



Nexus Study Update Report

South Placer Regional Transportation Authority

January 2024

Revisions July 30, 2024



GHD Inc.

220 21st Street

Sacramento, CA 95835

Tel (916) 245-4226 | Donald.Hubbard@GHD.com | ghd.com

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to present the methodology for the nexus study in relation to updating the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority's Tier I fee, pursuant to the requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act. The report updates previous work in several ways:

- It incorporates new land use forecasts for south Placer County, which were prepared based on updated information from the member agencies.
- The status of individual projects was updated, including payments already made towards the cost of some projects.
- Project costs were updated, based on new estimates and construction cost inflation.
- The trip generation rates were updated to reflect the new data found in the 11th edition of Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE's) *Trip Generation Manual*
- The percentage of the need for new projects that is attributable to new development was re-calculated using the latest version of the SPRTA demand model.
- Board policies regarding SPRTA contribution to certain projects, where that share is less than the maximum allowed by State law, have been updated.
- A new method of computing fees for residential units was developed based on requirements mandated by AB-602 and SB-13, which went into effect in 2022.

These updates enable SPRTA to re-affirm the findings required by the Mitigation Fee Act, which are shown in Chapter 5.

Of particular interest is the potential new fee level, which can be found in Chapter 4. The average potential fee per vehicle-trip rose \$930 to \$2,596, driven mainly by the need to increase SPRTA's contribution to the I-80/SR 65 interchange and increases in project construction costs generally. However, the increase in fees varies significantly between fee districts. Developments in the Rocklin fee district will have the highest increase at \$2,118, because development there adds the most traffic to projects with highest cost increases (the I-80/SR 65 interchange and the Rocklin Road Interchange). In contrast, developments in the Roseville East fee district's fees would be reduced by \$561 due to the fact that it adds little traffic to the projects with the highest cost increases, and because they benefit from the fact that previous payments (fee credits) have reduced its remaining future contribution to the projects most relevant to that district.

Please note that this study produces only recommended changes to fees. The SPRTA Board may, at their discretion, choose to set fee rates for any given development type and fee district at a level lower than that calculation in this report. They may not, however, set the fees higher than those supported by a nexus calculation described herein.

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this report	1
1.2	Background on the SPRTA Program	1
1.3	Previous Nexus Study Updates	2
2.	Fee Calculation Methodology	4
2.1	Overview of Fee Calculation Methodology	4
2.2	Changes to Comply with AB-602	5
2.3	SB-13 Compliance	9
3.	Updates of Key Inputs	10
3.1	Land Use Forecasts	10
3.2	Transportation Network Assumptions	18
3.3	Project Cost Estimates	18
3.4	Level of Service Policy	21
	3.4.1 Role of LOS Policy	21
	3.4.2 SPRTA LOS Policy	22
4.	Updated Fee Calculation	24
4.1	Allocation of Project Costs to Fee Districts	24
4.2	Recommended Updated Fees	29
4.3	Funding from Other Sources	33
5.	Findings	35
5.1	Purpose of the Fee	35
5.2	Use of Fee Revenues	35
5.3	Use/Type-of-Development Relationship	35
5.4	Need/Type-of-Development Relationship	36
5.5	Proportionality Relationship	36
5.6	Residential Floor Area	36

Table index

Table 1: Computation of Average Trip Generation by Dwelling Size Category	7
Table 2: Computation of Dwelling DUEs by Size and Dwelling Type	8
Table 3: Forecast of Growth by SPRTA Fee District	11
Table 4: Dwelling Unit Equivalence (DUE) Factor for Different Land Use Categories	14
Table 5: Forecast of Growth by SPRTA Fee District in DUEs	17
Table 6: Project Cost Inflation Factor	19
Table 7: Estimated Project Costs in Millions of 2022 Dollars	20
Table 8: Computation of the Percentage of the Need for a Project that is Attributable to New Development	25
Table 9: Share of Project Costs Attributable to New Development by SPRTA Fee District or Non-SPRTA Area	26
Table 10: Computation of the SPRTA's Share Project Costs	27
Table 11: Estimated Project Costs Applicable to Future Development in SPRTA Area	28
Table 12: Computation of New Fee/DUE by District	29
Table 13: Updated Recommended Fees for Residential Land Uses	30
Table 14: Updated Recommended Fees for Non-Residential Land Uses	31
Table 15: Possible Other Sources of Funding for SPRTA Projects	34

Figure index

Figure 1: SPRTA Fee Districts	2
Figure 2: Steps in the Fee Calculation	4
Figure 3: Residential Growth Assumptions	12
Figure 4: Non-Residential Growth Assumptions	12
Figure 5: Comparison of Growth Assumptions in the 2014 and Current Nexus Studies	18
Figure 6: Effect of LOS on Determination of Percent Attributable to New Development	21

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this report

California's Mitigation Fee Act requires local agencies that impose a fee as a condition of approval of a development project to, among other things, determine that a reasonable relationship (a "nexus") exists between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed. The Act further requires that this relationship be reviewed periodically to ensure that the nexus remains valid and that the assumptions used to compute the fees are reasonable. The purpose of this report is to fulfill this requirement and to give policy makers an analytical basis for determining whether the fee schedule should be adjusted going forward.

1.2 Background on the SPRTA Program

The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) adopted a Regional Transportation Funding Strategy in August 2000 which included the development of a regional transportation impact fee program. PCTPA staff worked with the jurisdictions of South Placer County, as well as the development community, environmentalists, and community groups to develop a program and mechanism to implement this impact fee. The South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA), formed in January 2002, is the result of those efforts. SPRTA is a joint powers authority comprised of the Cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and the County of Placer. The Authority is governed by a Board of Directors representing the JPA member jurisdictions and is staffed by the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency. The Board meets monthly or as needed.


From its inception, SPRTA has been part of an overall funding strategy rather than a stand-alone program. In most cases SPRTA provides only partial funding for a project, with the remaining funds coming from other sources. This is discussed in a later section of this report.

SPRTA fees are assessed as a mixture of district-based fees and flat fees. For most SPRTA projects, project costs assigned to the individual districts vary based on each district's percent use of the project improvements. For example, developments in Lincoln have a stronger nexus to the Lincoln Bypass project than developments in Granite Bay, and so would pay a high fee as their contribution to that particular project. SPRTA's contributions to Regional Transit and SR 65 Widening, are assessed as a flat fee, meaning that similar developments would pay the same rate no matter where they are built within the SPRTA region. Figure 1 shows the ten fee districts in the SPRTA program. As will be discussed in a later section of this report, a traffic forecasting model was used to determine how much development in each district contributed to the need for each improvement on the project list.

Not all development that occurs in the SPRTA districts pays a SPRTA impact fee. State¹ and Federal development projects are exempt from local fees as a matter of law, as are accessory dwelling units with a floor area of less than 750 square feet. Public kindergarten through grade 12 schools are also exempt from the fee as a matter of SPRTA policy.

¹ The proposed branch campus of the California State University system is a special case. The developer of the area around the proposed site signed a development agreement whereby they agreed to pay the SPRTA fee on behalf of CSU.

Figure 1: SPRTA Fee Districts



1.3 Previous Nexus Study Updates

The SPRTA fee was originally established to provide funding for the following projects:

- Placer Parkway (\$50 million)
- Sierra College Boulevard Widening (\$39.6 million)
- I-80/Douglas Boulevard Interchange Improvements (\$15.31 million)
- Lincoln Bypass (\$10 million)
- Transit Capital Improvement Projects (\$7 million)

In 2006 the program was updated to increase SPRTA's contribution to the estimated cost of widening Sierra College Boulevard from \$39.6M to \$44.0M, and SPRTA's contribution to the Lincoln Bypass from \$10M to \$20M.

In 2007, the cost estimates for the original projects were again updated and the program was expanded to cover these additional projects:

- Hwy 65 Widening (\$50 million)
- I-80/Rocklin Road Interchange Improvements (\$10 million)
- Auburn-Folsom Widening (\$8 million)

Also in 2007, SPRTA's contribution to Placer Parkway was reduced from \$50M to \$10M, while the program's contribution to the Lincoln Bypass was increased from \$20M to \$30M. SPRTA fees were increased by 24% to cover the additional projects and cost inflation on the original projects.

In 2009 the program was updated a third time, taking advantage of a new traffic model with updated land use and road network forecasts. The key difference between the 2009 and 2007 program updates was the addition of the Placer Vineyards specific plan, Regional University specific plan, and new projects in the City of Lincoln's sphere of influence. The addition of these developments spread project costs over a larger number of units, which resulted in a 14% lower fee per unit despite two years of cost inflation.

The program was updated a fourth time in 2014. Another three projects were added to the project list, namely:

- I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements (\$5 million)
- Douglas Blvd WB I-80 Ramp (\$740,000)
- Atlantic Street WB I-80 Ramp (\$4.54 million)

Land development assumptions and project costs were again updated. The key difference between the 2014 update and earlier updates is that by 2014 the program had collected over \$39 million in fee revenues which offset inflationary adjustments and the additional cost of the three new projects and allowed for an overall reduction in fees by 7.8%.

The current study will be the fifth update to the program.


2. Fee Calculation Methodology

An overview of the methodology used to compute the new, recommended SPRTA fees is provided in the section below, followed by sections providing more in-depth discussion of the key components. These are followed by section describing the resulting fees and the revenues that would be generated by the SPRTA program.

2.1 Overview of Fee Calculation Methodology

The methodology used in the fee computation is outlined in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: Steps in the Fee Calculation



The major steps include:

- 1) The starting point was the set of outputs from the SPRTA travel demand model that were used to determine the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio for each project under existing and 2040 (SACOG's planning horizon year from the most recent Sustainable Communities Strategy) conditions.
- 2) The V/C ratios were then used to determine the percentage of the need for each project that is attributable to new development.
- 3) The Engineering News-Record's (ENR's) Construction Cost Index was then used to determine cost inflation factors that allow cost estimates done in different years to be converted to 2023 dollars. Per

SPRTA policy, the inflation factors are established based on the ENR historical Construction Cost Indexes (CCI) for the “20-city average” and San Francisco.

- 4) Cost estimates for each of the projects were taken from studies commissioned by the member agencies or by SPRTA.
- 5) The cost estimates from Step 4, which were done in different years, were then inflated to 2023 dollars using the CCI inflationary adjustments developed in Step 3.
- 6) The outputs from Steps 2 and 5 were used to determine the share of project costs attributable to new development.
- 7) Select Link analyses were then performed on each of the projects using the SPRTA travel demand model. This enabled the study team to identify the share of project costs from Step 6 that is attributable to each of the 10 SPRTA districts, and to traffic from growth outside the SPRTA area. Although no fees can be collected from developments outside the SPRTA area, their share of traffic growth must be accounted for so the developments in the SPRTA areas are not charged for impacts created by other projects.
- 8) Multiplying the costs attributable to new development from Step 6 by the percentages in Step 7 resulted in the share of project costs attributable for new development in each SPRTA fee district.
- 9) In some cases, member agencies provided advance funding for specific projects. In such cases, credits for the advanced funding were applied to the associated member agency fee districts which reduces the remaining obligation for those districts and thus reduces their net fees going forward. Similarly, past fees collected from each district are also applied as credit towards their total obligation.
- 10) The expected growth in the number of units of each land use type for each district was derived from approved land use data, accounting for existing development that has already occurred. The number of new units for each development type was then multiplied by the ITE trip generation rate to produce the total number of new trips associated with each type of land use development. This was converted into Dwelling Unit Equivalents (DUEs), which are equivalent to the number of trips generated by the average single-family dwelling during the PM peak hour (the analysis period for the SPRTA program).
- 11) The updated fees/DUE to be collected in each district was then computed by dividing the remaining costs attributable to the district (from Steps 8 and 9) by the number of future DUEs expected in that district (from Step 10).

Later chapters of this report will describe how the various inputs used in this methodology were updated and will show the results in terms of recommended revised fees for each fee district.

2.2 Changes to Comply with AB-602

California Government Code Section 66016.5(a)(5)(A), which is new with the enactment of AB-602, states that,

“A nexus study adopted after July 1, 2022, shall calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development. A local agency that imposes a fee proportionately to the square footage of the proposed units of the development shall be deemed to have used a valid method to establish a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.”

