



A G E N D A

Wednesday, August 27, 2025

10:00 AM ⇐ NOTE NEW TIME

**Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue, Auburn CA 95603**

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCEDURES

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION INSTRUCTIONS: This meeting will be conducted as an in-person meeting at the locations noted above. A remote teleconference Zoom address is listed for the public's convenience and in the event a Board Member requests remote participation due to just cause or emergency circumstances pursuant to Government Code section 54953(f). Please be advised that if a Board Member is not participating in the meeting remotely, remote participation for members of the public is provided for convenience only, and in the event that the Zoom connection malfunctions for any reason, the Board of Directors reserves the right to conduct the meeting without remote access. By participating in this meeting, you acknowledge that you are being recorded.

Agendas, Supplemental Materials and Minutes of the Board of Directors are available on the internet at: <https://www.pctpa.net/sprta-meetings>. Public records related to an agenda item that are distributed less than 72 hours before this meeting are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Agency office located at 2260 Douglas Blvd., Suite 130, Roseville, California and will be made available to the public on the Agency website.

Remote access: <https://placer-ca-gov.zoom.us/j/97573064405>

You can also dial in using your phone: +1 669 900 6833 **Webinar ID:** 975 7306 4405

A. Flag Salute

B. Roll Call

C. Agenda Review

Matt Click, Executive Director

Info

D. AB 2449

Matt Click, Executive Director

Action

- If necessary, the Board will consider approval of any Directors' request to participate remotely and utilize a "just cause" or "emergency circumstance" exception for remote meeting participation pursuant to AB 2449 (Gov. Code 54953(f)).

E. Approval of Minutes: June 25, 2025

Action
Pg. 1

F. Public Comment

Persons may address the Board on items not on this agenda. Please limit comments to three (3) minutes.

G. Tier II Development Impact Fee Allocation Request for the Placer Parkway Phase 1 Project

Action
Pg. 2

- Adopt Resolution #25-06 allocating \$139,100,000 of current and future Tier II Development Impact Fee (Tier II) funds to the Placer Parkway Phase 1 Project as follows: \$200,000 for the environmental phase, \$2,900,000 for the right-of-way (ROW) and utility relocation phase, and \$136,000,000 for the construction phase.

H. Executive Director's Report

Info

I. Board Direction to Staff

J. Informational Items

1. SPRTA TAC Minutes: August 12, 2025

Info
Pg. 5

**Next regularly scheduled SPRTA Board Meeting
September 24, 2025**



ACTION MINUTES
June 25, 2025

A meeting of the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) Board convened on Wednesday, June 25, 2025, at 10:45 AM at the Placer County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 175 Fulweiler Avenue, California.

Board in Attendance:

- Ben Brown (City of Lincoln)
- Bruce Houdesheldt (City of Roseville)
- Suzanne Jones (Placer County)

Staff:

- Matt Click
- Rick Carter
- Mike Costa
- Jodi LaCosse
- Cory Peterson
- Solvi Sabol

Agenda Review

No changes to the June 25, 2025 SPRTA Board of Directors agenda.

AB 2449

No action necessary.

Approval of Action Minutes: April 23, 2025

Upon motion by Houdesheldt and second by Brown, the April 23, 2025 Board meeting minutes were approved.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

FY 2025/26 Administrative Budget

Presentation provided by Rick Carter, Deputy Executive Director

Upon motion by Houdesheldt, seconded by Brown, the Board unanimously approved the FY 2025/26 Administrative Budget as provided.

ADJOURN

The SPRTA Board meeting concluded at approximately 10:56 AM.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED BOARD MEETING: August 27, 2025.

Matt Click, Executive Director

Suzanne Jones, Chair

Solvi Sabol, Clerk of the Board

SPRTA Board of Directors
TIER II FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR PLACER PARKWAY PHASE 1 PROJECT
August 2025
Page 2

(UAIC). This results in the Tier II funding construction cost estimate of \$136,000,000. There is an existing MOU between the SPRTA agencies dated May 24, 2023 acknowledging that the UAIC has agreed to loan Placer County approximately \$27.7 million for the construction of Placer Parkway (in addition to the \$9 million noted above) and that the County will advance the remainder of needed funding for the project. This MOU also commits future Tier II revenue to repaying the County for the actual costs of the eligible Placer Parkway Phase 1 Project costs, including interest equal to the annual Tier II inflation adjustments.

