



---

**A G E N D A**

**Wednesday, October 25, 2006**  
**10:45 am**

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

- A. Roll Call**
- B. Approval of Minutes: May 24, 2006** **Action**  
**Pg. 1**
- C. Agenda Review**
- D. Public Comment**
- E. Consent Calendar** **Action**  
These items are expected to be routine and non controversial. **Pg. 3**  
They will be acted upon by the Board at one time without discussion. Any Board member, staff member, or interested citizen may request an item be removed from the consent calendar for discussion.
1. Amendment to Letter of Task Agreement 06-01 for Legal **Pg. 4**  
Services for FY 2006/07 - Miller, Owen & Trost
- F. South Placer Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Comprehensive Program Update** **Action**  
**Pg. 6**
- G. Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Allocation Request for Lincoln Bypass** **Action**  
**Pg. 21**
- H. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Implementation Study for South Placer County** **Action**  
**Pg. 23**
- I. Executive Director's Report**
- J. Board Direction to Staff**

**Board of Directors Meeting Agenda**  
**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**October 25, 2006**  
**Page 2**

<b>K.</b>	<b>Informational Items</b>	<b>Info</b>
1.	Technical Advisory Committee Minutes:	
	a. June 13, 2006	Pg. 24
	b. July 11, 2006	Pg. 26
	c. August 8, 2006	Pg. 28
	d. September 12, 2006	Pg. 29
	e. October 10, 2006	Pg. 31
2.	Status Report: Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Project & Tier 1 EIS/EIR	Pg. 32

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
MINUTES  
May 24, 2006**

---

The South Placer Regional Transportation Authority met on Wednesday, May 24, 2006 at 10:45 a.m. at the Placer County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 175 Fulweiler Avenue, Auburn, California.

<b>ATTENDANCE:</b>	Peter Hill	Celia McAdam
	Jim Holmes	Cynthia Page
	Rocky Rockholm	
	Primo Santini	

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion by Rockholm and second by Hill, the Board unanimously approved the minutes of the January 25, 2006 meeting as submitted.

**AGENDA REVIEW**

Celia McAdam stated that an amended agenda was sent to Boardmembers with an additional item – Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Allocation Request for Phase 1 of the I-80 Capacity Improvement Project. Upon motion by Rockholm and second by Holmes, the amended agenda was unanimously approved.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

Upon motion by Rockholm and second by Holmes, the Consent Calendar was unanimously approved as submitted.

**PUBLIC HEARING: SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY MITIGATION FEE PROGRAM INFLATIONARY ADJUSTMENT**

The SPRTA fee program provides for an annual inflationary adjustment based on the Construction Cost Index, requiring a public hearing and a unanimous vote of all four SPRTA members. The annual inflationary adjustment for 2006 is 3.052%.

Primo Santini opened the public hearing. Receiving no public comment, the public hearing was closed. Upon motion by Hill and second by Holmes, the Board unanimously approved Resolution 06-01 adopting the inflationary adjustment for SPRTA mitigation fees with a roll call vote.

**2006/07 ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET**

Celia McAdam explained that under the terms of our implementation plan, SPRTA allocates not more than \$150,000 annually for administration, to include traffic modeling, legal review, financial audit, and staff costs. The submitted budget meets that requirement. Upon motion by Rockholm and second by Hill, the Board unanimously approved the 2006/07 SPRTA budget.

**CERTIFICATION OF THE NEVADA STATION OPERATING BUDGET FOR 2006 AND 2007**

SPRTA is the official owner of the Nevada Station building and as such, is required to certify that the Nevada Station budget contains the required bond payments. Under the terms of a 2003 agreement between SPRTA and PCTPA, SPRTA leases the building to PCTPA, who administers the building. At the end of the lease, SPRTA will sell the building to PCTPA for \$10.

The PCTPA Board approved the Nevada Station budget earlier this morning. The building account realizes a positive cash flow for the calendar year. Upon motion by Holmes and second by Rockholm, the Board unanimously certified the Nevada Station budget for 2006 and 2007 with a roll call vote.

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY MITIGATION FEE ALLOCATION REQUEST FOR PHASE 1 OF THE I-80 CAPACITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

This agenda item authorizes SPRTA funding for the first phase of the I-80 Capacity Improvement Project – construction of an auxiliary lane on eastbound I-80 from Auburn Blvd to Douglas Blvd. This auxiliary lane will remove one of two merge movements on the eastbound side of I-80. \$690,000 in matching funds is required for the \$71.6 million federal earmark for this project. At its meeting earlier this morning, the PCTPA board authorized the Executive Director to negotiate and sign the cooperative agreement with Caltrans required to go to bid on this project. The cooperative agreement is still in draft form as it is being reviewed by legal counsel. It is expected that a contract will be awarded in September. Upon motion by Rockholm and second by Holmes, the Board unanimously adopted the allocation of \$690,000 of SPRTA funds for the I-80 Capacity Improvement Project with a roll call vote.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Celia McAdam reported that the PCTPA Board directed staff to move forward with placement of the transportation expenditure plan on the November, 2008 ballot. Staff will be working with jurisdictions to do a presentation on this during the Summer months, with adoption of the expenditure plan early next year.

Meeting adjourned.

---

Celia McAdam  
Executive Director

---

Primo Santini, Chair



---

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

**TO: Board of Directors**

**DATE: October 11, 2006**

**FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director**

**SUBJECT: CONSENT CALENDAR**

Below is the Consent Calendar item for the October 25, 2006 agenda for your review and action.

1. Amendment to Letter of Task Agreement 06-01 for Legal Services for FY 2006/07 – Miller, Owen & Trost  
Staff recommends Board approval of the attached amendment to the Letter of Task Agreement for Legal Services with Miller, Owen & Trost for FY 2006/07 that reflects an increase in the hourly rate from \$210 to \$225.

October 25, 2006

Nancy Miller  
Miller, Owen, & Trost  
428 J Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

**SUBJECT: AMENDMENT TO LETTER OF TASK AGREEMENT 06-01 BETWEEN  
MILLER, OWEN, & TROST AND THE SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL  
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (SPRTA)**

Dear Ms. Miller:

This letter, when countersigned, authorizes work under the SPRTA/Miller, Owen, & Trost Master Agreement dated March 1, 2002.

