

SCTDF Update
Stakeholder Questions and Comments (Ver. 3/11/19, Added Q131>Q136)

Stakeholder Questions and (County Staff) Responses

Stakeholder Questions (**Q#.**), and County Staff/DKS Associates/Mark Thomas Answers (**A#.**) in response to the draft SCTDF documents provided online for review. These Q & A are ordered chronologically when received by staff.

Q1. Intersection #32 (Zinfandel & Woodring): the estimate for this intersection of a Collector with an Arterial appears to include a new traffic signal, Class 'A' frontage improvements, and full ROW & easement acquisition costs, including for pavement and frontage along the Collector leg of the intersection. Why are the collector leg, the culvert improvements beneath it, and the signal included (contrary to DKS' memo)? There are a number of other major road intersections with minor streets within the Jackson corridor that this applies to as well.

A1. **The intersection estimate for Zinfandel/Woodring (No. 32) has been updated to exclude the signal and roadway improvements on the Woodring leg. Additional intersection estimates for collector roadways with arterials have been updated to eliminate the collector leg costs.**

Q2. Intersections 202, 203, 204, 600, 601, 602, etc. (incl. many other intersections of Collectors with Arterials or Thoroughfares within the limits of the Jackson Corridor development proposals): It makes sense why the minor street leg, frontage improvements, and signals for these intersections wouldn't be included in the SCTDF on account of surrounding development proposals. However, it would appear that the mainline turn lane improvements are included. This applies to numerous proposed intersections within the Jackson Corridor that do not yet exist within projects that have not yet been approved. What is the rationale behind inclusion of these proposed intersections when very similar intersections for both existing conditions (example: along Elverta Road east and west of the Elverta Specific Plan and at Palladay Road) or proposed conditions within projects that have been approved (Cordova Hills: North Loop Road at Town Center Blvd. and at Ridgeline Road, University Blvd. at Town Center Blvd. and at Ridgeline Road, Chrysanthy Blvd. at Town Center Blvd; Elverta Specific Plan: Loop Road East and West at Elverta Road) are not being included?

A2. **Costs have not been revised based on this comment. The collector intersections were included in the Jackson corridor since that level of detail already existed from prior cost estimates. The cost of 500 feet of an arterial segment is not significantly different from the cost resulting from the SCTDF method used to include intersections with collector roadways. While there some cost for turn lanes there is no frontage improvements for a portion of the intersection.**

Q3. If there's not any significant cost difference between inclusion of these intersection costs for their main line improvements (#2 above) vs. not breaking them out separately from the adjacent segment improvements, why not be consistent re inclusion (or exclusion) across the SCTDF plan area?

A3. **Costs have not been revised based on this comment. As discussed under Question 2, the inclusion of collector intersection on some roadways does not result in a significant difference in costs.**

Q4. Why are certain major road intersection improvements (both existing and proposed) not included? Existing intersection example: Elverta Road at 16th Street, or Elverta Road at Rio Linda Blvd.; proposed conditions: University Blvd. (Cordova Hills) at Grant Line Road. This would also include new required signals at existing collectors intersection major roads to be widened.

A4. Elverta Road at Rio Linda Blvd is intersection 702 and has a separate cost. Major road intersections at Elverta/16th St and Grant Line/University have been added to the intersection cost estimates. Roadway segment estimates include modifications to existing collector street signals. The locations of the modified signals are shown as red dots on the map that is part of the Cost Estimation Assumption Memo. Costs to install new signals at new collector roadways is not included.

Q5. Why is Elverta Road shown to be a 4-lane improvement (Table 1 and Figure 1), when the General Plan calls for 6 lanes at buildout (post-2030)?

A5. The original forecast traffic demand did not warrant a 6 lane roadway, the updated forecast traffic demand in the SCTDF analysis now warrants 6 lanes.

Q6. Regarding question #5 above, how does this 4-lane inclusion of Elverta Road in the SCTDF relate to the Elverta Specific Plan road section that has Elverta Road being built to 4 lanes “from the outside in” with a 34’-wide median to accommodate future 6-lane widening in the median?

A6. The updated forecast traffic demand in the SCTDF analysis now warrants 6 lanes. As such, it include 2 phases of construction (2 to 4-lane, and 4 to 6-lane) including an additional 20% cost for phasing.

Q7. Why are frontage improvements along Elverta Road west of Rio Linda Blvd. excluded per Figure 2?

A7. In the September 2018 Draft Nexus Study, future traffic forecasts on Elverta Road required four lanes. Yet ultimately that roadway would have 6 lanes. Under those circumstances, the County would not implement full frontage improvements until the roadway was widened to six lanes. In the updated forecasts, however, Elverta Road will require 6 lanes and full frontage improvements would be implemented except where there is planned adjacent development (including Elverta Specific Plan and North Precinct).

Q8. Please correct the spelling of Kiefer Blvd. throughout the document and appendixes. It’s currently spelled as “Keifer”.

A8. Corrected as noted.

Q9. DKS’ memorandum describes a 30-year development horizon through 2047 and clarifies which County growth areas it assumes to be built out. Please add a paragraph/section describing assumed growth in adjacent, traffic-contributing jurisdictions.

A9. The assumed amount of development growth within cities in Sacramento County is shown in the Nexus Study. SACOG has assumed that residential development within the cities in Sacramento County

will be approaching built out levels by 2036. The SCTDF has assumed additional development in major growth areas in cities that were not at residential buildout levels, including Folsom South of US 50, Greenbrier, Panhandle and Delta Shores. Additional, the forecast traffic demand has been revised and the horizon year extended to about 2050.

Q10. Antelope Road (SCTDF segment No. 17): why is this called out as a 4-lane roadway in Table 1 both in terms of the SCTDF as well as the General Plan when the General Plan Transportation diagram shows this to be a pre-2030 thoroughfare?

A10. This table, which will be included in the Nexus Study, was corrected to show Segment 17 as a 6 lane thoroughfare.

Q11. Table 3 of DKS' memorandum identifies assumed funding for portions of certain County roads to come from adjacent jurisdictions. Example: 16th Street Elkhorn Blvd. to County Line shows 50% of project cost funding coming from Placer County; Calvine Road has 50% of its funding shown to come from the City of Elk Grove; Elkhorn Blvd. has 50% of its funding coming from the City of Sacramento; Grant Line Road along the City of RC and Elk Grove limits shows 50% of its funding after Measure 'A' accounting to come from the City of Rancho Cordova and Elk Grove, respectively; Jackson Road shows funding from the City of Sacramento and Rancho Cordova, respectively; etc.. How realistic is this outside funding when the County has a reciprocal funding agreement only with The City of RC?