Until now, the SPRTA program residential fee rates have been charged per dwelling unit, with no adjustment for the size of the unit, so an additional step is now needed to fulfil this new State requirement. The SPRTA member agencies were consulted, and although CGC Section 66016.5(a)(5)(B) allows agencies to opt out of

basing fees on floor area if certain findings are made, a consensus was reached among member agencies to apply a lesser fee to smaller units and a greater fee to larger units in order to comply with the new government code. To simplify the administration of the new system, units will be grouped into four size categories, namely small (less than 1,500 square feet), medium (1,500 to 2,500 square feet), large (2,500 to 3,500 square feet), and very large (greater than 3,500 square feet).

There are no well-established sources for trip generation rates based on residential unit size. However, data on the number of persons per household can be obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Housing Survey, and data on the number of trips by household size is available from NCHRP Report 716, *Travel Demand Forecast: Parameters and Techniques*. This data was combined as shown in Table 1.

The average size of new single-family dwellings in the SPRTA fee area is 1,900 square feet, which falls within the Medium size category (1,500-to-2,500 square feet). This was set equal to 1 Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) for the purposes of the SPRTA fee program. Small units generate on average 83% as many trips as Medium units, and so are calculated at 0.83 DUEs. Similarly, new homes in the Large category generate on average 108% as many trips as Medium units (1.08 DUEs), and Very Large homes generate 114% as much and so were assigned a value of 1.14 DUE.

AB-602 applies to all residential developments. Therefore, a further decision was made to apply the small/medium/large/very-large fee structure ratios to other residential land use developments in addition to the associated ITE trip generation ratios. The application of ITE trip rates is a historical industry standard for the SPRTA member agencies and surrounding region and remains allowable under a different sub-section of AB-602, which reads:

CGC Section 66016.5(a)(5)(C) "*This paragraph does not prohibit an agency from establishing different fees for different types of developments.*"

The American Housing Survey only has data on the number of persons per household for single-family dwellings (Table 1 uses SFD data). DUEs for other types of housing were therefore calculated based on their respective PM peak-hour trip-generation rates found in ITE's *Trip Generation Manual*. This is shown in Table 2.

Table 1: Computation of Average Trip Generation by Dwelling Size Category

Persons per Household	Trips per Household	Less than 1,500 sq.ft			1,500 to 2,500 sq.ft			2,500 to 3,500 sq.ft			Greater than 3,500 sq.ft		
		Number of Units	Percent of Units	Trips	Number of Units	Percent of Units	Trips	Number of Units	Percent of Units	Trips	Number of Units	Percent of Units	Trips
		(A)	(C)=(B)*Σ(B)	(D)=(A)*(C)	(E)	(F)=(E)*Σ(E)	(G)=(A)*(F)	(H)	(I)=(H)*Σ(H)	(J)=(A)*(I)	(K)	(L)=(K)*Σ(K)	(M)=(A)*(L)
1	4.1	21,895	39%	1.58	7,828	20%	0.81	1,539	12%	0.51	849	11%	0.44
2	8.2	18,076	32%	2.61	14,701	37%	3.04	4,853	39%	3.20	2,901	36%	2.98
3	11.2	7,592	13%	1.50	6,928	17%	1.96	1,937	16%	1.74	1,162	15%	1.63
4	16.1	5,355	9%	1.52	5,928	15%	2.41	2,409	19%	3.12	1,697	21%	3.42
5	18.6	2,368	4%	0.78	2,754	7%	1.29	1,087	9%	1.63	838	10%	1.95
6	18.6	907	2%	0.30	989	2%	0.46	407	3%	0.61	348	4%	0.81
7+	18.6	525	1%	0.17	553	1%	0.26	202	2%	0.30	196	2%	0.46
Total		56,718	100%	8.46	39,681	100%	10.22	12,433	100%	11.11	7,990	100%	11.68
Average Persons Per Household		2.17			2.66			2.90			3.08		
Trip-Gen Rate as a % of SFD Average		83%			100%			108%			114%		

Sources: Column (A) - NCHRP Report 716, Columns (B), (E), and (H) - American Housing Survey

Table 2: Computation of Dwelling DUEs by Size and Dwelling Type

ITE Land Use Code	SPRTA Land Use Category	P.M. Peak Hour Trip Rate Per Unit ¹	Trip Length ²	% New Trips ²	VMT per Unit	DUE per Unit for Homes 1,500 to 2,500 sq.ft.	DUE for Units Smaller than 1,500 sq.ft.	DUE for Units Sized 2,400-3,500 sq.ft.	DUE for Units Larger than 3,500 sq.ft.
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)=(A)*(B)*(C)	(E)=(D) normalized to Average SFD	(F)=(E)*83%	(G)=(E)*108%	(H)=(E)*114%
210	Single Family	0.94 /DU	5.0	100	4.70	1.00	0.83	1.08	1.14
220	Apartment	0.51 /DU	5.0	100	2.55	0.54	0.45	0.59	0.62
230	Low-Rise Condominium	0.36 /DU	5.0	100	1.80	0.38	0.32	0.41	0.44
231	Medium-Rise Condominium	0.17 /DU	5.0	100	0.85	0.18	0.15	0.20	0.21
240	Mobile Home Park	0.58 /DU	5.0	100	2.90	0.62	0.51	0.67	0.70
251	Senior, Single-Family	0.30 /DU	5.0	100	1.50	0.32	0.26	0.34	0.36
252	Senior, Multi-Family	0.25 /DU	5.0	100	1.25	0.27	0.22	0.29	0.30

1) Source: ITE Trip Generation, 11th Edition. Note that ITE's national rates are based on the national average-sized house.

2) Source: ITE Journal, May 1992

Note: The figures shown in gray font in Columns F, G, and H are somewhat theoretical because units of these types are not usually built in these sizes in western Placer County. There appears to be no record of any units being built in this size in the last 5 years in any SPRTA member agency.

2.3 SB-13 Compliance

In addition to the considerations discussed above pursuant to AB-602, a separate piece of legislation, SB-13, passed in 2019, establishes a new system for assessing fees on accessory dwelling units (ADUs). It amended CGC Section 65852.2(3)(A)(f)(3) to read,

“A local agency, special district, or water corporation shall not impose any impact fee upon the development of an accessory dwelling unit less than 750 square feet. Any impact fees charged for an accessory dwelling unit of 750 square feet or more shall be charged proportionately in relation to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.”

Based on this sub-section, if an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is smaller than 750 square feet then it is exempt from SPRTA fees. Fees assessed on ADU's larger than 750 square feet require a two-part calculation. First, the SPRTA fee that would be charged to the primary unit is calculated, then the fee on the ADU is computed based on the ratio of its floor area in relation to the primary unit. For example, if the primary dwelling was 2,000 sq.ft. and would be charged a fee of \$800, then an ADU 1,000 sq.ft. in size on that property would be charged a fee of \$400.

For reference, 32% of the ADU's built in the SPRTA area in the 5-year period ending in 2022 were smaller than 750 sq.ft. and so would have been exempt from fees had AB-602 been enforceable during that period. This percentage may change over time based on market demands.

3. Updates of Key Inputs

One of the purposes of a nexus study update is to provide an opportunity to revise the inputs used to compute the fee. This chapter discusses several key inputs to the fee calculation and how they were updated.

3.1 Land Use Forecasts

The land use forecasts for the current study were developed using the land use assumptions from the 2014 study as a base. The 2014 assumptions were then adjusted to match existing conditions, taking into account developments that occurred in the 2014-2022 period. Staff from the SPRTA member jurisdictions then reviewed and revised the assumptions for future development in respective areas based on their knowledge of development projects currently planned. Among the key assumptions for various districts were:

- **Dry Creek:** Build-out of Regional University, Riolo Vineyards, Morgan Knowles, and Placer Vineyards - Phase 1
- **Granite Bay:** Only a small amount of new development is expected; less than 800 new DUEs in total, and little non-residential development
- **Lincoln:** General Plan buildout within the existing City limits, plus a portion of development within the Lincoln's SOI (primarily in Villages 1, 5, and 7)
- **Newcastle /Horseshoe Bar:** Only 837 new DUEs and very little non-residential development.
- **Placer Central:** Build-out of Bickford Ranch and The Ridge
- **Placer West:** Minimal rural residential growth assumed.
- **Rocklin:** Near build-out of residential and assumed 2035 absorption of non-residential. 1,500 additional students at William Jessup University and 6,000 additional students at Sierra College
- **Roseville West:** Build-out of Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment #3, West Park Rezone, Sierra Vista Specific Plan (maintaining Urban Reserve), Creekview Specific Plan, Reasons Farm Business Park, and Amoruso Ranch
- **Roseville East:** Moderate amount of development, focused mainly on multi-family residential units
- **Sunset:** Placer Ranch Specific Plan, including a future university with 25,000 students, and 20-year growth projections from the Sunset Area Plan.

Note that these assumptions do not correspond to full build-out of each jurisdiction's general plan. General Plan land uses are not associated with a particular time horizon and full buildout might not occur for many decades. The assumptions used for the current study represent the staffs' consensus view of what might realistically occur in the next 20 years.

Table 3, Figure 3, and Figure 4 summarize these growth forecasts.

Table 3: Forecast of Growth by SPRTA Fee District

Land Use Category	Unit	Forecast of Growth by Land Use										Total
		Dry Creek	Granite Bay	Lincoln	Newcastle /Horseshoe Bar	Placer Central	Placer West	Rocklin	Roseville West	Roseville East	Sunset	
Single Family Dwelling	DU	8,490	462	15,059	621	1,056	336	1,855	10,309	429	3,395	42,012
Apartment	DU	4,137	469	3,427	398	21	0	4,186	9,542	2,314	1,504	25,998
Senior Detached	DU	1,192	145	0	0	950	0	0	83	0	1,050	3,420
Convalescent Hospital	1,000 SF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-9	0	-9
Shopping Center	1,000 SF	751	93	3,327	84	88	0	634	5,365	1,287	1,891	13,520
Mall	1,000 SF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Commercial	1,000 SF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Club	1,000 SF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hotel	Room	0	0	0	0	0	0	321	286	253	353	1,213
Golf Course	Hole	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
K-12 School	student	5,592	392	10,172	523	0	0	1,343	11,169	2,312	2,050	33,553
University/College	student	6,000	0	0	0	0	0	7,500	0	0	24,954	38,454
Office	1,000 SF	326	94	1,922	0	0	0	247	2,330	543	1,999	7,462
Industrial Park	1,000 SF	422	111	1,816	179	0	0	35	6,907	1,118	8,241	18,828
Light Industrial	1,000 SF	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	200	0	2,372	2,714
Church	1,000 SF	246	22	140	19	4	8	41	404	73	-16	941
Medical/Dental Office	1,000 SF	0	30	0	16	0	0	203	0	63	0	311
Hospital	1,000 SF	0	0	0	0	0	0	320	0	163	0	483
Fire Station, Museum, Water Treatment	1,000 SF	382	35	33	0	0	0	5	440	67	12	973
Post Office, Library, Government Building	1,000 SF	0	0	29	0	0	0	1	0	25	400	455
City Park	Acre	51	12	0	0	65	0	0	387	0	70	585
Cemetary	Acre	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Total		27,592	1,864	35,925	1,840	2,183	344	16,833	47,422	8,638	48,275	

Figure 3: Residential Growth Assumptions





Figure 4: Non-Residential Growth Assumptions



The SPRTA fee program denominates its fee schedule in units of Dwelling Unit Equivalents (DUEs). DUEs are used to compare the trip-making characteristics of various land use types to that of the average single-family residential dwelling unit. A land use's DUE factor is based on the number of trips made to or from the site in the PM peak hour, the average length of those trips, and percentage of trips that are new to the roadway system as a result of the subject land use². This is the historical methodology and industry standard used for transportation impact nexus studies within the SPRTA member agencies and the surrounding region. Table 4 shows the DUE factors for the land use types used in the fee calculation.

The land use forecasts from Table 3 were multiplied by the DUE factors from Table 4 to produce a growth forecast in DUEs for each district. This is shown in Figure 5, which compares the assumed growth by district in the current study with the assumptions used in the 2014 nexus study. Several aspects of this figure are noteworthy:

- Some growth that was in 2014's future forecast has now occurred, which reduces the amount expected going forward. This is particularly noticeable in the Lincoln, Rocklin, and Roseville West districts which have been the site of active development in recent years.
- The addition of the Sunset Area Plan, including Placer Ranch, greatly increased the amount of development expected to occur in the Sunset district.