1. Incorporated Master Agreement: This letter of Task Agreement is the statement of contract - specific requirements applicable to the work effort to be undertaken by Miller, Owen, & Trost to provide legal counsel to SPRTA.
2. Term: Consultant services are to commence July 1, 2006 and shall be completed in such a sequence as to assure that services are completed in a timely manner. This contract shall end on June 30, 2007. Extensions to this contract may be made with the agreement of both parties. During the term of this contract, you are not to engage in other work that would be deemed a conflict of interest with SPRTA interests.
3. Scope of Services: Consultant will perform the tasks described below. The Executive Director will act as Project Manager.
  - a. Provide legal review and advice to the Agency on documents, agreements, memoranda of understanding, and funding agreements between agencies and analysis of legislation as it may affect Agency programs.
  - b. Provide legal review and advice to the Agency on documents, agreements, and responsibilities relating to administration and personnel issues for a public agency;
  - c. Attend Board meetings as may be required on an "as needed" basis as requested by the Executive Director;
  - d. Other legal services as may be needed and requested by the Executive Director or the Board of Directors.

**Miller, Owen, & Trost**  
**LETTER OF TASK AGREEMENT 06-01**  
**October 25, 2006**  
**Page two**

4. Personnel: Nancy Miller will provide primary legal counsel; Consultant will provide additional personnel to perform above noted services as needed.
  
5. Compensation: For services rendered by Nancy Miller, Consultant will be compensated at a rate of ~~\$210~~ **\$225** per hour. Documented mileage for this assignment will be reimbursed at a rate of \$ .445 per mile. Other actual and necessary telephone costs will also be reimbursed. Telephone bills, invoices, etc. must be provided for any reimbursements. Consultant will invoice on a monthly basis for work completed. Such invoices shall includes tasks completed, hours associated with each task, and hourly rate. Invoices will be paid within 30 days of receipt.

If this Letter of Task Agreement meets with your approval, please sign and return one copy. Questions concerning this agreement and the project in general should be directed to Celia McAdam, Executive Director, at (530) 823-4030.

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Celia McAdam  
Executive Director

Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy Miller  
Miller, Owen, & Trost

Date

CM/cp



---

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

**TO: Board of Directors** **DATE: October 10, 2006**

**FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director**

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

### **Action Requested**

1. Conduct a public hearing to consider the comprehensive fee program adjustment to the South Placer Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee.
2. Approve Resolution #06-03, adopting the adjustments for the South Placer Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee to reflect the use of the South Placer traffic model and cost increases to I-80/Douglas Boulevard Interchange and Lincoln Bypass.

### **Background**

In April 2002, the SPRTA Board adopted the Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee, which assessed new development for its impacts on specified regional transportation facilities. The adopted Fee Program, which went into effect on July 1, 2002, recognized the need to incorporate future versions of the traffic model on which the fee program nexus is based. Moreover, under section 10.A of the Joint Powers Agreement, directs that the fee program incorporate adjustments for actual project costs.

### **Discussion**

The original fee program was developed in 2002 using the SACMET model. A new South Placer model has now been developed and approved for use by member jurisdictions. This has been incorporated into the fee program adjustment to provide a more current basis for the fee program nexus. To provide greater precision, the model now divides the City of Roseville into two zones, "east" and "west"

This amendment to the fee program also includes adjustments to the actual costs for two of the included projects as follows:

- Increase of \$13.7 million to reflect actual cost to construct the I-80/Douglas Blvd interchange
- Increase of \$10 million to reflect a portion of the cost increases for the Lincoln Bypass

The overall average change is an increase of \$108 per development unit equivalent (DUE), with a range of a decrease of \$448 per DUE in Placer Central, to an increase of \$873 per DUE in the Sunset area.

**SPRTA Board of Directors**  
**COMPREHENSIVE FEE PROGRAM UPDATE**  
**October, 2006**  
**Page 2**

Staff has worked closely with member jurisdictions through the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which recommends approval. All legal requirements, including public notices, have been met.

***Adoption of Fee Program Adjustment***

In accordance with the Joint Powers Agreement, any changes to the Mitigation Fee must be adopted by unanimous vote of the four SPRTA members, and is specified in Resolution #06-03. Once adopted, the fees will go into effect January 1, 2007.

**2006 SPRTA Impact Fee Update  
Detailed DUE Rates**

ITE Code	Land Use Category	P.M. Peak Hour Trip Rate Per Unit <sup>1</sup>		Trip Length	% New Trips <sup>2</sup>	VMT per Unit	DUE per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>							
110	Light Industrial	0.98	0.98/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	4.60	0.911
120	Heavy Industrial	0.19	0.19/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	0.89	0.177
130	Industrial Park	0.86	0.86/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	4.04	0.799
140	Manufacturing	0.74	0.74/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	3.47	0.688
150	Warehousing	0.61	0.61/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	2.86	0.567
151	Mini-Warehousing	0.26	0.26/1,000 s.f.	3.1	92	0.74	0.147
<b>Residential</b>							
210	Single Family	1.01	1.01/DU	5	100	5.05	1.000
220	Apartment	0.62	0.62/DU	5	100	3.10	0.614
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	0.78	0.78/DU	5	100	3.90	0.772
240	Mobile Home Park	0.59	0.59/DU	5	100	2.95	0.584
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	0.26	0.26/DU	5	100	1.30	0.257
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	0.11	0.11/DU	5	100	0.55	0.109
253	Congregate Care	0.17	0.17/DU	2.8	74	0.35	0.070
260	Recreational Home	0.26	0.26/DU	2.8	75	0.55	0.108
<b>Lodging</b>							
310	Hotel	0.59	0.59/Room	6.4	71	2.68	0.531
311	All Suites Hotel	0.40	0.40/Room	6.4	71	1.82	0.360
312	Business Hotel	0.62	0.62/Room	6.4	71	2.82	0.558
320	Motel	0.47	0.47/Room	6.4	59	1.77	0.351
<b>Recreational</b>							
411	City Park	0.16	0.16/Acre	6.4	90	0.92	0.182
430	Golf Course	2.74	2.74/Hole	7.1	90	17.51	3.467
444	Movie Theater	3.80	3.80/1000 sf	2.3	85	7.43	1.471
492	Health/Fitness Club	4.05	4.05/1000 s.f.	3	75	9.11	1.804
493	Athletic Club	5.26	5.26/1000 s.f.	3	75	11.84	2.344
495	Recreational Community Center	1.64	1.64/1,000 s.f.	3	75	3.69	0.731
<b>Institutional</b>							
520	Elementary School	1.20	1.20/1000 s.f.	4.3	80	4.13	0.817
536	Private School (K - 12)	1.70	1.70/1000 s.f.	4.3	80	5.85	1.158
530	High School	0.97	0.97/1000 s.f.	4.3	90	3.75	0.743
560	Church	0.66	0.66/1,000 s.f.	3.9	90	2.32	0.459
565	Day Care Center	13.18	13.18/1,000 s.f.	2	74	19.51	3.863
590	Library	7.09	7.09/1,000 s.f.	3.9	90	24.89	4.928
<b>Medical</b>							
610	Hospital	1.18	1.18/1,000 s.f.	6.4	77	5.82	1.151
620	Nursing Home	0.42	0.42/1,000 s.f.	2.8	75	0.88	0.175
630	Clinic	5.18	5.18/1,000 s.f.	4.8	92	22.87	4.530
<b>Office</b>							
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	4.27	4.27/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	20.03	3.967
	50,001 - 150,000 s.f.	1.91	1.91/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	8.96	1.775
	150,001 - 300,000 s.f.	1.47	1.47/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	6.90	1.366
	300,001 - 500,000 s.f.	1.32	1.32/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	6.19	1.226
	500,000 - 800,000 s.f.	1.24	1.24/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	5.82	1.152
	> 800,000 s.f.	1.22	1.22/1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	5.72	1.134
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	3.72	3.72/1000 s.f.	5.1	77	14.61	2.893
<b>Retail</b>							
812	Building Materials & Lumber Yard	4.49	4.49/1,000 s.f.	1.7	36	2.75	0.544
814	Specialty Center	2.71	2.71/1,000 s.f.	3.6	78	7.61	1.507
815	Discount Store	5.06	5.06/1,000 s.f.	1.8	57	5.19	1.028
816	Hardware Store	4.84	4.84/1,000 s.f.	1.7	36	2.96	0.587
817	Nursery	3.80	3.80/1,000 s.f.	1.7	36	2.33	0.461
820	Shopping Center						
	< 200,000 s.f.	6.26	6.26/1,000 s.f.	1.8	59	6.65	1.316
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	4.09	4.09/1,000 s.f.	2.3	76	7.15	1.416
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	3.16	3.16/1,000 s.f.	3	78	7.39	1.464
	>1,000,000 s.f.	2.49	2.49/1,000 s.f.	3.6	78	6.99	1.385
931	Quality Restaurant	7.49	7.49/1,000 s.f.	2.5	79	14.79	2.929
932	High Turnover Restaurant	10.92	10.92/1,000 s.f.	1.9	76	15.77	3.122
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	26.15	26.15/1,000 s.f.	1.7	49	21.78	4.313
934	Fast Food Drive-In	34.64	34.64/1,000 s.f.	1.7	49	28.86	5.714
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	5.19	5.19/Srv. Pos.	2.2	83	9.48	1.877
942	Automobile Care Center	3.38	3.38/1000 s.f.	2.2	83	6.17	1.222
841	New Car Sales	2.64	2.64/1,000 s.f.	2.4	76	4.82	0.954
843	Automobile Parts Sales	5.98	5.98/1000 s.f.	3.6	78	16.79	3.325