A11. The County has a cooperative relationship with the adjacent jurisdictions. However, work within other jurisdictions is under the control of those jurisdictions, including prioritizing improvements and the amount of funding allocated to those improvements. While the County endeavors to work out agreements with other jurisdictions to deliver projects, we cannot guarantee agreement will be in place or that those jurisdictions will have funding. Ultimately it is beyond the control of the County to ensure their participation.

Q12. Figure 2 "Frontage Improvements Excluded from SCTDF" generally shows frontage improvements within existing or proposed project areas that are not included in the proposed SCTDF update. What is the reason for excluding Elverta Road frontage improvements west of Rio Linda Blvd.?

A12. Elverta Road west of Rio Linda Blvd was originally identified to be improved to 4 lanes in the SCTDF but ultimately will be a 6 lane thoroughfare. For that roadway, and similar roadway segments, frontage improvements are excluded in the SCTDF. With the revised forecast traffic demand Elverta is now identified as a 6-lane roadway and frontage has been added at the 6-lane sections except in areas slated for development along the frontage.

Q13. Pg. 16 of DKS' update memo references an attached memo from Mark Thomas & Company regarding how roadway phasing was determined to add 20% to the overall cost estimate. Is this memo available for review?

A13. The Cost Estimate Memo has been updated to include additional information on the development of the roadway phasing estimate. Details of the 20% incremental widening allowance are as follows:

| Roadway Widening | Estimated Construction Cost per Mile |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1.0 Staged Widening 2-6 | \$9,793,975 |
| 1.1 Widen from 2-4 | \$6,690,200 |
| 1.2 Widen from 4-6 | \$3,103,775 |
| 2.0 Widening from 2-6 | \$8,249,500 |
| Percent Construction Cost Increase | 18.7% Assume 20% Cost Factor for Staged Widening |

Q14. Roadway Segment #56 (Chrysanthy Blvd.: Grant Line Road to Town Center Blvd.) is calculated at a length of only 150'. Even when subtracting 500' for the intersection leg at Grant line Road, this length does not make sense as the approved large lot tentative map shows the total length (P.I. to P.I.) to be 1,169'. As the intersection of Chrysanthy Blvd. with Town Center Blvd. is not included in the SCTDF, it would seem erroneous to exclude the 500' intersection leg of the Town Center Blvd. intersection.

A14. Segment lengths have been corrected. Reductions in segment length occur if the adjacent intersection is estimated separately.

Q15. For the various Grant Line Road segments, why are the past and current Connector planning efforts and financial grants not reflected in the soft costs of the various Grant Line Road cost estimates?

A15. The project costs are not reduced for completed work or other funding, instead these reductions in SCTDF liabilities are captured as "Other Funding" which equally reduces the SCTDF burden. These are accounted for in Table 3 of the Memo (and Tables 18 and 19 of the Draft Nexus) for the total project cost. Overall the JPA is assumed to fund more than \$105 million.

Q16. A number of the intersection estimates do not appear to have been ground-truthed to current existing conditions. Two examples are White Rock Road at Grant Line Road and Douglas Road at Grant Line Road. There are likely others that fall into the same category.

A16. Estimates for intersection improvements at White Rock Road and Grant Line Road and Douglas Road at Grant Line Road have been revised based on the existing conditions. Other intersections have been reviewed for accuracy.

Q17. For the Grant Line Road widening segments across County property (segment 197 etc.), ROW acquisition costs should not be included. And unless already approved or currently processing projects will be credited for their right-of-way dedications, the same applies to the vast number of roadway segments and intersections across or adjacent to these projects, incl. Cordova Hills, SunRidge projects, SunCreek projects, Florin Vineyard, North Vineyard Station, and all of the Jackson Corridor projects where right-of-way dedication is a condition of project-approval.

A17. The County DOT must pay fair value to acquire land from other County departments (i.e. Waste Management). This is a legal requirement where the other department uses Enterprise Funds (i.e.

revenue from the trash collection bill) to acquire land for purposes other than roads. The SCTDF has

assumed ROW purchases from land likely to develop that could be obligated to dedicate. The timing of actual land dedications is dictated by the timing of land development and land purchases may be required to deliver projects. Where dedications occur, the owner will be entitled to credit based on the acquisition costs used within the SCTDF.

Q18. Regarding the detailed cost estimating methodology as described in Mark Thomas memo “Unit Costs and Cost Estimate Assumptions”, at the top of Page 5, Item B), saw cutting of an existing pavement section is assumed to remove 2’ of pavement per side saw cut, whereas the construction industry standard only calls for removal of 1’ of pavement (edge) per side of saw cut. Please explain.

A18. Estimates are based on saw cut and removal of 1’ of pavement. The Memo has been corrected to reflect this.

Q19. The cost estimating memo describes either Class A or Class C roadway improvements. How will the temporary AC path required with Class D improvements (in lieu of Class A improvements) be funded?

A19. If an AC path is required as part of an interim condition for a 2 to 4 lane widening of an ultimate 6 lane facility it is an eligible expense and considered within the added cost for miscellaneous items in addition to the 20% increased cost for phased projects.

Q20. For all of the roadway cross sections, Mark Thomas made assumptions for easement acquisition requirements. The width of these assumptions ought to be shown on the associate cross sections, incl. the general roadway cross sections.

A20. Cross sections have been revised to show the width of easement acquisitions.

Q21. Regarding the unit cost assumptions, please explain how railroad track widening/additions were estimated to cost \$2,000,000 per track. Recent bids we’ve seen came in at less than 50% of this assumption.

A21. The cost estimates for grade crossings have been split into at-grade and grade-separated crossings. The following costs were used: new at grade crossings with signal is \$1.2 million, grade separated widening is \$4 million.

Q22. Roadway right-of-way is estimated at \$8/sf, or about \$350,000 per acre. This is 3 times the going rate for right-of-way along existing roadways. Please explain.

A22. ROW costs have been updated based on information provided by the County for similar projects and transportation impact fee estimates. The cost for acquiring new ROW has been differentiated for roadways in un-developed ‘greenfield’ areas and for projects in developed areas. The cost for ROW acquisition in ‘Greenfields’ has been revised to \$2.25/SF for acquisition plus ROW ‘soft costs’ at \$15,000 per parcel which equates to \$40/LF of roadway. The cost for ROW acquisition in developed areas has been revised to \$9.25/SF. These costs include the costs to cure damages (i.e. loss of parking, ag production, fences, landscaping, etc.). See the updated Roadway Cost Estimates ‘Key Map’ for identification of ‘Greenfield’ and developed area projects.