The net result of these changes is that the overall growth in DUEs went from 129,141 in the 2014 nexus study to 112,548 in the current study, a reduction of 13%.

² Some uses, such as gas stations and coffee shops, may serve what are termed "pass-by trips", meaning that the driver stopped there during the course of a trip that would have taken place in any case. These trips are not considered an addition to the traffic on the adjacent road because the vehicle would have used that road anyway.

Table 4: Dwelling Unit Equivalence (DUE) Factor for Different Land Use Categories

ITE Code	Land Use Category	P.M. Peak Hour	Trip	% New	VMT	2023 SPRTA DUE
		Trip Rate Per Unit ¹	Length ²	Trips ²	per Unit	per Unit
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)=(A)*(B)*(C)	(E)=(D) normalized to Average SFD
Industrial						
110	Light Industrial	0.65 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	3.05	0.649
130	Industrial Park	0.34 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	1.60	0.339
140	Manufacturing	0.74 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	3.47	0.739
150	Warehousing	0.18 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	0.84	0.180
151	Mini-Warehousing	0.15 /1,000 s.f.	3.1	92	0.43	0.091
Residential						
210	Single Family	0.94 /Dwelling Unit	5.0	100	4.70	1.000
220	Apartment	0.51 /Dwelling Unit	5.0	100	2.55	0.543
230	Low-Rise w/ Ground Floor Commercial	0.36 /Dwelling Unit	5.0	100	1.80	0.383
231	Medium-Rise w/ Ground Floor Commercial	0.17 /Dwelling Unit	5.0	100	0.85	0.181
240	Mobile Home Park	0.58 /Dwelling Unit	5.0	100	2.90	0.617
251	Senior, Single-Family	0.30 /Dwelling Unit	5.0	100	1.50	0.319
252	Senior, Multi-Family	0.25 /Dwelling Unit	5.0	100	1.25	0.266
Lodging						
310	Hotel	0.59 /Room	6.4	71	2.68	0.570
311	All Suites Hotel	0.36 /Room	6.4	71	1.64	0.348
312	Business Hotel	0.31 /Room	6.4	71	1.41	0.300
320	Motel	0.36 /Room	6.4	59	1.36	0.289

1) Source: ITE Trip Generation, 11th Edition, except where indicated with an asterisk, which are from the 10th edition

2) Source: ITE Journal, May 1992

Table 4: Dwelling Unit Equivalence (DUE) Factor for Different Land Use Categories (*continued*)

ITE Code	Land Use Category	P.M. Peak Hour	Trip	% New	VMT	2023 SPRTA DUE
		Trip Rate Per Unit ¹	Length ²	Trips ²	per Unit	per Unit
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)=(A)*(B)*(C)	(E)=(D) normalized to Average SFD
Recreational						
411	City Park	0.11 /Acre	6.4	90	0.63	0.135
430	Golf Course	2.91 /Hole	7.1	90	18.59	3.956
444	Movie Theater	6.17 /1,000 s.f.	2.3	85	12.06	2.566
492	Health/Fitness Club	1.31 /1,000 s.f.	3.0	75	2.95	0.627
493	Athletic Club	6.29 /1,000 s.f.	3.0	75	14.15	3.011
495	Recreational Community Center	2.50 /1,000 s.f.	3.0	75	5.63	1.197
Institutional						
536	Private School (K - 12)*	5.50 /1000 s.f. Students	4.3	80	18.92	4.026
560	Church	0.49 /1,000 s.f.	3.9	90	1.72	0.366
565	Day Care Center	11.12 /1,000 s.f.	2.0	74	16.46	3.502
590	Library	8.16 /1,000 s.f.	3.9	90	28.64	6.094
Medical						
254	Assisted Living	0.24 /bed	2.8	74	0.50	0.106
610	Hospital	1.69 /1,000 s.f.	6.4	77	8.33	1.772
620	Nursing Home	0.59 /1,000 s.f.	2.8	75	1.24	0.264
630	Clinic	3.69 /1,000 s.f.	4.8	92	16.30	3.467
Office						
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1.94 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	9.10	1.937
	50,001 - 150,000 s.f.	1.66 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	7.79	1.657
	150,001 - 300,000 s.f.	1.45 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	6.80	1.448
	300,001 - 500,000 s.f.	1.31 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	6.15	1.308
	500,000 - 800,000 s.f.	1.21 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	5.68	1.208
	> 800,000 s.f.	1.12 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	92	5.26	1.118
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	3.93 /1,000 s.f.	5.1	77	15.43	3.284

1) Source: ITE Trip Generation, 11th Edition, except where indicated with an asterisk, which are from the 10th edition

2) Source: ITE Journal, May 1992

Table 4: Dwelling Unit Equivalence (DUE) Factor for Different Land Use Categories

(continued)

ITE Code	Land Use Category	P.M. Peak Hour	Trip	% New	VMT	2023 SPRTA DUE
		Trip Rate Per Unit ¹	Length ²	Trips ²	per Unit	per Unit
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)=(A)*(B)*(C)	(E)=(D) normalized to Average SFD
Retail						
812	Building Materials & Lumber Yard	2.25 /1,000 s.f.	1.7	36	1.38	0.293
815	Discount Store	4.86 /1,000 s.f.	1.8	57	4.99	1.061
816	Hardware Store	2.98 /1,000 s.f.	1.7	36	1.82	0.388
817	Nursery	6.94 /1,000 s.f.	1.7	36	4.25	0.904
820	Shopping Center					
	< 200,000 s.f.	5.04 /1,000 s.f.	1.8	59	5.35	1.138
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	3.97 /1,000 s.f.	2.3	76	6.95	1.478
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	3.21 /1,000 s.f.	3.0	78	7.51	1.598
	>1,000,000 s.f.	2.64 /1,000 s.f.	3.6	78	7.42	1.580
931	Quality Restaurant	7.80 /1,000 s.f.	2.5	79	15.41	3.278
932	High Turnover Restaurant	9.05 /1,000 s.f.	1.9	76	13.07	2.780
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	33.21 /1,000 s.f.	1.7	49	27.66	5.886
934	Fast Food Drive-In	33.03 /1,000 s.f.	1.7	49	27.51	5.854
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	4.85 /Src. Pos.	2.2	83	8.86	1.884
942	Automobile Care Center	2.25 /1,000 s.f.	2.2	83	4.11	0.874
841	New Car Sales	3.75 /1,000 s.f.	2.4	76	6.84	1.455
843	Automobile Parts Sales	4.90 /1,000 s.f.	3.6	78	13.76	2.927
944	Gasoline/Service Station	13.91 /Fueling Pos.	1.9	20	5.29	1.125
945	Gas/Serv. Stn. W/Conv. Market	18.42 /Fueling Pos.	1.9	20	7.00	1.489
848	Tire Store	3.75 /1,000 s.f.	2.2	80	6.60	1.404
850	Supermarket	8.95 /1,000 s.f.	1.7	48	7.30	1.554
851	Convenience Market	49.11 /1,000 s.f.	1.5	22	16.21	3.448
857	Discount Club	4.19 /1,000 s.f.	2.3	79	7.61	1.620
862	Home Improvement Superstore	2.29 /1,000 s.f.	1.8	52	2.14	0.456
863	Electronics Superstore	4.25 /1,000 s.f.	1.8	60	4.59	0.977
864	Toy/Childrens Superstore	5.00 /1,000 s.f.	1.8	59	5.31	1.130
880	Drugstore W/O Drive-Thru	8.51 /1,000 s.f.	1.8	47	7.20	1.532
881	Drugstore W/Drive-Thru	10.25 /1,000 s.f.	1.8	51	9.41	2.002
890	Furniture Store	0.52 /1,000 s.f.	3.6	78	1.46	0.311
911	Walk-In Bank	12.41 /1,000 s.f.	1.6	77	15.29	3.253
912	Drive-In Bank	21.01 /1,000 s.f.	1.6	57	19.16	4.077


1) Source: ITE Trip Generation, 11th Edition, except where indicated with an asterisk, which are from the 10th edition

2) Source: ITE Journal, May 1992

Table 5: Forecast of Growth by SPRTA Fee District in DUEs

Land Use Category	Unit	DUE per Unit	Forecast of Growth in DUEs										Total
			Dry Creek	Granite Bay	Lincoln	Newcastle /Horseshoe Bar	Placer Central	Placer West	Rocklin	Roseville West	Roseville East	Sunset	
Single Family Dwelling	DU	1.000	8,490	462	15,059	621	1,056	336	1,855	10,309	429	3,395	42,012
Apartment	DU	0.543	2,245	254	1,859	216	11	0	2,271	5,177	1,255	816	14,105
Senior Detached	DU	0.319	380	46	0	0	303	0	0	26	0	335	1,091
Convalescent Hospital	1,000 SF	0.079	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-1
Shopping Center	1,000 SF	1.265	949	117	4,207	106	111	0	802	6,784	1,628	2,392	17,096
Mall	1,000 SF	2.031	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Commercial	1,000 SF	2.040	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Club	1,000 SF	3.011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	-1
Hotel	Room	0.570	0	0	0	0	0	0	183	163	144	201	692
Golf Course	Hole	3.956	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
K-12 School	student	0.110	614	43	1,117	57	0	0	147	1,226	254	225	3,684
University/College	student	0.186	1,118	0	0	0	0	0	1,398	0	0	4,651	7,167
Office	1,000 SF	1.438	469	135	2,763	0	0	0	355	3,350	781	2,874	10,727
Industrial Park	1,000 SF	0.339	143	38	616	61	0	0	12	2,344	380	2,797	6,391
Light Industrial	1,000 SF	0.649	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	130	0	1,539	1,761
Church	1,000 SF	0.366	90	8	51	7	1	3	15	148	27	-6	344
Medical/Dental Office	1,000 SF	3.284	0	97	0	53	0	0	665	0	207	0	1,022
Hospital	1,000 SF	1.772	0	0	0	0	0	0	567	0	289	0	856
Fire Station, Museum, Water Treatment	1,000 SF	0.235	90	8	8	0	0	0	1	103	16	3	229
Post Office, Library, Government Building	1,000 SF	11.601	0	3	339	0	0	0	6	0	290	4,640	5,279
City Park	Acre	0.135	7	2	0	0	9	0	0	52	0	9	79
Cemetery	Acre	4.669	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Total			14,610	1,214	26,020	1,120	1,491	339	8,370	29,812	5,699	23,872	112,548

Figure 5: Comparison of Growth Assumptions in the 2014 and Current Nexus Studies



3.2 Transportation Network Assumptions

The assumptions used for the future transportation network included all of the projects in SACOG’s financially-constrained RTP 2040 project list. In addition, the internal road networks for the development projects that were assumed to occur (Placer Ranch for example) were assumed to be built out.

An anomalous situation arose with respect to Valley View Parkway. This was a new road which, if built, would connect Park Boulevard (Whitney Ranch) to Sierra College Boulevard as part of the Clover Valley development in northeastern Rocklin. Although this roadway is part of an approved development agreement, the City of Rocklin now believes that the agreement will expire (in 2025) without the road being built. This road was therefore omitted from the assumed future road network.

3.3 Project Cost Estimates

Cost estimates for each project on the SPRTA project list were prepared by SPRTA or the lead agency for the project. These cost estimates were prepared in different years, and so needed to be converted to reflect current costs. SPRTA policy is to apply inflationary adjustments based on the average of the Engineering News Record’s (ENR’s) Construction Cost Index (CCI) for 20 cities across the country and the index for the city of San Francisco. Table 6 shows the cost inflation factor used for project cost estimates prepared in different years.