Financial Analysis

Upon receipt of acceptable invoices, PCTPA will transmit Tier II funds to the County for actual eligible costs up to the allocation amount. Because this allocation amount far exceeds the current fund balance, PCTPA will transmit future revenue to the County on a quarterly basis until the County is fully reimbursed for actual eligible costs, including interest equal to the annual Tier II inflation adjustments, up to the allocation amount. Upon completion of the construction phase a final accounting of the costs will be known and an amended allocation may be requested to identify the final costs and include provisions for continuous adjustments for the annual inflation adjustment. The SPRTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) concurs with the staff recommendation.

RC:MBC:ss

RESOLUTION NO. 25-06

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
ALLOCATING TIER II DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES TO
THE PLACER PARKWAY PHASE 1 PROJECT**

The following resolution was duly passed by the Board of the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority at a regular meeting held August 27, 2025 by the following vote on roll call:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT/ABSTAIN:

WHEREAS, the County of Placer, the City of Roseville, the City of Rocklin, and the City of Lincoln (“Local Jurisdictions”) signed a Memorandum of Agreement effective May 27, 2009 to establish the Tier II Development Fee Program (“Tier II Fee”); and

WHEREAS, the Local Jurisdictions comprise the member agencies of the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (“Authority”) and the Authority is designated as the administrator of the Tier II Fee; and

WHEREAS, the Tier II Fee, has specified a total contribution to the Placer Parkway as a high-priority regional connector between State Route (SR) 65 and SR 70/99 at \$475,000,000, of which \$463,000,000 remains unallocated; and

WHEREAS, the Placer Parkway Tier I Corridor Preservation Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) was adopted by the SPRTA Board in December 2009 and received a Federal Record of Decision (ROD) in May 2010; and

WHEREAS, the SPRTA Board designated the County of Placer as lead agency for the Placer Parkway Phase 1 environmental and design in October 2009; and

WHEREAS, County of Placer in completing the Right-of-Way Acquisition and Utility Relocation phase of the project and proceeding to the construction phase of the project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Authority allocates \$139,100,000 from the Tier II Fee to the County of Placer for the Placer Parkway Phase 1 Project as follows: \$200,000 for the environmental phase, \$2,900,000 for the right-of-way acquisition and utility relocation phase, and \$136,000,000 for the construction phase.

Matt Click, AICP
Executive Director

Suzanne Jones
Chair

Attest: _____
Solvi Sabol, Board Secretary

SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Summary
August 12, 2025 - 2:00 PM

Technical Advisory Committee

Araceli Cazarez, City of Lincoln
Vin Cay, City of Lincoln
Katie Jackson, Placer County
Richard Moorehead, Placer County
Jake Hanson, City of Roseville
Mark Johnson, City of Roseville

Staff

Rick Carter
Matt Click
Cory Peterson
Solvi Sabol

Placer Parkway Allocation *(Rick Carter)*

The County has requested additional funding to cover the rising costs of the Placer Parkway project. Specifically, they are asking for \$2.9 million to cover right-of-way costs, \$200,000 for environmental expenses, and \$136 million for construction, bringing the total request to approximately \$139.1 million. The project is scheduled to go out to bid by October. The UAIC is contributing significantly, with about \$9 million in funds plus a \$27 million loan to the County. The UAIC's loan is part of the \$136 million construction cost eligible for SPRTA reimbursement.

The total project allocation far exceeds the available funds, approximately \$6 million unallocated. The County will advance the needed funding and be repaid with future SPRTA revenue, including interest based on the annual Construction Cost Index (CCI). This repayment could span decades, with current annual revenues of around \$6 million.

Cost estimates for the project have increased due to rising construction costs and the complexity of the project, which includes an interchange and railroad tracks. To help mitigate some of these costs, Placer Ranch is being consulted to provide fill material at a reduced cost.

Regarding fee allocation, nearly 99% of the SPRTA fees are allocated to Placer Parkway, with the remaining 1% going toward the I-80/SR 65 interchange.