Q23. The majority of roadway segment improvements included in the proposed SCTDF will occur in unobstructed green-field settings over significant distances at a time. According to a recent personal conversation with “a quarry staff person” (personal reference omitted), roadway excavation for such type of improvements would be bid at between \$25 and \$30/cy in 2017 and 2018, not at \$50/cy. The “quarry staff” did state that \$50/cy would be appropriate for labor-intensive piece-meal work such as the addition of center turn lanes or median work within existing roadways or intersections, i.e. when hand labor had to take the place of large equipment.

A23. Cost estimates are based on available recent and nearby roadway construction bid results. As program level cost estimates, they cannot take into account the differing conditions at each project site but use averages in the region. A review of completed projects indicates that the overall estimating methodology/costs correlate well to actual average project costs. However, the cost for Miscellaneous Items were reduced in greenfield areas to recognize the lower construction costs seen in greenfield areas. See the attachments in the Roadway Estimates Memo for additional details on the unit price analysis.

Q24. “Section 4.3 Street Lights/Electroliers” of Mark Tomas’ “Unit Cost memo: please clarify the spacing to be either “Each side” or “staggered” so as to be consistent with the County’s improvement standards.

A24. Cost estimates have been corrected to be consistent with County spacing standards for street lights.

Q25. Landscaping Costs at \$17 do not reflect today’s drought-tolerant landscaping requirements. Even the past unit cost assumption of \$15/sf were conservative.

A25. The unit price for landscaping and irrigation has been reduced to \$10/sf based on recent bid results.

Q26. “Section 6.1 Bridges” identifies the construction of bridges at creek crossings. Why were cheaper arch culverts not considered?

A26. Estimates are ‘high level’ program level estimates with structure crossing types not being evaluated at this time. The unit price for new and widened structures is consistent with recent bid results for reinforced concrete slabs and box culverts. See the attachments in the Roadway Estimates Memo for additional details on the unit price analysis.

Q27. “Section 7. Contingency” is described as “providing allowance for costs not captured within this estimate”. Seems that this overlaps directly with the “30% Minor Items” category.

A27. Memo language has been revised to define ‘contingency’ and ‘minor items’ costs. Contingency is intended to capture fluctuations in unit pricing due to escalation, site specific conditions/constraints, and seasonal impacts. Minor Items is meant to capture items too small to be included as individual items in a generalized program level estimate.

Q28. In reviewing the Caltrans Contract Cost Data provided relative to the Unit Cost assumptions inherent to the estimates, there appears to be no consistency between the various line items (pipes, AB, AC, etc.) and “Average Price/Unit” and “Weighted Average”. For some line items, the assumed unit cost is less than the weighted average (see aggregate base), for other items the assumed unit cost is greater than the average price/unit (see hot mix asphalt), whereas for yet other items the assumed cost lands somewhere in between (see roadway excavation). The assumptions made need to be transparent and consistent.

A28. Caltrans Cost Data is not the sole determining factor on the unit prices provided. Unit prices are determined based on evaluation of recent local roadway project bid results available at the time of the estimates. Prices are reviewed and adjusted, if needed, based on Caltrans Cost Data. Outliers have been eliminated from the unit cost analysis. See the attachments in the Roadway Estimates Memo for additional details on the unit price analysis.

Q29. The Caltrans Contract Cost Data includes extreme cost outliers such as \$0.01/cy of import borrow or \$288.88/LF of 12” plastic pipe for example. How are these outliers figured into the unit cost assumptions?

A29. Caltrans Cost Data is not the sole determining factor on the unit prices provided. Unit prices are determined based on evaluation of recent local roadway project bid results available at the time of the estimates. Prices are reviewed and adjusted, if needed, based on Caltrans Cost Data. Outliers have been eliminated from the unit cost analysis. See the attachments in the Roadway Estimates Memo for additional details on the unit price analysis.

Q30. I’m trying to figure out the structural section used for the per-mile trails estimate prepared by Mark Thomas. The numbers add up to a 4” AC section. However, for the AB section I get something slightly less than 8.5”. What trail materials and depths were assumed in the structural section?

A30. The trail cross section has been revised to conform to the County Trail Standard Plan which includes a 12-foot paved section (2” AC on 6” AB) and 3-foot DG shoulders on each side.

Q31. Add Don Julio/Elkhorn intersection improvements to the SCTDF program (as SCTDF Intersection #743?) at \$317,756 as discussed and per the attached “Table 1 Summary of APFFP Overlap with SCTDF” presented by DOT/DKS to the Antelope area owners on 7/18/18 (see Page 2 blue highlights; Antelope CIP Project ID #107)

| PROJ ID NO. | ROADWAY PROJECT | TOTAL PROJECT COST | FUNDING SOURCE | | OVERLAP WITH SCTDF | |
|-------------|--|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|
| | | | ROADWAY CIP | FUNDING SOURCES | NOTES | Amount |
| | Barret Ranch East | | | | | |
| 107 | Don Julio Blvd & Elkhorn Blvd- Signal mod, restripe (BRE COA #49) | \$ 317,756 | \$ - | SCTDF ✓ | NO | |
| 108 | Walerga Road & Elverta Road - Signal mod, restripe (BRE COA #50) | \$ 399,165 | \$ 399,165 | 100% APFFP | Yes | \$ 399,165 |
| | Walerga Rd & Elverta Rd - NB & WB Dual Rights (BRE COA #52, BRE fair share = | | | | | |

Should be light blue; acknowledged at meeting

A31. Intersection 743 has been added using the APFFP cost estimate

Q32. Include 100% credit for Developer built, critical SCTDF road improvements into the SCTDF program and/or in the forthcoming Barrett Ranch Credit-Reimbursement Agreement with the County.

A32. **Credit/reimbursement policies or reductions in SCTDF fee rates to account for overlaps with special finance districts are not part of the SCTDF Nexus Study document. These items will included for Board consideration at the time the SCTDF fee rates are adopted.**

Q33. Allow for SCTDF overlap or fee credits for the Northern and Southern Don Julio/Poker-Titan intersection. Is this the \$1,131,027 partial overlap credit shown in the 7/18/18 Table 1 Summary of APFFP Overlap Summary (See Antelope CIP Project ID #5.9)?