Table 6: Project Cost Inflation Factor

Date	ENR 20 Cities Index	ENR San Francisco Index	Average	Annual % Change	Period	Inflation Factor to Match 2023 Prices
	(A)	(B)	(C)= [(A)+(B)] /2			
Apr-09	8,528	9,756	9,142		2009-2023	56.14%
Apr-10	8,677	9,730	9,204	0.67%	2010-2023	55.10%
Apr-11	9,027	10,161	9,594	4.24%	2011-2023	48.79%
Apr-12	9,273	10,371	9,822	2.38%	2012-2023	45.33%
Apr-13	9,484	10,373	9,929	1.08%	2013-2023	43.77%
Apr-14	9,750	10,895	10,322	3.97%	2014-2023	38.29%
Apr-15	9,992	11,163	10,577	2.47%	2015-2023	34.96%
Apr-16	10,280	11,559	10,920	3.24%	2016-2023	30.73%
Apr-17	10,678	11,696	11,187	2.45%	2017-2023	27.60%
Apr-18	10,972	12,015	11,493	2.74%	2018-2023	24.20%
Apr-19	11,228	12,322	11,775	2.45%	2019-2023	21.23%
Apr-20	11,413	12,817	12,115	2.88%	2020-2023	17.83%
Apr-21	11,849	13,157	12,503	3.21%	2021-2023	14.17%
Apr-22	12,899	15,104	14,001	11.98%	2022-2023	1.95%
Apr-23	13,230	15,320	14,275	1.95%	2023-2023	0.00%

Table 7 shows how the cost inflation factor from Table 6 was applied to the cost estimates for the remaining construction phases to arrive at the current cost estimate for remaining work. Note that in some cases the project has already been constructed, though not fully paid for, so those costs are fixed at the actual amount paid. In such cases there was no need to apply a cost inflation factor and they are represented as zero remaining construction costs in Table 7. In cases where the project is partially complete (some portion has been constructed), the cost for the completed work is omitted for the same reasons as completed projects so the inflation factor is only applied to the remaining work. Table 10 includes both the cost of completed work and the cost of the remaining work.

Significant changes to projects, beyond inflationary increases, are as follows:

- An updated scope and cost estimate for the I-80/SR 65 Interchange was available which increased the total project cost from about \$120 million (2014 dollars) to about \$586 million for Phases 1 and 2 of the interchange. In addition, the SPRTA fee cost share was increased from a fixed \$5 million to a \$135 million share.
- The I-80/Rocklin Rd Interchange's scope was modified at Caltrans' request to include auxiliary lanes, adding about \$12 million to the total project cost. In 2022, the Board added the I-80 Auxiliary Lane project with a SPRTA fee cost share of \$15.7 million. These projects' total costs and the SPRTA fee cost share are included in Table 10.

Table 7: Estimated Project Costs in Millions of 2022 Dollars

Project ID	Projects	Status	Remaining Construction, Most Recent Project Costs (\$M)	Year of Cost Estimate	Escalation Rate	Remaining Construction Estimated Project Costs in 2023 \$M
			(A)			(B)
A	Placer Parkway	Future Improvement	\$783.06	2021	14.2%	\$893.99
	Sierra College Blvd					
B	Seg 1a - SR 193 to Twelve Bridges	Future Improvement	\$0.00	2015	35.0%	\$0.00
B	Seg 1b - Twelve Bridges Dr to Northern Rocklin City Limits	Future Improvement	\$11.97	2015	35.0%	\$16.15
C	Seg 2a - Rocklin N. Limit to Loomis Town Limit	Future Improvement	\$3.51	2014	38.3%	\$4.85
C	Seg 2b - Loomis Town Limit to Taylor Road	Future Improvement	\$6.66	2014	38.3%	\$9.21
D	Seg 3 - Taylor Road to Granite Drive	Complete	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
F	Seg 5 - I-80 EB Ramp to Rocklin Road	Partially Complete	\$3.19	2009	56.1%	\$4.98
G	Seg 6 - Rocklin Road to Southern Rocklin City Limits	Partially Complete	\$2.59	2009	56.1%	\$4.04
H	Seg 7 - Southern Rocklin City Limits to Douglas Boulevard	Complete	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
I	Seg 8 - Douglas Boulevard to Eureka Road	Future Improvement	\$1.50	2014	38.3%	\$2.07
J	Seg 9 - Eureka Road to East Roseville Parkway	Future Improvement	\$2.33	2014	38.3%	\$3.22
K	Seg 10 - East Roseville Parkway to County Line	Future Improvement	\$4.43	2014	38.3%	\$6.12
L	Lincoln Bypass	Partially Complete	\$90.00	2022	2.0%	\$91.76
M	I-80/Douglas Blvd Interchange	Complete	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
N	SR 65 Widening	Future Improvement	\$115.00	2020	17.8%	\$135.50
O	I-80 Rocklin Road, with WB Aux Lane	Future Improvement	\$52.00	2023	N/A	\$52.00
P&Q	Auburn Folsom Rd	Complete	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
R	I-80 / SR 65 Interchange					
	I-80 / SR 65 Interchange Phase 1	Complete	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
	I-80 / SR 65 Interchange Phase 2	Future Improvement	\$495.00	2020	17.8%	\$583.26
S	I-80/Douglas Blvd Ramp Improvements	Future Improvement	\$1.79	2022	2.0%	\$1.82
T	I-80/Atlantic WB Ave Ramp Improvements	In Construction	\$0.00	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
U	Regional Transit Project & Facilities	Future Improvement	\$100.00	2023	N/A	\$100.00
V	I-80 Auxiliary Lane (WB)	In Construction	\$0.00	2023	N/A	\$0.00
W	I-80 Auxiliary Lane (EB)	In Construction	\$0.00	2023	N/A	\$0.00
	Total		\$1,141.85			\$1,909.00

3.4 Level of Service Policy

3.4.1 Role of LOS Policy


AB-602 introduced the following requirement for all nexus studies, that, like this one, are adopted after July 1, 2022:

Section 66016.5(a)(2): “When applicable, the nexus study shall identify the existing level of service for each public facility, identify the proposed new level of service, and include an explanation of why the new level of service is appropriate.”

The reason that level-of-service (LOS) is important in a nexus study is because it defines when a deficiency occurs and the percentage of the deficiency that is attributable to new development. This is illustrated with the three scenarios shown in Figure 6. In the figure, for each scenario the gray bar represents the existing traffic volume and the green bar represents the additional traffic that is expected to be generated by new land development. The thick black bar represents the capacity of the road at a given LOS. In this case, for illustrative purposes the LOS policy allows up to 1,000 vehicles per hour. Then:

- Under Scenario 1, the road would be able to accommodate the expected growth in traffic and still maintain an acceptable LOS. No fee could be collected to add capacity, since none is needed.
- Under Scenario 2, the road can accommodate the existing level of traffic, but the expected growth in traffic would push volumes beyond what the road can handle at the target LOS. In that case the need for additional capacity is entirely attributable to new development, and a fee could be charged to new development to cover 100% of the cost of capacity improvements.
- Under Scenario 3, the road is already deficient, and the addition of new traffic would exacerbate the problem. In such a case the portion of the need for improvement would be Y/X , as shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Effect of LOS on Determination of Percent Attributable to New Development



These examples illustrate the central importance of the LOS policy in determining whether a fee can be imposed on new development for a given improvement and, if so, how much of the cost new development should bear. Note that in these examples the amount of new traffic attributable to new development was identical in every case, but the fees to be imposed on new development ranged from zero to 100% of the cost of improvement depending on the LOS policy.

3.4.2 SPRTA LOS Policy

SPRTA is a multi-jurisdictional agency and as such many of its policies reflect those of the member agencies. The LOS is one such policy. The LOS policies of the individual member agencies, which were used in the fee calculation, are described below:

Lincoln – The City’s LOS policy is found in General Plan Policy T-2.3³, which reads, “*Strive to maintain a LOS C at all signalized intersections in the City during the p.m. peak hours. Exceptions to this standard may be considered for intersections where the city determines that the required road improvements are not acceptable (i.e., due to factors such as the cost of improvements exceeding benefits achieved, results are contrary to achieving a pedestrian design, or other factors) or that based upon overriding considerations regarding project benefits, an alternative LOS may be accepted. For purposes of this policy, City intersections along McBean Park Drive between East Avenue and G Street, and G Street between First Street and Seventh Street, are excluded from the LOS C standard, and will operate at a lower LOS.*”

Rocklin - The City’s LOS policy is found in General Plan Policy C-10⁴, which reads, “*A. Maintain a minimum traffic Level of Service “C” for all signalized intersections during the p.m. peak hour on an average weekday, except in the circumstances described in C-10.B and C. below.*

B. Recognizing that some signalized intersections within the City serve and are impacted by development located in adjacent jurisdictions, and that these impacts are outside the control of the City, a development project which is determined to result in a Level of Service worse than “C” may be approved, if the approving body finds (1) the diminished level of service is an interim situation which will be alleviated by the implementation of planned improvements or (2) based on the specific circumstances described in Section C. below, there are no feasible street improvements that will improve the Level of Service to “C” or better as set forward in the Action Plan for the Circulation Element.

C. All development in another jurisdiction outside of Rocklin’s control which creates traffic impacts in Rocklin should be required to construct all mitigation necessary in order to maintain a LOS C in Rocklin unless the mitigation is determined to be infeasible by the Rocklin City Council. The standard for determining the feasibility of the mitigation would be whether or not the improvements create unusual economic, legal, social, technological, physical or other similar burdens and considerations.”

Roseville - The City’s LOS policy is found in General Plan Policy CIRC2.1⁵, which reads, “*Maintain a LOS “C” standard at a minimum of 70 percent of all signalized intersections and roadway segments in the City during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Exceptions to the LOS “C” standard may be considered where improvements required to achieve the standard would adversely affect pedestrian, bicycle, or transit access, and where feasible LOS improvements and travel demand-reducing strategies have been exhausted.*”

³ See: <https://www.lincolncalifornia.gov/en/business-and-development/resources/Documents/general-plan-2050.pdf>

⁴ See: https://www.rocklin.ca.us/sites/main/files/file-attachments/chapter_iv_c_circulation_element_0.pdf?1648508338

⁵ See: https://cdnsm5-hosted.civicleve.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_7964838/File/Government/Departments/Development%20Services/Planning/General%20Plan/Final%20General%20Plan%202020/03%20Circulation_Final.pdf

Unincorporated Placer County - The County's LOS policy is found in General Plan Policy 3.A.7⁶, which reads, "The County shall develop and manage its roadway system to maintain the following minimum levels of service (LOS), or as otherwise specified in a community or specific plan).

- a. LOS "C" on rural roadways, except within one-half mile of state highways where the standard shall be LOS "D".
- b. LOS "C" on urban/suburban roadways except within one-half mile of state highways where the standard shall be LOS "D".
- c. An LOS no worse than specified in the Placer County Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the state highway system.

Temporary slippage in LOS C may be acceptable at specific locations until adequate funding has been collected for the construction of programmed improvements. The County may allow exceptions to the level of service standards where it finds that the improvements or other measures required to achieve the LOS standards are unacceptable based on established criteria. In allowing any exception to the standards, the County shall consider the following factors:

- *The number of hours per day that the intersection or roadway segment would operate at conditions worse than the standard.*
- *The ability of the required improvement to significantly reduce peak hour delay and improve traffic operations.*
- *The right-of-way needs and the physical impacts on surrounding properties.*
- *The visual aesthetics of the required improvement and its impact on community identity and character.*
- *Environmental impacts including air quality and noise impacts.*
- *Construction and right-of-way acquisition costs.*
- *The impacts on general safety.*
- *The impacts of the required construction phasing and traffic maintenance.*
- *The impacts on quality of life as perceived by residents.*
- *Consideration of other environmental, social, or economic factors on which the County may base findings to allow an exceedance of the standards.*

Exceptions to the standards will only be allowed after all feasible measures and options are explored, including alternative forms of transportation.

⁶ See: <https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/8575/Transportation-and-Circulation-PDF>

4. Updated Fee Calculation

The updated inputs described in Chapter 3 were used to carry out the methodology described in Chapter 2, producing the results described in this chapter. These results show the maximum fee permissible under state law. Funding projects at less than the maximum would create a funding gap that would need to be filled with funds from some other source.

4.1 Allocation of Project Costs to Fee Districts

Table 8 shows how the percentage of the need for each SPRTA project that is attributable to new development was computed, based on the existing and future LOS. In most cases the computation was as described in Chapter 2, but there were three situations where a different approach was taken, namely:

- In some cases⁷, some or all of the improvements have already been constructed. In such cases the number of lanes used in the calculation of Existing LOS is for the pre-construction condition.
- In the cases of Placer Parkway and the Lincoln Bypass an entirely new road is being built to accommodate development. In such cases, we have assumed that, but for new development, there would be no need for the road.
- In the case of transit projects, the percentage attributable to new development was based on new development's share of future DUEs.