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Placer County  
 District: Dry Creek  
 Cost per DUE: \$175.00

Cost per DUE = \$175.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$159.43
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$30.98
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$139.83
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$120.40
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$99.23
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$25.73
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$175.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$107.45
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$135.10
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$102.20
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$44.98
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$19.08
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$12.25
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$18.90
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$92.93
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$63.00
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$97.65
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$61.43
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$31.85
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$606.73
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$257.43
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$315.70
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$410.20
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$127.93
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$142.98
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$202.65
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$130.03
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$80.33
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$676.03
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$862.40
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$201.43
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$30.63
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$792.75
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$694.23
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$310.63
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$239.05
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$214.55
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$201.60
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$198.45
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$506.28
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$95.20
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$263.73
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$179.90
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$102.73
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$80.68
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$230.30
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$247.80
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$256.20
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$242.38
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$512.58
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$546.35
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$754.78
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$999.95
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$328.48
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$213.85

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Placer County  
 District: Granite Bay  
 Cost per DUE: \$295.00

Cost per DUE = \$295.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$268.75
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$52.22
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$235.71
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$202.96
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$167.27
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$43.37
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$295.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$181.13
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$227.74
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$172.28
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$75.82
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$32.16
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$20.65
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$31.86
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$156.65
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$106.20
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$164.61
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$103.55
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$53.69
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$1,022.77
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$433.95
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$532.18
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$691.48
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$215.65
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$241.02
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$341.61
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$219.19
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$135.41
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$1,139.59
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$1,453.76
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$339.55
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$51.63
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$1,336.35
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$1,170.27
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$523.63
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$402.97
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$361.67
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$339.84
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$334.53
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$853.44
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$160.48
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$444.57
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$303.26
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$173.17
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$136.00
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$388.22
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$417.72
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$431.88
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$408.58
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$864.06
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$920.99
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$1,272.34
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$1,685.63
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$553.72
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$360.49

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Lincoln  
 District: Lincoln  
 Cost per DUE: \$1,640.00

Cost per DUE = \$1,640.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$1,494.04
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$290.28
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$1,310.36
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$1,128.32
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$929.88
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$241.08
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$1,640.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$1,006.96
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$1,266.08
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$957.76
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$421.48
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$178.76
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$114.80
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$177.12
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$870.84
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$590.40
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$915.12
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$575.64
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$298.48
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$5,685.88
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$2,412.44
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$2,958.56
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$3,844.16
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$1,198.84
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$1,339.88
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$1,899.12
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$1,218.52
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$752.76
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$6,335.32
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$8,081.92
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$1,887.64
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$287.00
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$7,429.20
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$6,505.88
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$2,911.00
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$2,240.24
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$2,010.64
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$1,889.28
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$1,859.76
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$4,744.52
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$892.16
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$2,471.48
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$1,685.92
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$962.68
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$756.04
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$2,158.24
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$2,322.24
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$2,400.96
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$2,271.40
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$4,803.56
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$5,120.08
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$7,073.32
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$9,370.96
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$3,078.28
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$2,004.08

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Placer County  
 District: Newcastle/Horseshoe Bar  
 Cost per DUE: \$1,057.00

Cost per DUE = \$1,057.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$962.93
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$187.09
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$844.54
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$727.22
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$599.32
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$155.38
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$1,057.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$649.00
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$816.00
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$617.29
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$271.65
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$115.21
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$73.99
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$114.16
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$561.27
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$380.52
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$589.81
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$371.01
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$192.37
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$3,664.62
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$1,554.85
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$1,906.83
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$2,477.61
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$772.67
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$863.57
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$1,224.01
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$785.35
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$485.16
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$4,083.19
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$5,208.90
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$1,216.61
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$184.98
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$4,788.21
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$4,193.12
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$1,876.18
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$1,443.86
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$1,295.88
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$1,217.66
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$1,198.64
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$3,057.90
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$575.01
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$1,592.90
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$1,086.60
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$620.46
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$487.28
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$1,391.01
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$1,496.71
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$1,547.45
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$1,463.95
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$3,095.95
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$3,299.95
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$4,558.84
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$6,039.70
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$1,983.99
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$1,291.65

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Placer County  
 District: Placer Central  
 Cost per DUE: \$1,636.00