A33. **See response to Question 32**

Q34. Add 20% Phasing Cost to Don Julio (SCTDF Project #62) per 8/6/18 DKS Memo

A34. **This roadway segment is 4 lanes in the SCTDF and thus will not include a phasing cost**

Q35. Adjust the "SCTDF Roadway Segment Improvement Cost Estimates" header for the SCTDF intersections so that it reads, "SCTDF Intersection Improvement Cost Estimates"

A35. **Revised as noted.**

Q36. RE: "Roadway Cost Estimates" Page 7, Project #59. We operate 4005 Manzanita Avenue, the retail center at SWC Cypress and Manzanita. Two curb cuts on Cypress are vital for customer ingress/egress. In you planning for this Project #59, we ask that existing Left In/Left Out be always maintained at our Western most curb cut. We value the idea of a "Complete Street" for Cypress and Manzanita, yet it must support convenient access to patrons at all times.

A36. **This is a project level detail that is beyond the generalized planning level SCTDF cost estimates so no changes to the estimate were made.**

Q37. SCTDF Credit Policy and Amounts: We believe it is critical the credit policy and amounts need to be established concurrently with the fee program and not subsequently. How do we know what the ultimate fee will be without the credit policy in place? How do we know the overlapping concern expressed in the opening of this comment letter has been fully addressed without knowing what the credit policy and amounts are? It is impossible to fully understand the SCTDF update without including the credit policy and amounts. We strongly urge the County to not keep these separate, and to include the credit policy and amounts for purposes of full transparency.

A37. **The Nexus Study document itself establishes the eligible costs and fees for the SCTDF; the current review is an intended to ensure those costs/fees are accurate not considering the credit for overlaps. Credit for overlaps will be addressed in separate documents that are still under development (pending completion of the cost estimates). The County staff understands the importance of stakeholders reviewing these documents and understanding the total proposed fees in advance. County staff intends**

to present the SCTDF rates, including credits for any adopted Special Finance Districts, to the Board of Supervisors simultaneously for adoption.

Q38. Capital Southeast Connector Consistency: Overall, we urge the County to more closely align the SCTDF with the Connector, which has been incorporated into the County's and other jurisdictions General Plans. The County has also conditioned Cordova Hills through its development agreement and conditions-of-approval to be consistent with the Connector. We continue to coordinate with the County and Connector to do so. We strongly encourage the County in the SCTDF update to do the same. We recommend brainstorming with the Connector for how the Connector could have access to SCTDF funds dedicated for Grant Line. Perhaps there is an opportunity for the Connector to utilize and leverage SCTDF funding for Grant Line with its current approvals and local, state, and federal funding efforts that are underway?

R38. The County continues to coordinate with the Connector. The County has estimated the Connector alignment as a standard County road solely for the purposes of establishing development impact fees. The County's position is that the Connector facility is a regional facility, above the typical County standards, that should receive regional funding for improvement costs above the County standards. SCTDF funding is eligible for use on the Connector.

Q38-A. All Grant Line Road segment and frontage costs are based on a standard 4-lane arterial with curb, gutter, sidewalk, and landscaping on both sides of the road, even though all of Grant Line has been included and adopted in the County's General Plan as a 4 lane expressway consistent with the Capital Southeast Connector. Overall, within the fee program, costs associated with Grant Line should be consistent with the General Plan Expressway design and the Connector's cost estimates of remaining tasks.

R38-A. See R38.

Q38-B. Grant Line Road intersections do not appear to be compatible with the Connector design, e.g. some are shown as 6 lanes and not the expressway 4 lane standard.

R38-B. The County has estimated the Connector alignment as a standard County road solely for the purposes of establishing development impact fees. The County's position is that the Connector facility is a regional facility, above the typical County standards, that should receive regional funding for improvement costs above the County standards. The SCTDF Program does not include the full cost of the ultimate expressway facility and assumes that additional regional funding would be needed. For the expressway portion of the Connector, the 2018 SCTDF Program includes the cost of a four lane roadway with "high capacity at grade intersection" improvements. A design for potential at-grade improvements at each intersection was not defined but the equivalent average cost of "high capacity at grade intersection" improvements was based on the County's standard design for an intersection on a six-lane thoroughfare.

Q38-C. The SCTDF Program appears to include costs for improvements that have already been constructed or funded through other sources. For example, much of the environmental

CEQA/NEPA work, and engineering and design work included in the SCTDF Program has already been funded by the Sacramento Capital Southeast Connector (Connector) program.

R38-C. Project costs are not reduced for completed work or other funding, instead these reductions in SCTDF liabilities are captured as “Other Funding” which equally reduces the SCTDF burden. These are accounted for in Table 3 of the Memo (and Tables 18 and 19 of the Draft Nexus) for the total project cost. Overall the JPA is assumed to fund more than \$105 million.

Q38-D. The right-of-way cost of \$8/square foot appears to be above-market. Shouldn't this amount be closer to the easement costs of \$3 per square foot? Also, ROW costs and land to be acquired should be consistent with the Connector. The Connector has acquired ROW and is currently in the process of acquiring additional ROW consistent with its requirements.

R38-D. ROW costs have been updated based on information provided by the County for similar projects and transportation impact fee estimates. The cost for acquiring new ROW has been differentiated for roadways in un-developed ‘greenfield’ areas and for projects in developed areas. The cost for ROW acquisition in ‘Greenfields’ has been revised to \$2.25/SF for acquisition plus ROW ‘soft costs’ at \$15,000 per parcel which equates to \$40/LF of roadway. The cost for ROW acquisition in developed areas has been revised to \$9.25/SF. These costs include the costs to cure damages (i.e. loss of fences, landscaping, parking, production, etc.). See the updated Roadway Cost Estimates ‘Key Map’ for identification of ‘Greenfield’ and developed area projects.

Q39. The SCTDF growth projections are based on the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) projections, which is not consistent with the County's approved growth and growth identified in the County's General Plan. For instance, the current MTP/SCS assumes no Cordova Hills, only portions of the Connector, lower speeds on Grant Line, and significantly more infill growth, much of which is inconsistent with much approved County land use, and contrary to the County's growth plans. We recommend utilizing a traffic study or modifying the current MTP/SCS traffic study to be consistent with the County's development approvals and growth identified in its General Plan. Not doing so will result in a fee program and roadway levels of service that do not properly mitigate for the growth the County is pursuing. Also, it will result in a SCTDF fee program that lacks the appropriate nexus requirements due to inaccurate land use and transportation assumptions.