New development's share of the responsibility for each project improvement, as computed in Table 8, includes all ten SPRTA fee districts as well as areas not included in SPRTA, such as the growth in trips passing through the SPTRA area without stopping. Table 9 shows the disaggregation for responsibility to each area, based on select link analysis performed using the SPRTA travel demand model.

Table 10 combines that percentage attribution by district from Table 9 and the project cost information from Table 7 to find the remaining costs for each project that is attributable to future development in the SPRTA area. Note that in several cases the newest cost estimates are lower than the original estimates, and SPRTA has already collected an amount exceeding that needed for SPRTA's contribution to the project. The project-specific surplus has been subtracted from the future SPRTA funding needed for those projects.

Table 11 takes SPRTA's share of the future cost for each project from Table 10 and splits it among the fee districts based on their respective shares as shown in Table 9. Some projects, indicated with asterisks in Table 11, were determined by the SPRTA Board to be regional in nature with the benefits shared by the residents of all SPRTA members. In such cases, SPRTA's share of project costs were distributed pro rata among the districts based on their respective shares of the growth in DUEs.

Table 11 also accounts for credits that some fee districts have that reflect contributions made to certain project prior to the establishment of the SPRTA program.

Also included in Table 11 are the costs incurred by PCTPA to administer the program. This includes the anticipated costs of updating the travel demand model used in the nexus analysis, the cost of consulting fees for periodic nexus study updates, and staff time used to administer the program.

⁷ Specifically, the I-80/Douglas Boulevard interchange and segments 3, 5, 6, and 7 of Sierra College Boulevard.

Table 8: Computation of the Percentage of the Need for a Project that is Attributable to New Development

Project ID	Project Name	SPRTA Cost for Completed Construction Work	Remaining Construction Project Cost Estimate	% of Need Attributable to All Future Development	Remaining Construction Costs Attributable to All Future Development	SPRTA Area Share of All Future Development	Costs Attributable to SPRTA Development, by Formula	Costs Attributable to SPRTA Development, Other Than Formula	Actual Costs Attributable to SPRTA Development	SPRTA Fees Previously Collected (thru June 2021)	Costs Attributable to Future SPRTA Development & Not Yet Collected
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D) = (B)*(C)	(E)	(F) = (A)+(D)*(E)	(G)	(H)=minimum (F) and (G)	(J)	(K) = (H) - (J)
A	Placer Parkway (East)		\$893,992,673	100%	\$893,992,673	77.2%	\$690,570,438	\$10,690,362	\$10,690,362	\$10,690,362	\$0
B	Sierra College Blvd Seg #1 (SR 193 to Rocklin City N. Limit)		\$16,154,266	92%	\$14,791,458	75.1%	\$11,112,003		\$11,112,003	\$5,657,792	\$5,454,211
C	Sierra College Blvd Seg #2 (Rocklin N. Limit to Taylor Road)		\$14,063,376	100%	\$14,063,376	71.9%	\$10,108,390		\$10,108,390	\$3,878,611	\$6,229,779
D	Sierra College Blvd Seg #3 (Taylor Rd to Granite Dr)	\$1,810,000	\$0				\$1,810,000		\$1,810,000	\$891,866	\$918,134
F	Sierra College Blvd Seg #5 (I-80 EB Ramps to Rocklin Rd)	\$3,040,000	\$4,981,024	43%	\$2,127,816	57.0%	\$4,252,879		\$4,252,879	\$1,648,605	\$2,604,274
G	Sierra College Blvd Seg #6 (Rocklin Rd to Rocklin S. Limit)	\$230,000	\$4,044,562	100%	\$4,044,562	50.0%	\$2,253,889		\$2,253,889	\$246,874	\$2,007,015
H	Sierra College Blvd Seg #7 (Rocklin S. Limit to Douglas Blvd)	\$2,569,604	\$0				\$2,569,604		\$2,569,604	\$1,181,590	\$1,388,014
I	Sierra College Blvd Seg #8 (Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd)		\$2,074,326	61%	\$1,265,690	59.3%	\$750,206		\$750,206	\$2,325,967	-\$1,575,761
J	Sierra College Blvd Seg #9 (Eureka Rd to E. Roseville Pkwy)		\$3,223,637	83%	\$2,669,033	58.8%	\$1,570,425		\$1,570,425	\$1,093,614	\$476,812
K	Sierra College Blvd Seg #10 (E. Roseville Pkwy to Sac County Line)		\$6,120,476	49%	\$3,004,049	63.2%	\$1,897,429		\$1,897,429	\$2,099,887	-\$202,458
L	Lincoln Bypass	\$23,350,000	\$91,756,915	43%	\$39,691,287	74.8%	\$53,056,372	\$32,400,000	\$32,400,000	\$10,216,055	\$22,183,945
M	I-80 / Douglas Boulevard Interchange	\$5,116,131	\$0				\$5,116,131		\$5,116,131	\$4,403,728	\$712,403
N	SR-65 Widening		\$135,504,446	90%	\$121,730,643	68.4%	\$83,298,691	\$80,400,000	\$80,400,000	\$8,532,857	\$71,867,143
O	I-80 / Rocklin Road Interchange, with WB Aux lane		\$52,000,000	70%	\$36,489,484	74.6%	\$27,221,504	\$23,410,000	\$23,410,000	\$4,481,755	\$18,928,245
P	Auburn-Folsom Rd Widening (Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd)	\$8,000,000	\$0				\$8,000,000		\$8,000,000	\$2,897,631	\$5,102,369
Q	Auburn-Folsom Rd Widening (South of Eureka Rd)		\$0				\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0
R	I-80/SR 65 Interchange	\$2,909,627	\$583,258,269	44%	\$259,497,395	67.2%	\$177,223,166	\$135,000,000	\$135,000,000	\$1,490,828	\$133,509,172
S	Douglas Blvd WB I-80 Ramp		\$1,824,943	89%	\$1,624,476	73.7%	\$1,197,743		\$1,197,743	\$269,448	\$928,295
T	Atlantic Street WB I-80 Ramp	\$650,000	\$0				\$650,000		\$650,000	\$1,857,074	-\$1,207,074
U	Transit Projects		\$100,000,000	37%	\$37,447,786	100.0%	\$37,447,786	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$2,093,446	\$7,906,554
V	I-80 WB Aux Lanes		\$34,600,000	100%	\$34,600,000	60.4%	\$20,910,476	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000		\$13,000,000
W	I-80 EB Aux Lanes		\$14,900,000	27%	\$4,039,641	67.4%	\$2,723,196	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000		\$2,700,000
	Tier 1 Administration										
	Total	\$47,675,362	\$1,958,498,915		\$1,471,079,368				\$358,889,062	\$65,957,989	\$292,931,073
	As a percent of total updated cost estimate				75%				18%	3%	15%

Note: For constructed projects, the Project Cost Estimate and Costs Attributable to SPRTA are equal to the amount SPRTA contributed to build the project; the percent and cost attributable to future development are not recalculated and no longer shown. The following projects were proposed for SPRTA funding but later dropped: (E) Sierra College Blvd Seg #4 (Granite Dr to I-80 EB Ramps), (X) Sierra College Blvd RR Grade Separation, (Y) Regional Active Transportation Projects, and (Z) SR-193/Sierra College Intersection

Table 9: Share of Project Costs Attributable to New Development by SPRTA Fee District or Non-SPRTA Area

Project ID	Project	Area's Share of the Growth Attributable to New Development in SPRTA and Other Areas											Total
		Dry Creek	Granite Bay	Lincoln	Newcastle /Horseshoe Bar	Placer Central	Placer West	Rocklin	Roseville West	Roseville East	Sunset	All Non-SPRTA Areas	
A	Placer Parkway (East) County	1.8%	0.1%	32.6%	0.1%	1.1%	0.3%	10.6%	6.0%	0.3%	24.2%	22.8%	100.0%
B	Sierra College Blvd (SR 193 to Rocklin City N. Limit)	0.0%	0.2%	45.1%	2.0%	17.1%	0.1%	4.5%	0.2%	0.6%	5.3%	24.9%	100.0%
C	Sierra College Blvd Seg #2 (Rocklin N. Limit to Taylor Road)	0.0%	0.4%	44.7%	0.5%	15.2%	0.1%	9.2%	0.3%	1.2%	0.3%	28.1%	100.0%
D	Sierra College Blvd (Taylor Rd to Granite Dr)	0.2%	0.3%	27.1%	4.0%	8.4%	0.1%	21.1%	1.3%	1.6%	0.5%	35.4%	100.0%
F	Sierra College Blvd (I-80 EB Ramps to Rocklin Rd)	0.1%	1.0%	11.7%	2.8%	4.1%	0.0%	33.6%	0.2%	3.1%	0.3%	43.0%	100.0%
G	Sierra College Blvd (Rocklin Rd to Rocklin S. Limit)	0.0%	1.2%	12.6%	3.1%	4.1%	0.0%	24.5%	0.2%	4.2%	0.1%	50.0%	100.0%
H	Sierra College Blvd (Rocklin S. Limit to Douglas Blvd)	0.3%	10.9%	8.7%	4.4%	2.6%	0.0%	12.5%	2.3%	15.3%	2.4%	40.6%	100.0%
I	Sierra College Blvd (Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd)	0.1%	6.4%	11.0%	2.4%	1.7%	0.0%	10.3%	10.1%	8.1%	9.0%	40.7%	100.0%
J	Sierra College Blvd (Eureka Rd to E. Roseville Pkwy)	0.3%	4.0%	13.3%	2.1%	1.5%	0.1%	9.4%	11.6%	5.5%	11.1%	41.2%	100.0%
K	Sierra College Blvd (E. Roseville Pkwy to Sac County Line)	1.0%	1.4%	15.9%	0.6%	0.7%	0.1%	5.8%	16.2%	3.9%	17.6%	36.8%	100.0%
L	Lincoln Bypass	1.0%	0.2%	53.7%	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	2.7%	6.1%	0.8%	9.5%	25.2%	100.0%
M	I-80 / Douglas Boulevard Interchange	0.2%	0.0%	33.2%	0.7%	0.8%	0.1%	4.6%	3.4%	2.3%	17.7%	36.9%	100.0%
N	SR-65 Widening	1.4%	0.1%	30.9%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	3.2%	12.4%	0.4%	19.7%	31.6%	100.0%
O	I-80 / Rocklin Road Interchange	0.8%	0.5%	4.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	52.8%	1.9%	0.1%	13.3%	25.4%	100.0%
P	Auburn-Folsom Rd Widening (Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd)	1.3%	6.8%	16.0%	1.8%	0.9%	0.1%	5.6%	13.0%	1.7%	14.6%	38.3%	100.0%
Q	Auburn-Folsom Rd Widening (South of Eureka Rd)	1.6%	2.1%	16.8%	1.4%	0.8%	0.1%	5.6%	14.7%	1.8%	16.5%	38.6%	100.0%
R	I-80/SR 65 Interchange	2.6%	0.2%	25.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	4.1%	16.0%	0.5%	18.2%	32.8%	100.0%
S	Douglas Blvd WB I-80 Ramp	8.3%	1.5%	1.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%	35.7%	24.5%	1.5%	26.3%	100.0%
T	Atlantic Street WB I-80 Ramp	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	58.7%	5.8%	0.5%	33.3%	100.0%
U	Transit Projects												
V	I-80 WB Auxiliary Lane (Douglas Blvd to Riverside Ave)	0.1%	0.2%	29.7%	1.4%	1.1%	0.1%	11.2%	11.8%	1.2%	3.7%	39.6%	100.0%
W	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane (SR-65 to Rocklin Rd)	0.5%	0.4%	2.1%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	60.9%	2.3%	0.1%	0.1%	32.6%	100.0%