Cost per DUE = \$1,636.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$1,490.40
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$289.57
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$1,307.16
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$1,125.57
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$927.61
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$240.49
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$1,636.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$1,004.50
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$1,262.99
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$955.42
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$420.45
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$178.32
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$114.52
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$176.69
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$868.72
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$588.96
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$912.89
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$574.24
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$297.75
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$5,672.01
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$2,406.56
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$2,951.34
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$3,834.78
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$1,195.92
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$1,336.61
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$1,894.49
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$1,215.55
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$750.92
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$6,319.87
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$8,062.21
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$1,883.04
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$286.30
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$7,411.08
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$6,490.01
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$2,903.90
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$2,234.78
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$2,005.74
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$1,884.67
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$1,855.22
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$4,732.95
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$889.98
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$2,465.45
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$1,681.81
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$960.33
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$754.20
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$2,152.98
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$2,316.58
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$2,395.10
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$2,265.86
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$4,791.84
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$5,107.59
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$7,056.07
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$9,348.10
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$3,070.77
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$1,999.19

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Placer County  
 District: Placer West  
 Cost per DUE: \$1,762.00

Cost per DUE = \$1,762.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$1,605.18
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$311.87
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$1,407.84
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$1,212.26
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$999.05
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$259.01
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$1,762.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$1,081.87
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$1,360.26
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$1,029.01
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$452.83
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$192.06
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$123.34
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$190.30
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$935.62
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$634.32
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$983.20
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$618.46
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$320.68
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$6,108.85
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$2,591.90
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$3,178.65
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$4,130.13
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$1,288.02
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$1,439.55
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$2,040.40
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$1,309.17
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$808.76
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$6,806.61
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$8,683.14
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$2,028.06
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$308.35
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$7,981.86
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$6,989.85
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$3,127.55
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$2,406.89
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$2,160.21
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$2,029.82
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$1,998.11
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$5,097.47
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$958.53
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$2,655.33
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$1,811.34
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$1,034.29
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$812.28
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$2,318.79
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$2,494.99
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$2,579.57
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$2,440.37
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$5,160.90
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$5,500.96
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$7,599.51
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$10,068.07
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$3,307.27
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$2,153.16

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Rocklin  
 District: Rocklin  
 Cost per DUE: \$1,317.00

Cost per DUE = \$1,317.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$1,199.79
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$233.11
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$1,052.28
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$906.10
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$746.74
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$193.60
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$1,317.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$808.64
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$1,016.72
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$769.13
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$338.47
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$143.55
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$92.19
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$142.24
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$699.33
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$474.12
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$734.89
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$462.27
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$239.69
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$4,566.04
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$1,937.31
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$2,375.87
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$3,087.05
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$962.73
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$1,075.99
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$1,525.09
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$978.53
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$604.50
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$5,087.57
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$6,490.18
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$1,515.87
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$230.48
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$5,966.01
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$5,224.54
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$2,337.68
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$1,799.02
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$1,614.64
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$1,517.18
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$1,493.48
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$3,810.08
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$716.45
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$1,984.72
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$1,353.88
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$773.08
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$607.14
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$1,733.17
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$1,864.87
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$1,928.09
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$1,824.05
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$3,857.49
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$4,111.67
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$5,680.22
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$7,525.34
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$2,472.01
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$1,609.37

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Roseville  
 District: Roseville East  
 Cost per DUE: \$288.00

Cost per DUE = \$288.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$262.37
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$50.98
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$230.11
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$198.14
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$163.30
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$42.34
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$288.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$176.83
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$222.34
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$168.19
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$74.02
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$31.39
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$20.16
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$31.10
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$152.93
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$103.68
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$160.70
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$101.09
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$52.42
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$998.50
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$423.65
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$519.55
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$675.07
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$210.53
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$235.30
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$333.50
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$213.98
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$132.19
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$1,112.54
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$1,419.26
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$331.49
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$50.40
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$1,304.64
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$1,142.50
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$511.20
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$393.41
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$353.09
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$331.78
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$326.59
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$833.18
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$156.67
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$434.02
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$296.06
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$169.06
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$132.77
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$379.01
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$407.81
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$421.63
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$398.88
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$843.55
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$899.14
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$1,242.14
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$1,645.63
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$540.58
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$351.94

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Roseville  
 District: Roseville West  
 Cost per DUE: \$544.00

Cost per DUE = \$544.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$495.58
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$96.29
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$434.66
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$374.27
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$308.45
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$79.97
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$544.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$334.02
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$419.97
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$317.70
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$139.81
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$59.30
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$38.08
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$58.75
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$288.86
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$195.84
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$303.55
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$190.94
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$99.01
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$1,886.05
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$800.22
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$981.38
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$1,275.14
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$397.66
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$444.45
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$629.95
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$404.19
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$249.70
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$2,101.47
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$2,680.83
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$626.14
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$95.20
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$2,464.32
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$2,158.05
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$965.60
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$743.10
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$666.94
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$626.69
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$616.90
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$1,573.79
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$295.94
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$819.81
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$559.23
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$319.33
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$250.78
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$715.90
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$770.30
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$796.42
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$753.44
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$1,593.38
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$1,698.37
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$2,346.27
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$3,108.42
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$1,021.09
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$664.77

