



A G E N D A

**Wednesday, February 22, 2012
10:45 am**

**Board of Supervisors Chambers
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, California 95603**

- | | | |
|-----------|---|-------------------------|
| A. | Flag Salute | |
| B. | Roll Call | |
| C. | Approval of Minutes: January 25, 2012 | Action
Pg. 1 |
| D. | Agenda Review | |
| E. | Public Comment | |
| F. | Placer Parkway Corridor Policy | Action
Pg. 3 |
| G. | South Placer Regional Transportation and Air Quality
Mitigation Fee Program Comprehensive Update | Action
Pg. 5 |
| H. | Executive Director's Report | |
| I. | Board Direction to Staff | |
| J. | Informational Items | Info |
| | 1. Technical Advisory Committee Minutes: February 7, 2012 | Pg. 7 |

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES
JANUARY 25, 2012**

The South Placer Regional Transportation Authority met on Wednesday, January 25, 2012 at 10:45 a.m. at the Placer County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 175 Fulweiler Avenue, Auburn, California.

ATTENDANCE: John Allard Celia McAdam
 Peter Hill Sue Sholtis
 Gabriel Hydrick
 Kirk Uhler

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion by Allard and second by Uhler, the Board unanimously approved the minutes of the June 29, 2011 and July 6, 2011 meetings as submitted.

AGENDA REVIEW

Celia McAdam stated staff recommends removing Item H, Placer Parkway Corridor Policy, from the agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Uhler and second by Allard, the Board unanimously approved the consent calendar as submitted.

SELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2012

Celia McAdam noted pursuant to the Board adopted rotation of officers, the new Chair for 2012 would be the representative from the City of Roseville and the Vice Chair would be the representative from Placer County.

Upon motion by Uhler and second by Hydrick, the Board unanimously designated the representative from the City of Roseville to act as Chair and the representative from Placer County as Vice Chair for 2012.

John Allard commenced chairing the remainder of the meeting. Allard thanked Peter Hill for his service as Board Chair during 2011.

SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY MITIGATION FEE PROGRAM COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE

Celia McAdam noted last year the Board directed staff to defer the annual inflationary increase and directed staff to perform a comprehensive update to the fee program in 2012. After discussions with Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members, staff is recommending to defer action on a comprehensive update until 2013 or later, depending on when such update would be warranted. Additionally, staff recommends

deferring action on the annual inflationary increase for 2012. Staff further recommends updating the fee schedule to include the latest version of the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual.

Peter Hill noted Sierra College Boulevard has been planned to eventually be six lanes, three lanes traveling in each direction. Currently there are three lanes traveling up and one lane traveling down. There have been discussions about whether six lanes are really needed on Sierra College Boulevard, noting Loomis will most likely not allow any development on their side of the road. Adding the two remaining lanes would be difficult, requiring a lot of fill or structures at a large expense.

Hill noted there is a submittal before Placer County for a large church on the top of the hill on Sierra College Boulevard. Frontage improvements and required lane configuration are currently being designed. These efforts led to questioning whether six lanes are necessary on Sierra College Boulevard from Rocklin Road to the Roseville City limits.

Rocklin staff is requesting that as a part of the fee update that Sierra College Boulevard be reviewed to ascertain whether six lanes are necessary. If Sierra College Boulevard is reduced to four lanes, costs are reduced and there is a possibility that fees could be reduced. Rocklin staff has had discussions with Placer County staff and a striping plan to reconfigure Sierra College Boulevard to two lanes in each direction has been prepared by Rocklin staff.

McAdam noted a focused comprehensive update could be performed, focusing on the costs for Sierra College Boulevard under a four-lane scenario with an accompanying traffic study to determine if the roadway would function appropriately with four lanes.

Kirk Uhler expressed his approval of this approach, noting the church project presents staff with an opportunity to reevaluate the needs of Sierra College Boulevard.

Upon motion by Uhler and second by Hill, the Board unanimously approved updating the Fee Program to conform to the latest trip generation rates provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 8th edition; deferring action on the inflationary fee program adjustment for 2012; and considering a reduced scope comprehensive update focusing on Sierra College Boulevard.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

None.

Meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Celia McAdam
Executive Director

John Allard, Chair



City of Lincoln • City of Rocklin • City of Roseville • Placer County

TO: Board of Directors

DATE: February 7, 2012

**FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director
Stan Tidman, Senior Planner**

SUBJECT: PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR POLICY

Action Requested

1. Confirm the Placer Parkway Corridor Tier 1 environmental document provides for:
 - a. Limited access between Pleasant Grove Road and Fiddymont Road and
 - b. Potential adjustments to the corridor width as part of the Tier 2 environmental document.
2. Support jurisdiction efforts on project level development proposals in the Parkway vicinity so long as they:
 - a. Do not jeopardize Tier 1 approvals and regulatory agency agreements
 - b. Do not result in increased net costs to the overall Parkway project

Background

The Placer Parkway is a high priority regional transportation project for the six-county Sacramento region. The approximate 15-mile freeway will connect State Route (SR) 99 in south Sutter County at Sankey Road to SR 65 in Placer County/Rocklin at Whitney Ranch Parkway. It will reduce anticipated congestion on both the local and regional transportation system as well as advance economic development goals in accordance with local jurisdictions' land use plans.