A39. The memo does not state that the growth projections are based on SACOG's MTP/SCS. It clearly states that it has included buildout of a number of approved and proposed specific plan areas, including Cordova Hills. Thus the SCTDF is clearly intended to mitigate the approved and planned growth in the County.

Q40. We commend DOT for the inclusion of 20% additional costs for phased roads which recognizes the additional costs of phasing construction.

R40. Noted

Q41. There is inconsistency regarding which intersections are included. Many minor roadway intersections are included in certain areas (for example, many minor intersections along the Jackson

Corridor, Gerber Rd., Florin Rd. and Elder Creek), but major intersections at Grant Line and University Blvd. and North Loop and Grant Line are not included. We recommend including these two intersections since other minor intersection are included.

R41. North Loop at Grant Line Road is intersection 78 and is included in the SCTDF. Major road intersections at Elverta/16th St and Grant Line/University have been added to the intersection cost estimates.

Q42. There is inconsistency in project conditioning and the class of improvements that are included in the SCTDF Program. For instance, DOT typically conditions individual projects to class D improvements but class C improvements are assumed in the SCTDF

R42. A road being widened from 2 to 6 lanes will likely include a 4-lane phase that may require the construction to Class D standards (separated pedestrian AC path). The cost of the AC path is assumed as included within the miscellaneous items cost and the 20% additional phasing costs.

Q43. Intersection rehabilitation is more expensive than constructing new intersections.

R43. Estimates have been revised to account for higher costs.

Q44. There may be overlap in environmental mitigation costs included in the SCTDF Program and environmental mitigation costs funded by Cordova Hills as a condition of its environmental permit. Cordova Hills has permitted and mitigated for all wetlands impacts along its frontage so there should be no costs in the SCTDF for wetlands permitting and mitigation along this segment.

R44. If a developer delivers a project included in the SCTDF they are eligible for reimbursements/credits for project costs included in the SCTDF, including environmental mitigation costs, permitting, engineering, etc.

Q45. The minor items cost is 30% of Earthwork, Drainage, Pavement, Traffic Signals, Street Lights/Electroliers, and Landscaping costs. This percentage is more accurately applicable to some urban segments, but other less urban segments would not require as extensive minor item improvements, such as extending culverts.

R45. The minor items allowance has been adjusted for 'Greenfield' projects to 25%.

Q46. The 13% construction management cost appears higher than typical in other fee programs, which we see typically at 3%-4%.

R46. The California Multi-Agency CIP Benchmarking Study indicates average CM costs of about 20% (including inspection, testing, etc). The proposed rates are below industry averages.

Q47. It appears as though the 15% construction contingency included in the total costs overlaps with the 30% minor items cost line item, which is included for estimated quantity changes.

R47. Memo language has been revised to define ‘contingency’ and ‘minor items’ costs. Change description to state the contingency is intended to capture fluctuations in unit pricing due to escalation, site specific conditions/constraints, and seasonal impacts. Minor Items is meant to capture items too small to be included as individual items in a generalized planning estimate.

Q48. When calculating average unit costs based on costs from the Caltrans database, cost outliers should be excluded from calculation of the average cost.

R48. Caltrans Cost Data is not the sole determining factor on the unit prices provided. Unit prices are determined based on evaluation of recent local roadway project bid results available at the time of the estimates. Prices are reviewed and adjusted, if needed, based on Caltrans Cost Data. Outliers have been eliminated from the unit cost analysis. See the attachments in the Roadway Estimates Memo for additional details on the unit price analysis.

Q49. There is not a consistent approach to calculating the average unit costs and to which average is used in which case. Sometimes, a straight average is used, and other times a weighted average is used without any apparent pattern or reason. Please explain the rationale.

R49. Caltrans Cost Data is not the sole determining factor on the unit prices provided. Unit prices are determined based on evaluation of recent local roadway project bid results available at the time of the estimates. Prices are reviewed and adjusted, if needed, based on Caltrans Cost Data. Outliers have been eliminated from the unit cost analysis. See the attachments in the Roadway Estimates Memo for additional details on the unit price analysis.

Q50. The SCTDF assumes new bridges are needed at all creek crossings; however, culverts could be constructed instead at some of the crossings, which could save significant dollars.

R50. Estimates are program level estimates, not detailed project level estimates. Structure crossing types not being evaluated at this time. The unit price for new and widened structures is consistent with recent bid results for reinforced concrete slabs and box culverts. See the attachments in the Roadway Estimates Memo for additional details on the unit price analysis.

Q51. Railroad overcrossings cost of \$2 million per track appears as though it might be 100 percent greater than typical costs.

A51. The cost estimates for grade crossings have been split into at-grade and grade-separated crossings. The following costs were used: new at grade crossings with signal is \$1.2 million, grade separated widening is \$4 million.

Q52. Frontage landscaping is included for all intersections, regardless of the location. We suggest frontage landscaping not be included for rural intersections.

R52. Frontage landscaping is included where frontage (curb, gutter, sidewalk) is required. If the location is currently “rural” but requires frontage improvements it is becoming “urban” and will require

landscaping. If the landscaping is deferred until the area is more urbanized it will still require landscaping and funding for it.

Q53. The cost estimates include costs of new improvements where reconstruction projects have recently been completed. The new improvements would not be needed, and so the costs should be excluded; e.g. Douglas and Grant Line has an existing stop light and turn lanes.

R53. The cost estimate for the intersection of Douglas Road and Grant Line Road has been updated based on current conditions.

Q54. Contingencies assumed in the SCTDF should be based on cost overruns and not quantities and/or costs excluded.

R54. Contingency is intended to capture fluctuations in unit pricing due to escalation, site specific conditions/constraints, and seasonal impacts.

Q55. Cross sections states pavement sections will vary, but the text does not and is very specific.

R55. Memo has been updated.

Q56. Grant Line and White Rock is a completed intersection, so this cost can be taken out.

R56. The cost estimate for the intersection at Grant Line Road has been updated based on current conditions.

Q57. Why include ROW costs for County owned properties? Does the County have to buy ROW from itself?

R57. The County DOT must pay fair value to acquire land from other County departments (i.e. Waste Management). This is a legal requirement where the other department uses Enterprise Funds (i.e. revenue from the trash collection bill) for the land.

Q58. Funding sources in the SCTDF are assumed from Rancho Cordova. However, we are not aware of any mechanism or agreement with the City to obtain these SCTDF funds. We recommend coordinating with the City to ensure the assumed funds from the City are realized. This will ensure there are no future shortfalls in the SCTDF program from this assumed funding source.