**SPRTA Impact Fees**

Jurisdiction: Placer County  
 District: Sunset  
 Cost per DUE: \$2,095.00

Cost per DUE = \$2,095.00

ITE Code	Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Fee per Unit
<b>Industrial</b>				
110	Light Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$1,908.55
120	Heavy Industrial	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$370.82
130	Industrial Park	1,000 s.f.	0.799	\$1,673.91
140	Manufacturing	1,000 s.f.	0.688	\$1,441.36
150	Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.567	\$1,187.87
151	Mini-Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.147	\$307.97
<b>Residential</b>				
210	Single Family	DU	1.000	\$2,095.00
220	Apartment	DU	0.614	\$1,286.33
231	Attached Condominium/Townhome	DU	0.772	\$1,617.34
240	Mobile Home Park	DU	0.584	\$1,223.48
251	Senior Adult Housing - Detached	DU	0.257	\$538.42
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	DU	0.109	\$228.36
253	Congregate Care	DU	0.070	\$146.65
260	Recreational Home	DU	0.108	\$226.26
<b>Lodging</b>				
310	Hotel	Room	0.531	\$1,112.45
311	All Suites Hotel	Room	0.360	\$754.20
312	Business Hotel	Room	0.558	\$1,169.01
320	Motel	Room	0.351	\$735.35
<b>Recreational</b>				
411	City Park	Acre	0.182	\$381.29
430	Golf Course	Hole	3.467	\$7,263.37
444	Movie Theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$3,081.75
492	Health/Fitness Club	1,000 s.f.	1.804	\$3,779.38
493	Athletic Club	1,000 s.f.	2.344	\$4,910.68
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 s.f.	0.731	\$1,531.45
<b>Institutional</b>				
520	Elementary School	1,000 s.f.	0.817	\$1,711.62
536	Private School (K - 12)	1,000 s.f.	1.158	\$2,426.01
530	High School	1,000 s.f.	0.743	\$1,556.59
560	Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$961.61
565	Day Care Center	1,000 s.f.	3.863	\$8,092.99
590	Library	1,000 s.f.	4.928	\$10,324.16
<b>Medical</b>				
610	Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$2,411.35
620	Nursing Home	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$366.63
630	Clinic	1,000 s.f.	4.530	\$9,490.35
<b>Office</b>				
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	3.967	\$8,310.87
	50,001-150,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.775	\$3,718.63
	150,001-300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.366	\$2,861.77
	300,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.226	\$2,568.47
	500,001-800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.152	\$2,413.44
	> 800,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.134	\$2,375.73
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	1,000 s.f.	2.893	\$6,060.84
<b>Retail</b>				
812	Lumber Yard	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$1,139.68
814	Specialty Center	1,000 s.f.	1.507	\$3,157.17
815	Discount Store	1,000 s.f.	1.028	\$2,153.66
816	Hardware Store	1,000 s.f.	0.587	\$1,229.77
817	Nursery	1,000 s.f.	0.461	\$965.80
820	Shopping Center			
	< 200,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.316	\$2,757.02
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.416	\$2,966.52
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.464	\$3,067.08
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.385	\$2,901.58
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	2.929	\$6,136.26
932	High Turnover Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	3.122	\$6,540.59
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	4.313	\$9,035.74
934	Fast Food Drive-In	1,000 s.f.	5.714	\$11,970.83
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	Service Pos.	1.877	\$3,932.32
942	Automobile Care Center	1,000 s.f.	1.222	\$2,560.09

**RESOLUTION NO. 06-03**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE  
SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
AMENDING THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY MITIGATION  
FEE FOR ALL NEW DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN THE AREA OF JURISDICTION  
OF THE AUTHORITY**

A. **WHEREAS**, the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority ("Authority") was formed to provide for the coordinated planning, design, financing, acquisition, determination of the timing of construction, and construction, of certain transportation improvements located in the area of jurisdiction of the Authority; and

B. **WHEREAS**, the adoption of the Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee included the requirement that, on an annual basis, the Board review the estimated cost of the Facilities, the continued need for the Facilities and the reasonable relationship between such need and the impacts of the various types of development pending or anticipated and for which the Fee is charged, and may change the Fee based upon that review.

C. **WHEREAS**, the Board of Directors of the Authority finds as follows:

(i) The purpose of the Fee is to finance the public facilities (the "Facilities") described and identified in the to reduce the impacts of increased traffic caused by New Development within the area of jurisdiction of the Authority;

(ii) The Fee shall be used to finance the Facilities (including, without limitation, planning, design, administration, environmental compliance, and construction costs of the Facilities);

(iii) The estimated cost of the Facilities, the need for the Facilities and the reasonable relationship between such need and the impacts of the various types of development pending or anticipated and for which the Fee is charged continues to exist.

D. **WHEREAS**, the revised Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee schedule, as adjusted for the most current South Placer traffic model and for updated costs for the I-80/Douglas Boulevard Interchange and Lincoln Bypass, was available for public inspection and review more than ten (10) days prior to this public hearing;

**NOW, THEREFORE**, pursuant to the authority of Section 5.M of the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement for the Planning, Design, Financing, Acquisition and Construction of Regional Transportation Improvements, dated January 23, 2002, ("JPA Agreement"), it is hereby resolved by the Board that:

1. Fee Adjustment. The Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee schedule, as shown in Attachment B, is hereby adjusted to reflect the use of the South Placer traffic model and for updated costs to construct the I-80/Douglas Boulevard Interchange and Lincoln Bypass.
2. Adoption. Pursuant to Section 8 of the JPA Agreement, this Resolution is adopted unanimously.
3. Judicial Review. Any judicial action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul this Resolution shall be brought within one hundred twenty (120) days after the effective date set forth below.
4. Effective Date. This Resolution and the Fee hereby approved shall be effective January 1, 2007.

Passed and Adopted by the Board of the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority, this 25th day of October, 2006, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES Board Members:

NOES Board Members:

ABSENT Board Members:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Primo Santini, Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Celia McAdam, Executive Director



---

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

**TO: Board of Directors**

**DATE: October 10, 2006**

**FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director**

**SUBJECT: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY  
MITIGATION FEE ALLOCATION REQUEST FOR LINCOLN  
BYPASS**

**Action Requested**

Board adoption of Resolution #06-04, allocating \$2,500,000 of Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fees to the Lincoln Bypass for embankment materials and construction.

**Background**

The Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Program ("Fee Program") was adopted by the SPRTA Board on April 10, 2002, and went into effect on July 1, 2002.

**Discussion**

The adopted Implementation Plan includes \$10 million for the Lincoln Bypass. To date, \$4,886,000 has been allocated for this project.

Although the initial plans anticipated the cash flow needs for the Lincoln Bypass to occur in FY 2007/08 and 2008/09, the situation has changed significantly since the Fee Program was adopted. First and foremost, the state's cash flow situation has pushed back timelines for the availability of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds. Delays in obtaining final approvals from Federal regulatory agencies for the Lincoln Bypass environmental document have also affected access to Federal funding.

Meanwhile, there is an opportunity for long-term cost savings through early work on embankments as part of other local development efforts. Due to the constraints on other funding sources, use of SPRTA funds is therefore requested.

In August 2004, the Board approved \$500,000 toward this earthwork project, with another \$786,111 was requested in April 2005. It is estimated that this effort has saved several million dollars.

The Technical Advisory Committee has reviewed this request and recommends approval.

**RESOLUTION NO. 06-04**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE  
SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
ALLOCATING REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY  
MITIGATION FEE PROGRAM FEES TO THE LINCOLN BYPASS**

**WHEREAS**, the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority ("Authority") was formed to provide for the coordinated planning, design, financing, acquisition, determination of the timing of construction, and construction, of certain transportation improvements located in the area of jurisdiction of the Authority; and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority adopted the Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee to finance specified transportation facilities, as specified in Authority Resolution #02-06 dated April 10, 2002; and

**WHEREAS**, the Capital Improvement Program has specified a total contribution to the Lincoln Bypass project on State Route 65 at \$10,000,000 (ten million dollars); and

**WHEREAS**, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is the lead agency for this state highway project; and

**WHEREAS**, in the interests of moving the Lincoln Bypass project forward as expeditiously and cost effectively as possible, certain activities funded in the short term can provide significant cost savings and reduce the schedule of the project.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Authority allocates \$2,500,000 to the City of Lincoln for expenditure for the benefit of the Lincoln Bypass project for embankment materials and placement.

