It was agreed everyone needs to be consistent with a unified policy.

McAdam will contact jurisdictions for information on units and timelines and will provide information regarding timing of funding of SPRTA projects at our March 27 TAC meeting

to continue this discussion of fee deferral considerations, develop consensus on a policy and eventually bring this to the SPRTA Board for their consideration.

There was discussion regarding support letters to Sutter County who is pursuing a \$300,000 planning grant to look into a multi-jurisdictional fee program effort. Placer County will be providing a support letter for this planning grant.

**Fee Program: Focused Comprehensive Update**

Celia McAdam stated at the January SPRTA Board meeting the issue of downscoping a portion of Sierra College Boulevard was raised. TAC discussed the pros and cons of pursuing a comprehensive update and if so when. It was pointed out that the cost of the update is chiefly the traffic modeling, which would be the same whether the update is for one project or multiples, as well as the possibility that the fees might not actually be reduced as anticipated. It was also noted that even if Sierra College Blvd is ultimately downsized, any difference in fees would likely be needed by the underfunded SR 65 Widening.

TAC agreed the comprehensive update should be completed in 2013 or 14 which is on schedule with previous updates, the last being conducted in 2009. Downsizing of Sierra College Boulevard could be addressed at that time.

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.