R58. Projects that cross jurisdictional boundaries typically assume participation from the other jurisdiction. Many of the projects are along roads where the centerline is the jurisdictional boundary. The County has a cooperative relationship with these adjacent jurisdictions. However, work within other jurisdictions is under the control of those jurisdictions, including prioritizing improvements and the amount of funding allocated to those improvements. While the County endeavors to work out agreements with other jurisdictions to deliver projects, we cannot guarantee agreement will be in place or that those jurisdictions will have funding. Ultimately it is beyond the control of the County to ensure their participation.

Q59. Re: "Roadway Improvements Memo, dated 8/6/18", Page 16 - Bullet beginning "Existing deficiencies -...", paragraph is confusing and difficult to understand. Please clarify how existing deficiencies are proposed to be handled.

R59. Existing deficiencies will be handled the same way as the 2010 SCTDF Program. Further explanation of how existing deficiencies are handled is provided in the revised Nexus Study.

Q60. Re: "Roadway Improvements Memo, dated 8/6/18", Page 16 - The discussion about "other funding sources" does not appear to address the potential for additional grant funding, which may be applicable throughout the County. For instance, grants may be available for public trails. If grants are secured in the future, how (if at all) would that effect developer SCTDF fee payments or reimbursements?

R60. "Other Funding Sources" includes known grants that offset the cost of projects. The SCTDF analysis has determined that over the next 30 to 35 years the County will have unfunded transportation needs of approximately \$677 million, including existing deficiencies and unfunded portions of improvements to bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, rural shoulders and smart growth streets. Future additional grant funding would be applied to the County's cost of unfunded needs.

Q61. Re: "Roadway Improvements Memo, dated 8/6/18", Page 16 - The discussion about "other funding sources" is not clear regarding how the County plans to allocate funding received from new development in other jurisdictions (e.g., City of Folsom, City of Rancho Cordova). As just one example, for purposes of the Folsom South Development, we understand that multiple mitigation measures require contributions to the County for impacts to County roads. Please clarify.

R61. The SCTDF has allocated the full amount of anticipated funding from the Folsom South Development to a number of key projects that were included in the City/County agreement on funding. The SCTDF also assumes that the cities will share in the costs of improvements to roadways and intersections along the borders with unincorporated areas.

Q62. Re: "Roadway Improvements Memo 8-6-2018", Page 6 - Under the heading "Unit Costs," the memo notes that the referenced 2014 Tech Memo was developed with input from developers. Developers provided input after the release of this tech memo, and participated in workshops with the County's DOT and Mark Thomas to discuss more appropriate unit cost assumptions. The revised unit cost assumptions were applied to the Mark Thomas 2016 cost estimates for the four Jackson Corridor development proposals.

R62. Noted.

Q63. Re: "Roadway Improvements Memo 8-6-2018", Page 6 - Table C. The table reflects significant increases in unit costs for roadway excavation, import fill, asphalt concrete, aggregate base, and right-of-way acquisition as compared to the unit costs that were agreed upon and applied to Mark Thomas' 2016 cost estimates for the four Jackson Corridor development proposals. Unit costs for roadway excavation, aggregate base, and right-of-way acquisition in particular seem very excessive - in each case, more than twice what we might expect adjusting for inflation or CCI indices since 2016. Assumed right-of-way

acquisition amounts to nearly \$350k/acre. The roadway segment and intersection improvements suggested for inclusion in the SCTDF are in proximity to three large aggregate production facilities (i.e., Granite's Bradshaw Plant, Teichert's Perkins Plant, and CalMat's (Vulcan's) Triangle Rock Plant. Unlike many Caltrans construction projects that require import of construction materials from longer distances, these local trail improvements can reasonably be expected to source their materials locally at a lower cost for trucking. We would appreciate an explanation as to what appears to be a significant departure from unit cost assumptions that were vetted for work in 2015/2016. See attached annotated excerpts for additional detail (*Excerpt from Page 7 of 14 shown below*).




Table C – 2017/2018 Unit Costs

This table shows significant changes to unit costs as compared to those which were used for cost estimating in 2016.

| ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | 2017/2018 COSTS * |
|---|------|-------------------|
| 1 EARTHWORK | | |
| 1.1 ROADWAY EXCAVATION | | \$50 |
| 1.2 IMPORT FILL (GRADE SEPARATIONS ONLY) | | \$40 |
| 2 DRAINAGE | | |
| 2.1 DRAINAGE CLASS A (LATERAL & DI) | LF | \$45 |
| 2.2 DRAINAGE CLASS C and D (LATERAL ONLY) | LF | \$15 |
| 3 PAVEMENT | | |
| 3.1 ASPHALT CONCRETE | | \$120 |
| 3.2 AGGREGATE BASE | | \$70 |
| 3.3 SIDEWALK | | \$8 |
| 3.4 CURB & GUTTER | | \$35 |

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----|
| 9 RIGHT-OF-WAY & EASEMENTS | | \$8 |
| 9.1 RIGHT-OF-WAY | | \$8 |
| 9.2 EASEMENT | | \$2 |

R63. Cost estimates are based on available recent and nearby roadway construction bid results. Prices are reviewed and adjusted, if needed, based on Caltrans Cost Data. Outliers have been eliminated from the unit cost analysis. As program level cost estimates, they cannot take into account the differing conditions at each project site but use averages in the region. A review of completed projects indicates that the overall estimating methodology/costs correlate well to actual average project costs. However, the cost for Miscellaneous Items were reduced in greenfield areas to recognize the lower construction costs seen in greenfield areas. See the attachments in the Roadway Estimates Memo for additional details on the unit price analysis.

Q64. Re: "Regional Trails", App A.1 - Unit costs for excavation and aggregate base seem very high. The regional trail networks suggested for inclusion in the SCTDF are in proximity to three large aggregate production facilities (i.e., Granite's Bradshaw Plant, Teichert's Perkins Plant, and CalMat's (Vulcan's) Triangle Rock Plant. Unlike many other instances that require import of construction materials from longer distances, these local trail improvements can reasonably be expected to source their materials locally at a lower cost for trucking. See prior comments above. In addition, LS cost for design engineering also seems high at \$48,300/mile. Please provide better justification for this suggested expense or consider a reduction in the unit cost.