Passed and Adopted by the Board of the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority, this 25th day of October, 2006 by the following vote on roll call:

AYES Board Members:

NOES Board Members:

ABSENT Board Members:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Primo Santini, Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cynthia Page, Secretary



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

**TO: Board of Directors** **DATE: October 10, 2006**

**FROM: David Melko, Senior Transportation Planner**

**SUBJECT: BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) IMPLEMENTATION STUDY FOR SOUTH PLACER COUNTY**

### **Action Requested**

1. Accept the report, "Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Implementation Study for South Placer County," as complete.
2. Direct staff to transmit the Study to SPRTA member jurisdictions.

### **Background**

In April 2005, Placer County contracted with Fehr & Peers to complete the first phase of a bus rapid transit study covering the southwest portion of Placer County. The Conceptual Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Plan for south Placer County provided guidance for the County and developers about land use and station requirements for a future BRT system.

In June 2005, PCTPA contracted with Fehr & Peers to complete the second phase of a bus rapid transit study that would identify transit stations and route alignment. Station information would include station options, characteristics, and location assessment (general conclusions and design considerations). Transit route alignment information would include potential corridors assessment. It was recognized that completing this work in a timely fashion would be very important in light of pending specific plan developments in the southwest portion of the County. A later study phase would outline technology options, cost estimates, and funding sources.

### **Discussion**

The SPRTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed a draft of the report at its July 11 and September 12 meetings. The TAC requested that we clarify to the Board that the recommended corridors are still conceptual. As land use development and roadway plans move forward within south Placer County it is entirely possible that there may be further refinements to the recommended corridors. The TAC's comments have been incorporated into the study report.

The consultant for the study, Fehr & Peers, will provide the Board a brief overview of the study, including a review of: south Placer County's potential market for BRT service; nine potential transit corridors; three BRT routes and associated improvements to occur within recommended corridors; recommended station and transit center locations; and suggested next steps to facilitate the implementation of BRT service in south Placer County.

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**June 13, 2006**

---

ATTENDANCE: Carl Walker, City of Lincoln  
Rob Jensen, City of Roseville

David Melko, PCTPA  
Cynthia Page, PCTPA  
Stan Tidman, PCTPA

**Cash Flow Plan Update**

A spreadsheet listing SPRTA Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Program project costs and timelines was distributed to TAC members for review.

**Lincoln Bypass Allocation Request**

John Pedri, Lincoln Public Works Director, sent a letter requesting that SPRTA funds allocated but not expended in 2005-06 to the Lincoln Bypass project be rolled over to 2006-07. Carl Walker stated that this is not new allocation request and will, therefore, not require Board action.

**Tier 2 Impact Fee Strategy**

A spreadsheet was emailed to TAC members listing projects included in the Expenditure Plan detailing project costs by funding source (local funds, TUMF mitigation fees, Tier 2 fees, sales tax). Rob Jensen discussed the Tier 2 fee strategy with Rick Dondro from Placer County and the development community, and they are open to getting both the Tier 2 and the \$500 DUE fee in place as soon as possible. He emphasized the importance of capturing the various new development agreements currently in process. He suggested this be done under SPRTA instead of a Countywide fee – he doesn't feel that Auburn, Colfax or Loomis need to be included.

Rob suggested that each SPRTA member look at prioritization of their projects, and which projects might better be funded with sales tax dollars and dropped from the SPRTA list or be paid for equally between SPRTA and sales tax dollars. He would like to see the majority of the I-80 improvement project be paid with sales tax monies. He also suggested that staff come up with several funding options/scenarios to present to the Board. He would like to see at least three different scenarios to review at the next TAC meeting. Carl Walker suggested some sort of escalation clause, whereby fees would increase each year a sales tax is not in place. Stan Tidman stated that Larry Wing had phoned in earlier to let the TAC know that Rocklin is not interested in participating in Tier 2 fees.

**Draft SPRTA Traffic Impact Fee Update**

Sarah Brandenburg from Fehr & Peers distributed the 2006 Draft SPRTA Traffic Impact Fee Update study to TAC members. She noted that all Tier 2 projects were removed from this fee update, except Phase I of Placer Vineyards. There was a decrease in

DUEs due to growth during the past three years. This update has a horizon year of 2022. Sarah went through some of the tables in the document with TAC members, stating that the same methodology was used on this update as used in original fee calculations. She asked that TAC members review the document. Rob Jensen stated that he would get Sarah the information she needed for the City of Roseville, including I-80/Douglas Blvd costs. She will perform another model run prior to the next TAC meeting. Ms. Brandenburg also requested that Roseville and Placer County provide her with fees collected by fee district.

**Other**

David Melko stated that a presentation on the Bus Rapid Transit Study may be included in the July agenda.

Meeting adjourned.

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**July 11, 2006**

---

ATTENDANCE:           Darren Neishi, Loomis  
                              Larry Wing, Rocklin  
                              Stephanie Holloway, Placer County  
                              Ron Herndon, Roseville  
                              Mike Wixon, Roseville  
                              Matt Freidman, Caltrans  
                              Bob Grandy, Fehr & Peers

Celia McAdam, PCTPA  
Cynthia Page, PCTPA  
Stan Tidman, PCTPA

**Lincoln Bypass Allocation Request**

Celia McAdam reported that staff received notification that the City of Lincoln would be requesting a SPRTA allocation; however, staff has not yet received a formal allocation request. Seeing as no representative from Lincoln was in attendance, this item will be postponed until the next TAC meeting.

**Tier 2 Impact Fee Strategy**

Rob Jensen from the City of Roseville sent staff a chart which was forwarded to all TAC members regarding the splitting up of projects and fees into funding sources in order to keep the Tier 2 impact fee at \$3,000 or less. Stephanie Holloway explained that Rick Dondro had asked her to request more time for Placer County to review this material. This item was postponed until cost estimates are revised – hopefully, by the end of this week.

**Draft Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Implementation Study for South Placer County**

David Melko stated that the SPRTA TAC approved the scope of work for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Implementation Study in September. The purpose of the study was to provide guidelines to cities and the County for a future BRT system with a general, conceptual alignment. This study follows up on another study done by Placer County. The study is now ready for review, and Mr. Melko suggested a due date by the first part of August for comments so the report can be presented to the Board at their August meeting.

Bob Grandy stated that this study incorporated data from both the West Placer Long Range Transit Study and PCTPA's Long Range Transit Plan. He discussed some of the specific data for TAC members to review. The study includes travel demand forecasts using the supercumulative land use model. Placer Ranch has been determined the number one new growth area and is an outstanding candidate for BRT stations. The study includes nine corridors and proposes three BRT routes. Mr. Grandy described these three routes and showed a detailed map.