Table 10: Computation of the SPRTA's Share Project Costs

Project ID	Project Name	SPRTA Cost for Completed Construction Work	Remaining Construction Project Cost Estimate	% of Need Attributable to All Future Development	Remaining Construction Costs Attributable to All Future Development	SPRTA Area Share of All Future Development	Costs Attributable to SPRTA Development, by Formula	Costs Attributable to SPRTA Development, Other Than Formula	Actual Costs Attributable to SPRTA Development	SPRTA Fees Previously Collected (thru June 2021)	Costs Attributable to Future SPRTA Development & Not Yet Collected
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D) = (B)*(C)	(E)	(F) = (A)+(D)*(E)	(G)	(H)=minimum (F) and (G)	(J)	(K) = (H) - (J)
A	Placer Parkway (East)		\$893,992,673	100%	\$893,992,673	77.2%	\$690,570,438	\$10,690,362	\$10,690,362	\$10,690,362	\$0
B	Sierra College Blvd Seg #1 (SR 193 to Rocklin City N. Limit)		\$16,154,266	92%	\$14,791,458	75.1%	\$11,112,003		\$11,112,003	\$5,657,792	\$5,454,211
C	Sierra College Blvd Seg #2 (Rocklin N. Limit to Taylor Road)		\$14,063,376	100%	\$14,063,376	71.9%	\$10,108,390		\$10,108,390	\$3,878,611	\$6,229,779
D	Sierra College Blvd Seg #3 (Taylor Rd to Granite Dr)	\$1,810,000	\$0				\$1,810,000		\$1,810,000	\$891,866	\$918,134
F	Sierra College Blvd Seg #5 (I-80 EB Ramps to Rocklin Rd)	\$3,040,000	\$4,981,024	43%	\$2,127,816	57.0%	\$4,252,879		\$4,252,879	\$1,648,605	\$2,604,274
G	Sierra College Blvd Seg #6 (Rocklin Rd to Rocklin S. Limit)	\$230,000	\$4,044,562	100%	\$4,044,562	50.0%	\$2,253,889		\$2,253,889	\$246,874	\$2,007,015
H	Sierra College Blvd Seg #7 (Rocklin S. Limit to Douglas Blvd)	\$2,569,604	\$0				\$2,569,604		\$2,569,604	\$1,181,590	\$1,388,014
I	Sierra College Blvd Seg #8 (Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd)		\$2,074,326	61%	\$1,265,690	59.3%	\$750,206		\$750,206	\$2,325,967	-\$1,575,761
J	Sierra College Blvd Seg #9 (Eureka Rd to E. Roseville Pkwy)		\$3,223,637	83%	\$2,669,033	58.8%	\$1,570,425		\$1,570,425	\$1,093,614	\$476,812
K	Sierra College Blvd Seg #10 (E. Roseville Pkwy to Sac County Line)		\$6,120,476	49%	\$3,004,049	63.2%	\$1,897,429		\$1,897,429	\$2,099,887	-\$202,458
L	Lincoln Bypass	\$23,350,000	\$91,756,915	43%	\$39,691,287	74.8%	\$53,056,372	\$32,400,000	\$32,400,000	\$10,216,055	\$22,183,945
M	I-80 / Douglas Boulevard Interchange	\$5,116,131	\$0				\$5,116,131		\$5,116,131	\$4,403,728	\$712,403
N	SR-65 Widening		\$135,504,446	90%	\$121,730,643	68.4%	\$83,298,691	\$80,400,000	\$80,400,000	\$8,532,857	\$71,867,143
O	I-80 / Rocklin Road Interchange, with WB Aux lane		\$52,000,000	70%	\$36,489,484	74.6%	\$27,221,504	\$23,410,000	\$23,410,000	\$4,481,755	\$18,928,245
P	Auburn-Folsom Rd Widening (Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd)	\$8,000,000	\$0				\$8,000,000		\$8,000,000	\$2,897,631	\$5,102,369
Q	Auburn-Folsom Rd Widening (South of Eureka Rd)		\$0				\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0
R	I-80/SR 65 Interchange	\$2,909,627	\$583,258,269	44%	\$259,497,395	67.2%	\$177,223,166	\$135,000,000	\$135,000,000	\$1,490,828	\$133,509,172
S	Douglas Blvd WB I-80 Ramp		\$1,824,943	89%	\$1,624,476	73.7%	\$1,197,743		\$1,197,743	\$269,448	\$928,295
T	Atlantic Street WB I-80 Ramp	\$650,000	\$0				\$650,000		\$650,000	\$1,857,074	-\$1,207,074
U	Transit Projects		\$100,000,000	37%	\$37,447,786	100.0%	\$37,447,786	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$2,093,446	\$7,906,554
V	I-80 WB Aux Lanes		\$34,600,000	100%	\$34,600,000	60.4%	\$20,910,476	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000		\$13,000,000
W	I-80 EB Aux Lanes		\$14,900,000	27%	\$4,039,641	67.4%	\$2,723,196	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000		\$2,700,000
	Tier 1 Administration										
	Total	\$47,675,362	\$1,958,498,915		\$1,471,079,368	75%			\$358,889,062	\$65,957,989	\$292,931,073
	As a percent of total updated cost estimate								18%	3%	15%

Note: For constructed projects, the Project Cost Estimate and Costs Attributable to SPRTA are equal to the amount SPRTA contributed to build the project; the percent and cost attributable to future development are not recalculated and no longer shown.

The following projects were proposed for SPRTA funding but later dropped: (E) Sierra College Blvd Seg #4 (Granite Dr to I-80 EB Ramps), (X) Sierra College Blvd RR Grade Separation, (Y) Regional Active Transportation Projects, and (Z) SR-193/Sierra College Intersection

Table 11: Estimated Project Costs Applicable to Future Development in SPRTA Area

Project ID	Project Name	Costs Attributable to Future SPRTA Development & Not Yet Collected	Dry Creek	Granite Bay	Lincoln	Newcastle /Horseshoe Bar	Placer Central	Placer West	Rocklin	Roseville West	Roseville East	Sunset	Total for Development in SPRTA Areas
A	Placer Parkway (East)*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
B	Sierra College Blvd (SR 193 to Rocklin City N. Limit)	\$5,454,211	\$1,371	\$16,193	\$3,271,857	\$147,488	\$1,240,635	\$5,139	\$328,429	\$13,457	\$43,431	\$386,211	\$5,454,211
C	Sierra College Blvd Seg #2 (Rocklin N. Limit to Taylor Road)	\$6,229,779	\$2,322	\$31,095	\$3,874,997	\$45,907	\$1,320,451	\$7,378	\$794,360	\$25,821	\$105,629	\$21,820	\$6,229,779
D	Sierra College Blvd (Taylor Rd to Granite Dr)	\$918,134	\$2,574	\$4,469	\$385,023	\$56,801	\$119,999	\$752	\$299,944	\$18,022	\$23,210	\$7,340	\$918,134
F	Sierra College Blvd (I-80 EB Ramps to Rocklin Rd)	\$2,604,274	\$3,047	\$45,611	\$536,409	\$128,868	\$188,100	\$0	\$1,536,892	\$9,990	\$141,430	\$13,927	\$2,604,274
G	Sierra College Blvd (Rocklin Rd to Rocklin S. Limit)	\$2,007,015	\$539	\$48,873	\$507,015	\$125,665	\$163,157	\$0	\$981,891	\$8,246	\$166,452	\$5,177	\$2,007,015
H	Sierra College Blvd (Rocklin S. Limit to Douglas Blvd)	\$1,388,014	\$7,029	\$254,783	\$203,146	\$102,004	\$59,903	\$99	\$292,255	\$53,789	\$358,511	\$56,494	\$1,388,014
I	Sierra College Blvd (Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd)	-\$1,575,761	-\$3,527	-\$171,372	-\$293,636	-\$63,751	-\$45,473	-\$832	-\$273,049	-\$267,616	-\$216,606	-\$239,899	-\$1,575,761
J	Sierra College Blvd (Eureka Rd to E. Roseville Pkwy)	\$476,812	\$2,376	\$32,527	\$107,847	\$16,911	\$12,137	\$415	\$76,154	\$93,920	\$44,769	\$89,756	\$476,812
K	Sierra College Blvd (E. Roseville Pkwy to Sac County Line)	-\$202,458	-\$3,058	-\$4,429	-\$51,041	-\$2,053	-\$2,155	-\$327	-\$18,554	-\$51,850	-\$12,657	-\$56,335	-\$202,458
L	Lincoln Bypass	\$22,183,945	\$304,710	\$45,694	\$15,926,726	\$24,174	\$98,182	\$149,860	\$786,258	\$1,795,494	\$249,642	\$2,803,204	\$22,183,945
M	I-80 / Douglas Boulevard Interchange	\$712,403	\$2,401	\$1	\$374,630	\$8,054	\$9,236	\$1,192	\$51,474	\$38,948	\$26,424	\$200,043	\$712,403
N	SR-65 Widening*	\$71,867,143	\$9,329,312	\$775,317	\$16,614,679	\$715,438	\$952,269	\$216,491	\$5,344,823	\$19,036,624	\$3,638,855	\$15,243,336	\$71,867,143
O	I-80 / Rocklin Road Interchange	\$18,928,245	\$202,698	\$137,158	\$1,111,384	\$130,483	\$69,761	\$1,122	\$13,388,708	\$491,551	\$13,262	\$3,382,117	\$18,928,245
P	Auburn-Folsom Rd Widening (Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd)	\$5,102,369	\$108,013	\$565,967	\$1,318,727	\$145,220	\$77,365	\$8,778	\$460,435	\$1,070,465	\$144,536	\$1,202,862	\$5,102,369
Q	Auburn-Folsom Rd Widening (South of Eureka Rd)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
R	I-80/SR 65 Interchange	\$133,509,172	\$5,259,789	\$319,537	\$50,153,219	\$277,700	\$303,672	\$233,329	\$8,055,012	\$31,760,644	\$965,502	\$36,180,767	\$133,509,172
S	Douglas Blvd WB I-80 Ramp	\$928,295	\$104,631	\$19,186	\$12,210	\$2,323	\$1,595	\$918	\$10,002	\$449,680	\$308,413	\$19,337	\$928,295
T	Atlantic Street WB I-80 Ramp	-\$1,207,074	-\$17	-\$405	-\$10,122	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$20,533	-\$1,062,187	-\$105,564	-\$8,246	-\$1,207,074
U	Transit Projects*	\$7,906,554	\$1,026,376	\$85,297	\$1,827,885	\$78,710	\$104,765	\$23,817	\$588,017	\$2,094,338	\$400,333	\$1,677,015	\$7,906,554
V	I-80 WB Aux Lanes	\$13,000,000	\$15,135	\$41,971	\$6,392,396	\$294,682	\$233,164	\$31,396	\$2,410,648	\$2,527,721	\$250,745	\$802,141	\$13,000,000
W	I-80 EB Aux Lanes	\$2,700,000	\$21,328	\$14,951	\$82,808	\$38,188	\$3,227	\$75	\$2,437,910	\$90,861	\$4,945	\$5,706	\$2,700,000
	Total SPRTA Costs Attributed by District		\$16,380,785	\$2,262,425	\$102,346,159	\$2,272,813	\$4,909,990	\$679,602	\$37,531,079	\$58,197,917	\$6,551,262	\$61,792,775	\$292,931,073
	Administrative Costs (1.5% of total SPRTA project costs)*		\$570,395	\$47,403	\$1,015,824	\$43,742	\$58,222	\$13,236	\$326,783	\$1,163,902	\$222,480	\$931,979	\$4,393,966
	Pre-SPRTA Credits		\$0	-\$1,933,154	-\$929,237	\$0	-\$210,053	\$0	\$0	-\$562,249	-\$1,504,421	\$0	-\$5,139,113
	Total	\$292,931,073	\$16,951,180	\$376,674	\$102,432,745	\$2,316,555	\$4,758,160	\$692,838	\$37,857,862	\$58,799,570	\$5,269,321	\$62,724,755	\$292,185,925

* Note: Allocated pro rata based on the number of DUEs

4.2 Recommended Updated Fees

The recommended new fee per DUE was computed by taking the project costs for each SPRTA district from Table 11 and dividing it by the number of new DUEs expected in each district, from

Table 5. The results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Computation of New Fee/DUE by District

SPRTA Fee District	Share of Project Costs	Growth in DUEs	New SPRTA Fee
	(A)	(B)	(C)=(A)/(B)
Dry Creek	\$16,951,180	14,610	\$1,160
Granite Bay	\$376,674	1,214	\$310
Lincoln	\$102,432,745	26,020	\$3,937
Newcastle/Horseshoe Bar	\$2,316,555	1,120	\$2,068
Placer Central	\$4,758,160	1,491	\$3,191
Placer West	\$692,838	339	\$2,044
Rocklin	\$37,857,862	8,370	\$4,523
Roseville West	\$58,799,570	29,812	\$1,972
Roseville East	\$5,269,321	5,699	\$925
Sunset	\$62,724,755	23,872	\$2,628
Total	\$292,179,659	112,548	
Average			\$2,596

As can be seen in Table 12, the fees vary significantly between fee districts. This is due to differences in how often the trips associated with new development would use expensive facilities. For example, the Lincoln fee district has the highest fees because development there adds the most traffic to the highest-cost project (the I-80/SR 65 interchange). In contrast, the Granite Bay fee district's fees are low because development there would add little traffic to the most expensive projects. It also benefits from the fact that previous payments have reduced its remaining future contribution to the projects most relevant to that district.