R64. Cost estimates are based on available recent and nearby roadway construction bid results. Prices are reviewed and adjusted, if needed, based on Caltrans Cost Data. Outliers have been eliminated from the unit cost analysis. As program level cost estimates, they cannot take into account the differing conditions at each project site but use averages in the region. A review of completed projects indicates that the overall estimating methodology/costs correlate well to actual average project costs. However, the cost for Miscellaneous Items were reduced in greenfield areas to recognize the lower construction costs seen in greenfield areas. See the attachments in the Roadway Estimates Memo for additional details on the unit price analysis.

Q65. Why did the estimated cost for the Glenborough Drive (Folsom Boulevard to Easton Valley Parkway) and US 50/Hazel Avenue Interchange projects decrease, compared to the cost estimates used in the 2010 SCTDF?

R65. The cost estimates used in the 2018 SCTDF Program update are more detailed than those prepared in 2010. The US 50/Hazel interchange costs were based on the analysis conducted for the County by Mark Thomas and DKS Associates.

Q66. The US 50/Hazel Avenue interchange project includes the extension of Hazel Avenue from Folsom Boulevard to Atlanta Street in Easton Place. How are costs allocated between the US 50/Hazel Avenue Interchange (Project 75) and the extension of Hazel Avenue between Folsom Boulevard and Easton Valley Parkway (Project 224)?

R66. The cost for the intersection 75 reflects the County's planned improvements for the US 50/Hazel interchange including the extension to Atlanta Street. The cost of Segment 224 is from Atlanta Street to Easton Valley Parkway.

Q67. How are freeway interchanges analyzed in the needs analysis?

R67. The US 50/Hazel interchange needs and costs were based on the analysis conducted for the County by Mark Thomas and DKS Associates.

Q68. The US 50/Hazel Avenue interchange is identified as Project 75, which is associated with the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard intersection. What components for the US 50/Hazel Avenue interchange will be used to develop traffic shares for the interchange?

R68. The cost were allocated based on the origin/destinations of the trips using of its major new components (the freeway off-ramps and the portion of Hazel Avenue from US 50 to the "jug handle" intersection).

Q69. What was the "Other" funding source assumed for the 2010 SCTDF for the US 50/Hazel Avenue Interchange project and why was it eliminated in the 2018 Update?

R69. The other funding had included Measure A and a grant assumption; the grant assumption has been eliminated since there is no grant for the project and assuming a project specific grant is highly speculative. The current Nexus assumes Measure A and Folsom SOI funding.

Q70. Does the cost of the US 50/Hazel Avenue Interchange, listed in the Roadway Improvements Memo, reflect the latest cost estimate for the preferred project that has been prepared for the interchange Project Report?

R70. The costs reflect the most current estimate from that report.

Q71. Please make available the base and future year travel demand forecasting models used for the 2010 SCTDF.

R71. Model has been made available.

Q72. Please make available the base and future year travel demand forecasting models used for the 2018 SCTDF.

R72. Model has been updated and will be made available.

Q73. Potential oversight? - SCTDF Segment 1 (16th Street: County line to Elverta Rd.): the cost estimate does not contain costs for the drainage crossing of the C-corridor north of Elverta Road, though Exhibit 1 in Attachment A of Mark Thomas' technical memorandum does appear to show a culvert at or near the intersection of Elverta Rd. and 16th Street.

R73. Estimates have been updated to include structures crossing costs for the creeks along 16th Street.

Q74. Potential oversight? - Intersection of 16th Street with Elverta Rd.: not proposed for inclusion in SCTDF Update.

R74. Intersection has been added to the estimates.

Q75. Potential oversight? -SCTDF Segment 2 (16th Street: Elverta Rd. to Q-Street.): the cost for this segment ought to include a new signal at the Q-Street intersection.

R75. Intersection has been added to the estimates.

Q76. Potential oversight? - SCTDF Segment 3 (16th Street: Q-Street to Elkhorn Blvd.): though the SCTDF update includes a cost for this new segment of 16th Street between Q-Street and Elkhorn Blvd., it does not include new bridges across Dry Creek and the Dry Creek bypass channel that both fall within the limits of this segment.

R76. Estimate has been updated to include new bridges across Dry Creek and bypass channel.

Q77. With the potential, updated SCTDF fees increasing substantially, will the current 2% Administration Charge be reduced/updated to reflect a reasonable, actual administration cost and associated percent charge?

For example, the current March 2010 SCTDF Fee Program Report indicates \$910,089,163 in Countywide plus Special Financing District Roadway project costs. Current 2% Administration Charges generate \$18.2MM to administer the SCTDF program. That's \$607K per year over the program's assumed 30 year life for just Roadway administration. Comparatively, the August 6, 2018 DKS SCTDF Update Memorandum indicates \$1,806,573,720 for Countywide plus Special Financing District Roadway project costs. If the SCTDF Update maintains the current 2% Administration charge, that would generate a total of \$36.1MM or \$1.2MM per year over the Roadway portion of the program's 30 years. Unless the County plans to double or significantly increase its current costs to administer the SCTDF program, we think the County should only apply a 1% or less Administration Charge as part of its 2018 SCTDF Program update.

R77. The current 2% administrative fee does not fully cover existing expenses to administer the SCTDF. Based on current administrative expenses a 2.5% fee has been included in the Nexus.

Q78. Of the total cost of \$203,105,360 to construct 211.26 miles of regional trail, the SCTDF proposes to fund only 39.1%, or \$79,617,300. The remaining share is attributed to existing DUEs within the unincorporated part of the County. The document is silent, however, as to how the remainder \$123,488,060 is to be funded.

A78. The SCTDF only funds the costs associated with new development. If the County is constructing the improvement the County will undertake construction after it has secured other funds (e.g., local, state, federal). If the developer is constructing improvements, costs above the amounts funded by the SCTDF may be reimbursable/creditable through a Special Finance District or similar mechanism if the work was specifically included within the district of other mechanism. If the project is a condition of approval and the County does not have other identified funds for the project, the costs above the amounts funded by the SCTDF will likely be borne by the developer.

Q 79. With only 39.1% of the funding being included in the SCTDF, it raises the question of how credits and reimbursements will be calculated. For example, if Cordova Hills constructs trails in excess of its fair share (based on a percentage of Cordova Hills DUs vs. all new growth assumed by 2047), will the entire transit portion of the SCTDF be creditable?

A 79. The SCTDF only funds the costs associated with new development. If the County is constructing the improvement the County will undertake construction after it has secured other funds (e.g., local, state, federal). If the developer is constructing improvements, costs above the amounts funded by the SCTDF may be reimbursable/creditable through a Special Finance District or similar mechanism if the work was specifically included within the district of other mechanism. If the project is a condition of approval and the County does not have other identified funds for the project, the costs above the amounts funded by the SCTDF will likely be borne by the developer.