There was discussion about policy decisions for increased transit. Mr. Grandy stated that a BRT system could also be started on a much smaller scale and then built up to an ultimate BRT system. Celia McAdam requested that the final version include an Executive Summary with the salient points. Mike Wixon would like to take this draft version of the study to the Roseville Transportation Commission for their review and comment. Bob Grandy will incorporate all comments and prepare the final version for SPRTA staff in order for it to be included in the August agenda packet.

Meeting adjourned.

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**August 8, 2006**

---

ATTENDANCE:            John Pedri, Lincoln  
                              Brian Frাগiao, Loomis  
                              Andrew Gabor, Placer County  
                              Larry Wing, Rocklin  
                              Rob Jensen, Roseville  
                              Sarah Brandenburg, Fehr & Peers

Celia McAdam, PCTPA  
Cynthia Page, PCTPA  
Stan Tidman, PCTPA

**Updated Traffic Impact Fee Schedule – South Placer Model**

Sarah Brandenburg from Fehr & Peers distributed copies of the updated traffic impact fee schedule for TAC members review. She reviewed the updated project costs – Sierra College Blvd costs were updated to reflect actual costs. The 2006 cost estimate of \$39 million includes all construction costs through 2020. Fee credits for improvements already constructed have been applied. Sarah Brandenburg will schedule individual meetings with each jurisdiction to go over project cost estimates before bringing the final update to the September TAC meeting.

\$10 million of SPRTA fees were originally allocated for the Lincoln Bypass project. John Pedri would like to add an additional \$10 million for this project. Rob Jensen agreed. Rob also stated that I-80/Douglas Blvd Interchange project costs would be updated to reflect actual project costs. Larry Wing stated that Rocklin doesn't want to contribute more dollars to the Lincoln Bypass. Andrew Gabor relayed Rick Dondro's request to add additional projects, such as Auburn-Folsom Road. Rob Jensen, Larry Wing, and John Pedri felt we should get through this update prior to adding any new projects.

A separate meeting has been scheduled for 3:00 pm on August 23<sup>rd</sup> at Roseville to discuss the Tier 2 Fee strategy.

Meeting adjourned.

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**September 12, 2006**

---

ATTENDANCE:            Brian Fragiao, Loomis  
                              Ann Baker, Placer County Planning Dept  
                              Larry Wing, Rocklin  
                              Rob Jensen, Roseville  
                              Sarah Brandenburg, Fehr & Peers  
                              Bob Grandy, Fehr & Peers

                              Celia McAdam, PCTPA  
                              Cynthia Page, PCTPA  
                              Stan Tidman, PCTPA

**Updated Traffic Impact Fee Schedule – South Placer Model**

Sarah Brandenburg from Fehr & Peers distributed copies of Draft 3 of the 2006 SPRTA Traffic Impact Fee Update for TAC members review. Sierra College Blvd credits have been included along with project cost increase figures. The cost estimate for the Lincoln Bypass was increased from \$10M to \$20M. The funding contribution for the Douglas Blvd/I-80 Interchange project was updated to reflect actual construction costs for a total contribution of \$29.04M. Sarah Brandenburg requested TAC members review both the memo and the document, and contact her by September 29<sup>th</sup> with any further comments. She would like to get TAC member agreement on the document by the next TAC meeting.

**Tier 2 Impact Fee Strategy with Updated Costs**

Rick Dondro requested that the Tier 2 fee update be discussed at a separate meeting with involved parties. A meeting was scheduled for 10:00 am on September 22<sup>nd</sup> at Rocklin City Hall.

**Lincoln Bypass Allocation**

Staff has not received a formal request for a SPRTA allocation for the Lincoln Bypass, so this item was postponed until the October TAC meeting.

**Board Presentation on the Bus Rapid Transit Study**

Bob Grandy summarized the presentation he will give to the Board on the Bus Rapid Transit Study. Rob Jensen stated that the roadway network included in the report is not consistent with Roseville's latest traffic model. He requested such changes be made to the report prior to the Board presentation. Celia McAdam noted that this is the only item to take to the SPRTA Board, and this item could be delayed until the October Board meeting. TAC members agreed.

**Placer Parkway Update**

Stan Tidman gave a brief project update. He said the work is still on schedule to complete the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR for public comment in Spring 2007 and the Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR in Summer 2008.

He said that Steve Propst (Caltrans – Local Assistance) made a number of inquiries, over the Spring and Summer, with Caltrans HQ staff to extend the February, 2007 STIP funding deadline for the environmental work. Steve reported in mid-August there will be no extension. Based on this, the project team re-started scoping and budgeting revisions. This work includes ways to constructively ‘spend-down’ the remaining approximate \$1.5 million. These include getting a head start on preparing the administrative record in anticipation of a law suit. Instead of waiting until the end of the process, funding could be used to develop a system and to complete the administrative record through the Technical Reports milestone. Another idea is to begin preparing responses to Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR comments. This work would be based on comments from the scoping process and public meetings. Celia McAdam indicated that remaining funds to complete the environmental work would have to come from the SPRTA fee program. There was general TAC agreement.

Mr. Tidman cited some of the Placer County coordination work underway with vicinity development proposals (Placer Ranch Specific Plan, Motocross, and parcel map). The proposed Placer Ranch Specific Plan (PRSP) could create conflicts with Placer County Board of Supervisors’ direction to process vicinity specific plan proposals and the Parkway concurrently. There are two issues: 1) the PRSP’s proposed east-west arterial roadway alignment is outside of the corridor alignment alternative in several locations and 2) the PRSP does not illustrate the 500’- to 1,000’-wide corridor. The project team is seeking FHWA, Caltrans, and legal input.

Eight of the 11 draft technical reports have been submitted to Caltrans for comments. These technical reports will become the core of the Tier 1 EIS/EIR. Each jurisdiction completed review of the draft Transportation Technical Report. Stan asked that each jurisdiction complete reviews on the remaining ones. These reviews are to be global/big-picture ones. The objective is to improve accuracy and to eliminate unnecessary comments on the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR. He also suggested ‘farming’ these reviews out to other ‘experts’ in each jurisdiction such as Loren Clark/Mark Morse (Placer County/Roseville) for the Natural Environment Study, Christine Turner (Placer County) for the Community Impact Assessment, etc. He requested that drafts with ‘no comment’ reviews be reported. Rob Jensen requested that drafts be prioritized so the jurisdictions would know the order for review. Stan will email the priority listing to the TAC.

Meeting adjourned.