The recommendation is to approve an allocation above the current available funds acknowledging the County will be repaid as funds become available, in accordance with the 2023 MOU. The TAC concurred with the allocation recommendation.

Patio Fee Discussion *(Cory Peterson)*

The discussion on patio fees stemmed from a desire to create consistency among the three cities and the county regarding the fees for outdoor and indoor enclosed patios, particularly in relation to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). Several agencies were surveyed to understand their policies:

- Folsom, Elk Grove, and Sacramento City charge no fees for patios.
- Sacramento County charges 33%.
- Placer County charges based on patio usage and geographic location, acknowledging seasonal differences (e.g., patios in certain areas are used less due to weather conditions).

There was no existing technical data specifically for patios regarding traffic generation, so it was highlighted that the decision is primarily a policy issue for each agency. The SPRTA members were asked whether they wanted to create a unified policy or continue their individual approaches.

The conversation touched on several points:

- One member suggested charging fees for large covered patios used most of the year, but expressed concerns about keeping fees competitive for businesses.
- Some members pointed out the challenge of creating internal consistency, and whether to align with other agencies' methods or establish a unique policy.
- There was also concern about the defensibility of charging fees for patios without technical studies supporting the impact, although some believed it was possible to justify fees reasonably.

Further feedback indicated:

- Placer County indicated that they had never faced legal challenges for charging patio fees, though businesses occasionally question fee charges.
- The City of Lincoln was not in favor of charging, primarily due to concerns about retail sales tax generation and the risk of burdening businesses.
- Placer County charges fees for patios based on the impact on the transportation network, especially for restaurants with outdoor patios. This policy evolved over time but wasn't based on specific studies.
- Sacramento County uses a 33% charge based on a practical estimate that patios are usable around one-third of the time, taking weather conditions into account.

Ultimately, the general consensus among TAC members was to drop the idea of creating a unified policy for patio fees. The complexity and lack of consistency across agencies made it challenging to establish one approach, especially considering that patio fees were considered a smaller issue compared to ADU fees. The meeting concluded with the decision to not move forward with further action unless any agency wanted to revisit the topic in the future.

SB 937 Discussion *(Rick Carter)*

The Tier 1 Fees are affected by SB 937 and must be collected on residential units at the time of occupancy or final inspection unless specific conditions are met, such as having already incurred certain expenses. However, the Tier 2 Fees are exempt from the provisions of SB 937 since they are categorized as DA (Development Agreement) based fees, which are not subject to the new law.

An important aspect discussed was the treatment of low-income housing. SB 937 has special provisions for low-income units, where fees cannot be collected early. However, performance bonds or letters of credit can be used in these cases to ensure payment of fees.

There was also discussion around how Tier 2 Fees are handled differently across agencies. Typically, Tier 2 Fees are collected at the time of permit issuance, but complications can arise when reconciling the fees between SPRTA reports and internal finance departments, as they are recorded differently. One recommendation was to avoid deferring Tier 2 Fees, as it could complicate the accounting process further.

In terms of the County's position, they have already reviewed the impact of SB 937 with their legal counsel and concluded that Tier 2 Fees are exempt from the new legislation. However, the

County is applying SB 937's provisions to its county-wide traffic fee program. There remains some uncertainty about how to handle performance bonds or letters of credit for low-income housing, and this will likely require further coordination.

In the broader context, there is a need for a consistent approach across the agencies, especially concerning how low-income housing fees, bonds, and letters of credit are addressed. Some members suggested it might be easier to align SPRTA's processes with the practices already in place at individual agencies to ensure consistency.

The group agreed that further discussions are needed to solidify policies around Nexus-based fees, and the handling of Tier 2 Fees in the context of SB 937 will continue to evolve.

Conclusion

The meeting concluded with the understanding that Tier 1 Fees must be collected at either occupancy or final inspection, while Tier 2 Fees remain exempt from the provisions of SB 937 and will continue to be collected at permit issuance. The treatment of low-income housing and related performance bonds or letters of credit will need more discussion. Each agency is encouraged to align with their existing policies, and further conversations on this topic will take place in the future to ensure consistency across jurisdictions.

Other

August 27: SPRTA Board Meeting

September 9: SPRTA TAC Meeting

Adjourn: 2:45 PM

SS:rc:mbc