Table 13: Updated Recommended Fees for Residential Land Uses

Residential Land Use Category	Unit	2023 SPRTA DUE per Unit	Dry Creek	Granite Bay	Lincoln	Newcastle /Horseshoe Bar	Placer Central	Placer West	Rocklin	Roseville West	Roseville East	Sunset
Single-Family Dwelling												
Small (< 1,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.83	\$963	\$257	\$3,268	\$1,716	\$2,648	\$1,696	\$3,754	\$1,637	\$767	\$2,181
Medium (1,500-2,500 sq.ft.)	DU	1.00	\$1,160	\$310	\$3,937	\$2,068	\$3,191	\$2,044	\$4,523	\$1,972	\$925	\$2,628
Large (>2,500-3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	1.08	\$1,253	\$335	\$4,252	\$2,233	\$3,446	\$2,207	\$4,885	\$2,130	\$999	\$2,838
Very Large (>3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	1.14	\$1,323	\$354	\$4,488	\$2,357	\$3,637	\$2,330	\$5,156	\$2,248	\$1,054	\$2,995
Apartment												
Small (< 1,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.45	\$522	\$140	\$1,772	\$930	\$1,436	\$920	\$2,035	\$888	\$416	\$1,182
Medium (1,500-2,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.54	\$627	\$168	\$2,126	\$1,116	\$1,723	\$1,104	\$2,442	\$1,065	\$499	\$1,419
Large (>2,500-3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.59	\$685	\$183	\$2,323	\$1,220	\$1,882	\$1,206	\$2,668	\$1,164	\$546	\$1,550
Very Large (>3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.62	\$719	\$192	\$2,441	\$1,282	\$1,978	\$1,267	\$2,804	\$1,223	\$573	\$1,629
Low-Rise Condominium												
Small (< 1,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.32	\$371	\$99	\$1,260	\$662	\$1,021	\$654	\$1,447	\$631	\$296	\$841
Medium (1,500-2,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.38	\$441	\$118	\$1,496	\$786	\$1,212	\$777	\$1,719	\$749	\$351	\$998
Large (>2,500-3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.41	\$476	\$127	\$1,614	\$848	\$1,308	\$838	\$1,854	\$809	\$379	\$1,077
Very Large (>3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.44	\$510	\$136	\$1,732	\$910	\$1,404	\$899	\$1,990	\$868	\$407	\$1,156
Mid-Rise Condominium												
Small (< 1,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.15	\$174	\$47	\$591	\$310	\$479	\$307	\$678	\$296	\$139	\$394
Medium (1,500-2,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.18	\$210	\$56	\$713	\$374	\$577	\$370	\$819	\$357	\$167	\$476
Large (>2,500-3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.20	\$232	\$62	\$787	\$414	\$638	\$409	\$905	\$394	\$185	\$526
Very Large (>3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.21	\$244	\$65	\$827	\$434	\$670	\$429	\$950	\$414	\$194	\$552
Mobile Home Park												
Small (< 1,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.51	\$594	\$159	\$2,016	\$1,059	\$1,634	\$1,046	\$2,316	\$1,010	\$473	\$1,345
Medium (1,500-2,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.62	\$716	\$191	\$2,429	\$1,276	\$1,969	\$1,261	\$2,791	\$1,217	\$571	\$1,621
Large (>2,500-3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.67	\$777	\$208	\$2,638	\$1,385	\$2,138	\$1,369	\$3,030	\$1,321	\$620	\$1,760
Very Large (>3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.70	\$812	\$217	\$2,756	\$1,447	\$2,233	\$1,430	\$3,166	\$1,381	\$647	\$1,839
Senior, Single-Family												
Small (< 1,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.26	\$302	\$81	\$1,024	\$538	\$830	\$531	\$1,176	\$513	\$240	\$683
Medium (1,500-2,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.32	\$370	\$99	\$1,256	\$660	\$1,018	\$652	\$1,443	\$629	\$295	\$838
Large (>2,500-3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.34	\$394	\$105	\$1,338	\$703	\$1,085	\$695	\$1,538	\$671	\$314	\$893
Very Large (>3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.36	\$418	\$112	\$1,417	\$744	\$1,149	\$736	\$1,628	\$710	\$333	\$946
Senior, Multi-Family												
Small (< 1,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.22	\$256	\$69	\$870	\$457	\$705	\$452	\$1,000	\$436	\$204	\$581
Medium (1,500-2,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.27	\$309	\$83	\$1,047	\$550	\$849	\$544	\$1,203	\$525	\$246	\$699
Large (>2,500-3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.29	\$336	\$90	\$1,142	\$600	\$925	\$593	\$1,312	\$572	\$268	\$762
Very Large (>3,500 sq.ft.)	DU	0.30	\$348	\$93	\$1,181	\$620	\$957	\$613	\$1,357	\$592	\$277	\$788

Table 14: Updated Recommended Fees for Non-Residential Land Uses

ITE Code	Land Use Category	SPRTA DUE	Dry Creek	Granite Bay	Lincoln	Newcastle /Horseshoe Bar	Placer Central	Placer West	Rocklin	Roseville West	Roseville East	Sunset
Industrial												
110	Light Industrial	0.65 /1,000 s.f.	\$753	\$201	\$2,555	\$1,342	\$2,071	\$1,326	\$2,935	\$1,280	\$600	\$1,705
130	Industrial Park	0.34 /1,000 s.f.	\$393	\$105	\$1,335	\$701	\$1,082	\$693	\$1,533	\$669	\$313	\$891
140	Manufacturing	0.74 /1,000 s.f.	\$857	\$229	\$2,909	\$1,528	\$2,358	\$1,510	\$3,342	\$1,458	\$683	\$1,942
150	Warehousing	0.18 /1,000 s.f.	\$209	\$56	\$709	\$372	\$574	\$368	\$814	\$355	\$166	\$473
151	Mini-Warehousing	0.09 /1,000 s.f.	\$106	\$28	\$358	\$188	\$290	\$186	\$412	\$179	\$84	\$239
Lodging												
310	Hotel	0.57 /Room	\$661	\$177	\$2,244	\$1,179	\$1,819	\$1,165	\$2,578	\$1,124	\$527	\$1,498
311	All Suites Hotel	0.35 /Room	\$404	\$108	\$1,370	\$720	\$1,110	\$711	\$1,574	\$686	\$322	\$914
312	Business Hotel	0.30 /Room	\$348	\$93	\$1,181	\$620	\$957	\$613	\$1,357	\$592	\$277	\$788
320	Motel	0.29 /Room	\$335	\$90	\$1,138	\$598	\$922	\$591	\$1,307	\$570	\$267	\$759
Recreational												
411	City Park	0.14 /Acre	\$157	\$42	\$531	\$279	\$431	\$276	\$611	\$266	\$125	\$355
430	Golf Course	3.96 /Hole	\$4,590	\$1,227	\$15,574	\$8,179	\$12,622	\$8,084	\$17,892	\$7,802	\$3,658	\$10,395
444	Movie Theater	2.57 /1,000 s.f.	\$2,977	\$796	\$10,102	\$5,305	\$8,187	\$5,244	\$11,606	\$5,061	\$2,373	\$6,742
492	Health/Fitness Club	0.63 /1,000 s.f.	\$727	\$195	\$2,468	\$1,296	\$2,001	\$1,281	\$2,836	\$1,237	\$580	\$1,647
493	Athletic Club	3.01 /1,000 s.f.	\$3,493	\$934	\$11,854	\$6,225	\$9,607	\$6,153	\$13,618	\$5,939	\$2,784	\$7,912
495	Recreational Community Center	1.20 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,389	\$371	\$4,712	\$2,475	\$3,819	\$2,446	\$5,414	\$2,361	\$1,107	\$3,145
Institutional												
536	Private School (K - 12)*	4.03 /1000 s.f. Students	\$4,671	\$1,249	\$15,849	\$8,324	\$12,845	\$8,227	\$18,209	\$7,941	\$3,723	\$10,579
560	Church	0.37 /1,000 s.f.	\$425	\$114	\$1,441	\$757	\$1,168	\$748	\$1,655	\$722	\$338	\$962
565	Day Care Center	3.50 /1,000 s.f.	\$4,063	\$1,086	\$13,787	\$7,241	\$11,173	\$7,157	\$15,839	\$6,907	\$3,238	\$9,202
Medical												
254	Assisted Living	0.11 /bed	\$123	\$33	\$417	\$219	\$338	\$217	\$479	\$209	\$98	\$279
255	Continuing Care Community	0.08 / Unit	\$97	\$26	\$331	\$174	\$268	\$172	\$380	\$166	\$78	\$221
610	Hospital	1.77 /1,000 s.f.	\$2,056	\$550	\$6,976	\$3,664	\$5,654	\$3,621	\$8,015	\$3,495	\$1,638	\$4,656
620	Nursing Home	0.26 /1,000 s.f.	\$306	\$82	\$1,039	\$546	\$842	\$539	\$1,194	\$521	\$244	\$694
630	Clinic	3.47 /1,000 s.f.	\$4,022	\$1,076	\$13,649	\$7,168	\$11,062	\$7,085	\$15,681	\$6,838	\$3,206	\$9,110
Office												
710	Up to 50,000 s.f.	1.94 /1,000 s.f.	\$2,247	\$601	\$7,625	\$4,005	\$6,180	\$3,958	\$8,761	\$3,820	\$1,791	\$5,090
	50,001 - 150,000 s.f.	1.66 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,922	\$514	\$6,523	\$3,426	\$5,287	\$3,386	\$7,494	\$3,268	\$1,532	\$4,354
	150,001 - 300,000 s.f.	1.45 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,680	\$449	\$5,700	\$2,994	\$4,620	\$2,959	\$6,549	\$2,856	\$1,339	\$3,805
	300,001 - 500,000 s.f.	1.31 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,518	\$406	\$5,149	\$2,704	\$4,173	\$2,673	\$5,916	\$2,580	\$1,209	\$3,437
	500,000 - 800,000 s.f.	1.21 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,402	\$375	\$4,756	\$2,498	\$3,854	\$2,469	\$5,464	\$2,383	\$1,117	\$3,174
	> 800,000 s.f.	1.12 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,297	\$347	\$4,401	\$2,312	\$3,567	\$2,285	\$5,057	\$2,205	\$1,034	\$2,938
720	Medical - Dental Office Building	3.28 /1,000 s.f.	\$3,810	\$1,019	\$12,928	\$6,790	\$10,478	\$6,711	\$14,853	\$6,477	\$3,037	\$8,629

Table 14: Updated Recommended Fees for Non-Residential Land Uses (continued)