On December 3, 2009, the Board certified the Final Tier 1 Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and selected a 500'- to 1,000'-wide Preferred Alternative Corridor (Alternative #5) with five interchanges. This action culminated a 7 ½-year process to comply with federal/state environmental requirements. This work involved extensive coordination with federal/state agencies, local jurisdictions, property owners and other interested individuals and organizations. On May 4, 2010, the Federal Highway Administration completed the federal portion of the environmental work and selected the Preferred Alternative via a Record of Decision. Later project-level (or Tier 2) analyses for segments are to evaluate the freeway's specific footprint within the corridor. On October 28, 2009, the Board designated Placer County as the lead for Tier 2/Project-level environmental and design work.

Discussion

Two of the most discussed issues from the Tier 1 work involved:

- Limiting access to the future Parkway within a 7-mile segment between Pleasant Grove Road and Fiddymont Road.
- Determining the ultimate width of the corridor.

SPRTA Board of Directors
TIER 1 PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR POLICY
February 2012
Page 2

Restricting access to the Parkway will preserve it as a high-speed facility and will limit opportunities for growth inducement in this segment. Creating a corridor wider than needed for the future freeway will promote a 'parkway' concept with visual open space and encourage linkages to adjacent open space (agricultural and biological resource) areas.

The Tier 1 document cites that the final size and shape of the corridor may be adjusted for project-level proposals on a case-by-case basis in agriculturally-designated areas undergoing urban development based on (yet to-be-determined) performance standards. The corridor width would depend upon identifying land use needs of the future approved development, restricting Parkway access (for the 7-mile segment), and complying with agreements made via the modified NEPA/404 process.

As documented above, there has been a significant amount of time and money already invested by SPRTA, its member agencies, and regulatory agency partners to develop the environmental document for the Placer Parkway. It is critical to maintain the integrity of these efforts, particularly as the Tier 2, or construction level, environmental document is now underway.

Member jurisdictions are now working on project-level Placer Parkway implementation and/or development proposals, which will be crossed by the future Parkway. To date, SPRTA staff has encouraged proposals that would facilitate future Parkway construction. Early coordination with the regulatory agencies has also been recommended.

With these proposals moving forward, staff sees the need for the Board to articulate a policy for projects that potentially impact the development of the Placer Parkway. Specifically, staff recommends that SPRTA support jurisdiction efforts on project-level proposals so long as they do not jeopardize Tier 1 approvals and regulatory agency agreements.

Funding any major transportation facility is challenging and cost containment must be a constant focus. Therefore, staff also recommends that the policy also specify that SPRTA would support development proposals so long as they do not result in an increase in net costs to the Parkway project.

The Board's confirmation of the Tier 1 Placer Parkway Corridor access, corridor width, existing agreements, and funding provisions will help to facilitate member jurisdictions' Parkway implementation and vicinity development proposals.

CM:ss



City of Lincoln • City of Rocklin • City of Roseville • Placer County

TO: Board of Directors

DATE: February 9, 2012

FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director

**SUBJECT: SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY
MITIGATION FEE PROGRAM COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE**

Action Requested

Defer action on a comprehensive update of the Fee Program to 2013 or later.

Background

In April 2002, the SPRTA Board adopted the Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee (known as the Fee Program), which assessed new development for its impacts on specified regional transportation facilities, which went into effect on July 1, 2002. SPRTA's Joint Powers Agreement provides that an annual inflationary adjustment to the fees, based on the published Construction Cost Index, be brought to the Board for consideration.

The Board adopted inflationary adjustments to the Fee Program in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2007, and 2008. In 2006 and 2009, the Board adopted comprehensive updates to the Fee Program, to reflect changes in adopted land uses and project costs. No changes to the Fee Program were adopted in 2010 or 2011. In June 2011, the Board directed staff to implement a comprehensive update to the fee program in 2012.

At your January meeting, the Board considered a staff recommendation to defer the comprehensive fee program update, at which time the prospect of a reduced scope for a portion of Sierra College Boulevard in the City of Rocklin was discussed. The Board directed that the fee program be updated for the current Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual, defer the inflationary increase for 2012, and bring back to the Board a consideration of a fee program update for a reduced scope on Sierra College Boulevard Segments 6 and 7.

Discussion

Staff has worked with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to evaluate the implications of a reduced scope for Sierra College Boulevard both in terms of cost for the technical study and potential change in fee levels.

The change of the cost of any project in the Fee Program would require a new traffic modeling run, which is the gist of the cost of a comprehensive fee program update. The consensus of the TAC was that it was not cost effective to do a comprehensive update, at a cost of approximately \$60,000, for one project.

It was also noted that the SR 65 Widening project is currently underfunded in the Fee Program. The consensus of the TAC was that even if the fees might be slightly reduced by

SPRTA Board of Directors
REGIONAL MITIGATION FEE PROGRAM COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE
February 2012
Page 2

rescoping of the Sierra College Boulevard project, they would be recaptured in the need for additional funds for SR 65 Widening.

Recommended Action

Based on the cost benefit factors outlined above, staff is recommending that the comprehensive update for the Fee Program be deferred until at least 2013.

The SPRTA TAC has reviewed this recommendation and unanimously concurs.

CM:ss

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.