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**October 10, 2006**

---

**ATTENDANCE:** John Pedri, City of Lincoln  
Rick Dondro, Placer County Public Works  
Stephanie Holloway, Placer County Public Works  
Heather Kuklo, Placer County Air Pollution Control District  
Larry Wing, City of Rocklin  
Rob Jensen, City of Roseville  
Sarah Brandenburg, Fehr & Peers

Celia McAdam, PCTPA  
David Melko, PCTPA  
Cynthia Page, PCTPA  
Stan Tidman, PCTPA

**Updated Traffic Impact Fee Schedule – Final Review**

Sarah Brandenburg from Fehr & Peers distributed the final version of the 2006 SPRTA Traffic Impact Fee Update to TAC members. This document will be presented to the SPRTA Board for adoption. Rick Dondro stated that he is meeting with Bill Santucci tomorrow to discuss the updated fee structure. There has been continuing discussion at the County about whether to include other new projects, such as Auburn-Folsom Road, in this fee update or adopt this updated version and then take a look at including other projects. He will let staff know the results of this meeting prior to the SPRTA Board on October 25<sup>th</sup>.

**Board Presentation on Bus Rapid Transit Study**

At the last TAC meeting, the consultant was directed to update the road network contained in the study. These revisions have been made, and the document will be presented to the SPRTA Board for acceptance. The recommendation will also include direction for staff to work with jurisdictions to incorporate the BRT study into their individual planning efforts. Rob Jensen felt the staff recommendation should clarify that this is a conceptual, planning level study; route alignments could change as community plans are developed and approved.

**Lincoln Bypass Allocation**

Staff will be including an allocation request from the City of Lincoln for \$2.5 million on the SPRTA agenda. This request is for further embankment work on the Lincoln Bypass. Rick Dondro would like to make sure that there will be enough monies left for additional right-of-way required for the Bypass. TAC members unanimously supported the \$2.5 million allocation.

**Other**

Celia McAdam will send TAC members the cash flow projections for their review and update prior to the next TAC meeting.

Larry Wing reported that the NOP for the EIR for the Sierra College Blvd. widening project is out.

Meeting adjourned.



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

**TO:** Board of Directors & Sutter County Board of Supervisors      **DATE:** October 10, 2006

**FROM:** Stan Tidman, Senior Planner

**SUBJECT:** **STATUS REPORT: PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION PROJECT & TIER 1 EIS/EIR**

**Action Requested**

None. For information only.

**Discussion**

**Project Management**

Project Development Team (PDT) #16 meeting was held on September 21. Meeting agenda items included the February 2007 funding deadline, early mitigation strategy, and technical reports status.

The meeting focused on Placer County coordination issues with the proposed Placer Ranch Specific Plan. The proposal is for a 2,200-acre residential, commercial/office, industrial, and CSU-Sacramento branch campus on a portion of the Sunset Industrial Plan area. One common Placer Parkway corridor alignment alternative crosses the north edge of the proposed project. The proposed specific plan needs a roadway connection from SR 65 (off site) to Fiddymment Road – in the middle of the proposed project. Placer County staff is discussing, with the specific plan applicant, ways to build a four-lane, east-west roadway from SR 65 (the future Whitney Ranch interchange) to Fiddymment Road. This potential four-lane roadway might be suitable for integration with the Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation project and the future Placer Parkway.

At this time, the specific plan shows—the east-west roadway alignment dipping south -- outside of the Placer Parkway's common corridor alignment in some areas between SR 65 and Fiddymment. In addition, the proposed east-west roadway width is not consistent with the 500'- to 1,000'-wide corridor requirement.

Over the past four years, there have been numerous meetings with the Placer Ranch team concerning the project's Tier 1-nature and corridor width requirements. Placer Ranch representatives are participating on the project's Study Advisory Committee (SAC). According to Placer County, the potential east-west roadway alignment slips out of the corridor alternative area to reduce impacts to Ultra Power and to get the alignment onto Placer Ranch-controlled property. There is no explanation for the significantly reduced width.

**SPRTA Board of Directors**  
**STATUS REPORT – PLACER PARKWAY**  
**October 10, 2006**  
**Page 2**

To keep both projects moving, Placer County requested that PCTPA consider studying the roadway alignment areas outside of the common Parkway corridor alignment alternative. As cited in previous status reports, these inconsistencies will pose concerns for federal/State resources agencies and the three-year modified NEPA/404 process. Specific concerns will be with the agreement on the reasonable range of alternatives and potentially the eventual LEDPA. PDT members also registered concerns with the work to modify the draft technical reports, project delay and additional cost. The biggest concern, for both the alignment and corridor width issues, was the potential credibility concern with the resources agencies.

For the alignment issue, the PDT agreed that the areas outside the corridor alignment alternative should be studied. This work would be addressed as a separate 'disclosure' section in each technical report. No scoping changes would be required. This work would ensure that an alignment with the least amount of resource impacts would be identified (inside the corridor alternative or immediately adjacent to it). By addressing the issue now, the potential for 're-circulating' the Tier 1 EIS/EIR could be avoided.

On the corridor width issue – specifically in the area west of Fiddymont, Placer County is to require the specific plan to include an alternative land plan. This would reflect the 1,000'-wide corridor for Parkway consistency. It could also provide for future land uses that could be developed should the corridor width be reduced during Tier 2 work. PDT members commented that this 'alternative' land plan needed to be credible one. If it were loaded with fatal flaws; it could easily be dismissed via the County's environmental review and project approval process.

The PDT was very clear that the resource agencies needed to know about these issues sooner than later. The project team will set-up a coordination meeting.

### Technical Studies

Work continued on the Technical Studies –

- ✓ Transportation. Submitted to Caltrans in July. Responding to local jurisdiction and Caltrans comments.
- ✓ Community Impact Assessment. Submitted to Caltrans in September – awaiting comments.
- ✓ Visual Impact Assessment. Submitted to Caltrans in September – awaiting comments.
- ✓ Air Quality Impact Study. On-hold waiting for resolution of comments to Transportation draft.
- ✓ Noise Impact Study. On-hold waiting for resolution of comments to Transportation draft.
- ✓ Natural Environment Study. Submitted to Caltrans in August – awaiting comments.
- ✓ Initial Site Assessment. Submitted to Caltrans in August – awaiting comments.
- ✓ Water Quality Report. Submitted to Caltrans in August – awaiting comments.

**SPRTA Board of Directors**  
**STATUS REPORT – PLACER PARKWAY**  
**October 10, 2006**  
**Page 3**

- ✓ Floodplain/Hydraulics. Submitted to Caltrans in August – awaiting comments.
- ✓ Cultural Resources. Received comments on revised draft Archaeology Survey Report and Historic Resources Evaluation Report – to be 'finalized' pending Placer Ranch Specific Plan adjustments. See PDT discussion – above.
- ✓ Growth Inducement. Finalizing model parameters with MEPLAN author.

Environmental Document Preparation

Work is underway on the following chapters – Purpose and Need, Cultural Resources, Energy, and Geology.