ITE Code	Land Use Category	SPRTA DUE	Dry Creek	Granite Bay	Lincoln	Newcastle /Horseshoe Bar	Placer Central	Placer West	Rocklin	Roseville West	Roseville East	Sunset
Retail												
812	Building Materials & Lumber Yard	0.29 /1,000 s.f.	\$340	\$91	\$1,153	\$606	\$935	\$599	\$1,325	\$578	\$271	\$770
815	Discount Store	1.06 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,231	\$329	\$4,177	\$2,194	\$3,385	\$2,168	\$4,799	\$2,093	\$981	\$2,788
816	Hardware Store	0.39 /1,000 s.f.	\$450	\$120	\$1,527	\$802	\$1,238	\$793	\$1,755	\$765	\$359	\$1,019
817	Nursery	0.90 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,049	\$280	\$3,559	\$1,869	\$2,884	\$1,847	\$4,089	\$1,783	\$836	\$2,375
820	Shopping Center											
	< 200,000 s.f.	1.14 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,320	\$353	\$4,480	\$2,353	\$3,631	\$2,326	\$5,147	\$2,244	\$1,052	\$2,990
	200,001-500,000 s.f.	1.48 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,715	\$459	\$5,819	\$3,056	\$4,716	\$3,020	\$6,685	\$2,915	\$1,367	\$3,884
	500,000s.f.-1,000,000 s.f.	1.60 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,854	\$496	\$6,291	\$3,304	\$5,099	\$3,266	\$7,228	\$3,152	\$1,478	\$4,199
	>1,000,000 s.f.	1.58 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,833	\$490	\$6,220	\$3,267	\$5,041	\$3,229	\$7,146	\$3,116	\$1,461	\$4,152
931	Quality Restaurant	3.28 /1,000 s.f.	\$3,803	\$1,017	\$12,905	\$6,778	\$10,459	\$6,699	\$14,826	\$6,465	\$3,031	\$8,613
932	High Turnover Restaurant	2.78 /1,000 s.f.	\$3,225	\$862	\$10,944	\$5,748	\$8,870	\$5,681	\$12,574	\$5,483	\$2,571	\$7,305
933	Fast Food w/o Drive-In	5.89 /1,000 s.f.	\$6,829	\$1,826	\$23,172	\$12,170	\$18,780	\$12,028	\$26,622	\$11,609	\$5,443	\$15,466
934	Fast Food Drive-In	5.85 /1,000 s.f.	\$6,792	\$1,816	\$23,046	\$12,104	\$18,678	\$11,963	\$26,477	\$11,546	\$5,413	\$15,382
941	Quick Lube Vehicle Shop	1.88 /Position	\$2,186	\$584	\$7,417	\$3,895	\$6,011	\$3,850	\$8,521	\$3,716	\$1,742	\$4,950
942	Automobile Care Center	0.87 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,014	\$271	\$3,441	\$1,807	\$2,789	\$1,786	\$3,953	\$1,724	\$808	\$2,296
841	New Car Sales	1.46 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,688	\$451	\$5,728	\$3,008	\$4,642	\$2,973	\$6,581	\$2,870	\$1,345	\$3,823
843	Automobile Parts Sales	2.93 /1,000 s.f.	\$3,396	\$908	\$11,523	\$6,052	\$9,339	\$5,981	\$13,238	\$5,773	\$2,706	\$7,691
944	Gasoline/Service Station	1.13 /Pump	\$1,305	\$349	\$4,429	\$2,326	\$3,589	\$2,299	\$5,088	\$2,219	\$1,040	\$2,956
945	Gas/Serv. Stn. W/Conv. Market	1.49 /Pump	\$1,728	\$462	\$5,862	\$3,079	\$4,751	\$3,043	\$6,735	\$2,937	\$1,377	\$3,912
848	Tire Store	1.40 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,629	\$436	\$5,527	\$2,903	\$4,480	\$2,869	\$6,350	\$2,769	\$1,298	\$3,689
850	Supermarket	1.55 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,803	\$482	\$6,118	\$3,213	\$4,958	\$3,176	\$7,029	\$3,065	\$1,437	\$4,083
851	Convenience Market	3.45 /1,000 s.f.	\$4,000	\$1,070	\$13,574	\$7,129	\$11,001	\$7,046	\$15,595	\$6,801	\$3,188	\$9,060
857	Discount Club	1.62 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,880	\$503	\$6,378	\$3,349	\$5,169	\$3,311	\$7,327	\$3,195	\$1,498	\$4,257
862	Home Improvement Superstore	0.46 /1,000 s.f.	\$529	\$141	\$1,795	\$943	\$1,455	\$932	\$2,062	\$899	\$422	\$1,198
863	Electronics Superstore	0.98 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,134	\$303	\$3,846	\$2,020	\$3,117	\$1,997	\$4,419	\$1,927	\$903	\$2,567
864	Toy/Childrens Superstore	1.13 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,311	\$351	\$4,449	\$2,336	\$3,605	\$2,309	\$5,111	\$2,229	\$1,045	\$2,969
880	Drugstore W/O Drive-Thru	1.53 /1,000 s.f.	\$1,777	\$475	\$6,031	\$3,168	\$4,888	\$3,131	\$6,929	\$3,022	\$1,417	\$4,025
881	Drugstore W/Drive-Thru	2.00 /1,000 s.f.	\$2,323	\$621	\$7,881	\$4,139	\$6,388	\$4,091	\$9,055	\$3,949	\$1,851	\$5,260
890	Furniture Store	0.31 /1,000 s.f.	\$361	\$96	\$1,224	\$643	\$992	\$636	\$1,407	\$613	\$288	\$817
911	Walk-In Bank	3.25 /1,000 s.f.	\$3,774	\$1,009	\$12,806	\$6,726	\$10,379	\$6,648	\$14,713	\$6,416	\$3,008	\$8,547
912	Drive-In Bank	4.08 /1,000 s.f.	\$4,730	\$1,265	\$16,050	\$8,430	\$13,008	\$8,332	\$18,440	\$8,041	\$3,770	\$10,713

4.3 Funding from Other Sources

The SPRTA program will provide only part of the funding needed to construct the projects on the SPRTA project list. The rest of the funding must come from other sources. Table 15 identifies other potential sources of funding for SPRTA projects. The figures shown in Table 15 are estimates based on information available at this time, and could be higher or lower depending on how the funding situation evolves over time. There are some gaps in the estimated funding, but this is not unusual for a program extending over decades because funding from State and Federal sources changes from year to year in ways that are difficult to predict far in advance.

Table 15: Possible Other Sources of Funding for SPRTA Projects

Project Name	2023 Fee Update		Other Sources		
	Total Project Cost Estimate ¹	Total SPRTA Share of Funding	SPRTA Tier 2 Funding	Future Transportation Sales Tax Contribution ²	Non-SPRTA Funding Sources ³
Placer Parkway	\$893,992,673	\$10,690,362	\$644,292,508	\$25,000,000	\$214,009,803
Sierra College Blvd	\$58,311,272	\$36,324,826			\$21,986,446
Lincoln Bypass	\$115,106,915	\$32,400,000			\$82,706,915
I-80 / Douglas Boulevard Interchange	\$5,116,131	\$5,116,131			\$0
SR-65 Widening	\$135,504,446	\$80,400,000		\$33,000,000	\$22,104,446
I-80 / Rocklin Road Interchange	\$52,000,000	\$23,410,000		\$27,700,000	\$890,000
Auburn-Folsom Rd Widening	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000			\$0
I-80/SR 65 Interchange ⁴	\$586,167,896	\$135,000,000	\$6,782,026	\$265,000,000	\$179,385,869
Douglas Blvd WB I-80 Ramp	\$1,824,943	\$1,197,743			\$627,200
Atlantic Street WB I-80 Ramp	\$650,000	\$650,000			\$0
Transit Projects	\$100,000,000	\$10,000,000		\$60,000,000	\$30,000,000
I-80 WB Aux Lanes	\$34,600,000	\$13,000,000			\$21,600,000
I-80 EB Aux Lanes	\$14,900,000	\$2,700,000			\$12,200,000
Total	\$2,006,174,277	\$358,889,062	\$651,074,535	\$410,700,000	\$585,510,680

1. Estimated costs as of April 2023.

2. Based on the March 2020 Sales Tax Expenditure Plan.

3. Includes State and Federal funding, Tribal funding, Local Agency funding, grants, and STIP

4. The amount of “Other Sources” of funding for this project recognizes a commitment from the Building Industry Authority to assist SPRTA in securing substantial state and federal funding for the interchange. The future funding mix for the 80/65 interchange, including the SPRTA funding commitment, may be revised based on SPRTA’s success rate in obtaining state and federal funding for the project.

5. Findings

The Mitigation Fee Act, as set forth in the California Government Code Sections 66000 through 66008, establishes the framework for mitigation fees in the State of California. The Act requires agencies to make five findings with respect to a proposed fee. These are described in the subsections of the California Government Code described below.

5.1 Purpose of the Fee

§ 66001(a)(1): Identify the purpose of the fee

The purpose of SPRTA is to maintain a cooperative funding program to mitigate the cumulative indirect regional impacts of future developments on traffic conditions on high-priority roadways in south Placer County. The fees will help fund improvements needed to maintain the target level of service in the face of the higher traffic volumes brought on by new developments.

5.2 Use of Fee Revenues

§ 66001(a)(2): Identify the use to which the fees will be put. If the use is financing facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in Section 65403 or 66002, may be made in applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the public facilities for which the fee is charged.

The Mitigation Fee Act requires that the local government identify the public facilities that are to be financed through the use of the impact fee. In the case of the SPRTA fee program, candidate projects for inclusion in the fee program were proposed by member agencies and then vetted by the Technical Advisory Committee. The projects were then evaluated using the SPRTA Travel Demand Model to ensure that the projects were in fact needed to accommodate future traffic. The final list of projects eligible to receive SPRTA funding is shown in Table 8.

5.3 Use/Type-of-Development Relationship

§ 66001(a)(3): Determine the reasonable relationship between the fees' use and the type of development project on which the fees are imposed

To determine the “use” relationship, the development being assessed an impact fee must be reasonably shown to derive some use or benefit from the facility being built using the fee. In the case of SPRTA the projects to be funded were selected based on their ability to satisfy three sets of criteria, namely: that they were of high priority as expressed by the member agencies, that they performed a regional (as opposed to strictly local) function, and that the need for the project was at least in part attributable to new development. The fact that the projects that will be funded by SPRTA are high-priority regional roads means that all of the county’s new residents and businesses will benefit in important ways from the maintenance of a reasonable level of service. Most drivers in the new developments can be expected to use these roads regularly, and those that do not will nevertheless benefit because good traffic conditions on the SPRTA-funded roads will keep drivers from diverting to other roads and causing congestion in other parts of the county. Even residents or workers in the new developments who do not drive at all will benefit from access to goods and services made possible in part by the serviceability of the regional road network.

5.4 Need/Type-of-Development Relationship

§ 66001(a)(4): Determine the reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the types of development on which the fees are imposed

To determine the “need” relationship, the facilities to be financed must be shown to be needed at least in part because of the new development. One of the purposes of the current study is to determine extent to which each of the projects on the SPRTA project list are needed because of new land development. This was determined by analyzing the forecast traffic demand with the expected degree of new development and comparing that with the demand without new development. Projects were analyzed individually and the degree to which the need for the project was attributable to new development varied widely from project to project. This analysis is described in Section 4.1 of this report.

5.5 Proportionality Relationship

§ 66001(b): In any action imposing a fee as a condition of approval of a development project by a local agency, the local agency shall determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

The “proportionality” relationship requires that there be rough proportionality between the fee charged to each type of development and the cost of the facility being financed. In the case of SPRTA the differences in the traffic generated by different types of development were factored into the fee to be charged for each type, as is described in

Table 4: Dwelling Unit Equivalence (DUE) Factor for Different Land Use Categories

. Within each development category, the fee charged is based on the size of the project, usually measured in square feet, so that the larger projects, which have greater traffic impacts, are charged a higher fee than smaller projects.

5.6 Residential Floor Area

CGC§ 66016.5(a)(5)(B): A nexus study is not required to comply with subparagraph (A) if the local agency makes a finding that includes all of the following:

- (i) An explanation as to why square footage is not appropriate metric to calculate fees imposed on housing development project.*
- (ii) An explanation that an alternative basis of calculating the fee bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.*
- (iii) That other policies in the fee structure support smaller developments, or otherwise ensure that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees.*

CGC§ 66016.5(a)(5) subparagraph (A), which is new with AB-602, requires fees on housing development to be proportionate to the square footage of proposed units of the development unless the agency chooses to make the three findings described above. During the course of this study, we found that while the traffic impacts from residential developments are related to the floor area of the unit, the relationship is not one of direct proportionality. We therefore make the following findings with respect to the SPRTA fee program:

- That square footage, applied as a direct proportion, is not an appropriate metric for calculating traffic impact fees for residential developments, based on substantial evidence showing that the number of vehicle trips generated by residential units is not directly proportional to the floor area (see Table 1)
- That an alternative basis of calculating traffic impact fees, based on the expected number of trips generated by small, medium, large, and very large units, but not directly proportional to floor area, would bear a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development. This alternative method is supported by substantial evidence from the American Housing Survey and the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP)
- That the differences in trip generation characteristics between single-family residences, multi-family residences, mobile homes in mobile home parks, and age-restricted senior residences, as determined through surveys collected by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, justifies using separate fee levels for these different types of units, and
- That differentiating between small, medium, large, and very large units within each category of housing would ensure that smaller developments are not charged fees disproportionate to their traffic impacts.