Q80. Please confirm that if Cordova Hills constructs certain trail improvements, for example \$1 million worth of trails, that they would be able to receive credits against the trail fee component. Please see the example below, which assumes the trail fee component equals \$500 per unit. If \$1 million of credits were available, 2,000 units would be able to use the fee credits.

Cordova Hills SCTDF Trail Fee Credit Example

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Cordova Hills Trails Construction for SCTDF Trails | \$ 1,000,000 |
| SCTDF Trail Fee Component per DUE | \$ 500 |
| Cordova Hills DUEs to Receive \$500 Fee Credit | \$ 2,000 |

A80. The SCTDF only funds the costs associated with new development. If the County is constructing the improvement the County will undertake construction after it has secured other funds (e.g., local, state, federal). . If the developer is constructing improvements, costs above the amounts funded by the SCTDF may be reimbursable/creditable through a Special Finance District or similar mechanism if the work was specifically included within the district of other mechanism. If the project is a condition of approval and the County does not have other identified funds for the project, the costs above the amounts funded by the SCTDF will likely be borne by the developer.

Q81. The cost estimate for trail construction does not identify the assumed structural section of the trail itself. Backing into the numbers, the AC section calculates to 4 inches. The AB section however calculates to a little less than 8.5". It seems that the numbers may need to be amended or corrected.

A81. The trail cross section has been revised to conform to the County Trail Standard Plan which includes a 12-foot paved section (2" AC on 6" AB) and 3-foot DG shoulders on each side.

Q82. Please label the cross sections for clarity. Please indicate AC/AB vs. CY and tonnage.

A82. Cross sections have been updated for clarity.

Q83. Please check and correct the labeling, numbering, and footnotes on the cost estimate tables.

A83. Cost estimate tables have been corrected as needed.

Q84. The CCTC Traction Railroad Trail should be excluded to be consistent with the North Vineyard Station Specific Plan.

A84. The CCTC Traction Railroad Trail remains in the Bicycle Master Plan, is considered a regional route, and remains in the SCTDF.

Q85. The Class 1 trail along North Loop Road should be included in the SCTDF Trail CIP.

A85. This segment was not considered a regional segment and not included within the SCTDF.

Q86. The portions of the Connector trail in the unincorporated County should be included in the SCTDF program (i.e., the portions from White Rock to Folsom and Calvine to Sunrise).

A86. The County has estimated the Connector alignment as a standard County road solely for the purposes of establishing development impact fees. As a standard County road, it does not include a separate class 1 trail. The County's position is that the Connector facility is a regional facility, above the

typical County standards, that should receive regional funding for improvement costs above the County standards.

Q87. As stated on the first page of the memo, "2047 travel demand forecasts, incl. traffic forecasts and transit ridership estimates, were prepared using SACOG's SACSIM regional travel demand model". As SACOG's clearly flawed MTP growth forecasts form the basis of their model even with adjustments to that model to account for growth in the County's new growth areas through 2047, it is not clear that the modeling results will be consistent with the County's General Plan growth assumptions.

A87. While the SACOG's SACSIM model was used to prepare the forecasts, SACOG's growth assumptions were not the inputs to the SACSIM model runs used for the Draft 2018 SCTDF update. The Draft Nexus Study explains the growth assumptions that were used for 2047. The analysis of the County's General Plan (adopted in 2011) was based on residential buildout of the unincorporated areas of the County using estimated "holding capacities" of areas included in the General Plan. The SCTDF assumed full buildout of the major adopted and proposed specific plans in the County, some of which were not included in the 2011 General Plan. The level of development in each specific plan reflects the latest development plans/proposal.

Q88. In the first paragraph on Page 2 of the memo, under Transit Improvement Needs, it states that "To accommodate new development, RT will need to increase frequency on some current transit (bus and light rail) routes,...". However, RT's very own Strategic Plan 2015-2017 states under "Service Consumption" that "the passenger miles total for bus and light rail service in Fiscal Year 2013 is similar to that estimated in the late 1990s and early 2000s". Yet during that same time span (late 1990's to 2013), the metropolitan area's population grew by nearly 20%. Additionally, RT's Strategic Plan notes that between the years 2000 and 2012, the commuting mode share for public transportation (including taxicab) dropped by 0.7% from 3.1% to an even lower 2.4%. In combination then, the actual statistics over the last 2 decades are inconsistent with DKS' purported nexus tying transit improvement needs to new growth.

A88. The 2050 transit service assumptions in the SCTDF are based on SACOG's 2036 MTP transit system plus some additional transit service for High Bus service on roadways that are projected to have LOS F conditions in 2050. SACOG's MTP includes a 108% increase in bus service hours in the region by 2036. That increase would warrant the capital improvements in SacRT's long-term (2045) Capital Improvement Plan. The SCTDF analysis indicates that systemwide bus ridership would increase by 111% by 2050 with the assumed bus service.

Q89. The Bus Route Organization costs included in the Transit CIP are not capital improvements like the remainder of costs included in the Transit CIP. Planning and other operational costs should not be included in a development impact fee program.

A89. SacRT has estimated the capital costs that would be needed to implement their Route Optimization. The Route Optimization would benefit both existing and future riders. Only capital costs are included for that item.

Q90. Nexus and Cordova Hills Fair Share:

Q90a. Over one quarter of the total transit improvement costs (\$139 MM of \$431 MM) are due to High Bus Corridor improvements and Folsom Gold Line Service Enhancements, none of which benefit Cordova Hills in any way. (Note that a very minor nexus may be found in Cordova Hills' vehicle trip contributions to the Jackson Rd. corridor, i.e. one of the targeted High Bus Corridor Improvements. Based on Cordova Hills' traffic study, this "fair share" component under the "cum + project" analysis is very minor however, and would be even less with the extension of the cumulative growth horizon to 2047.

A90a. The High Bus routes include roadway segments that will operate at LOS F conditions with the maximum number lanes allowed in the General Plan. New development throughout the unincorporated portions of Sacramento County, including Cordova Hills, will contribute traffic to those roadways and thus should help fund alternative improvements – including transit, bikeways walkways and ITS.

Q90b. The SCTDF proposes to fund \$1.46 MM in Circular Bus Service Expansion and \$13.13 MM in Bus Maintenance Facility 2 improvements. As the nexus of these improvements to Cordova Hills is arguably questionable, either Cordova Hills as part of District 3 ought to not have to fund a share of these costs or alternatively, be credited for its construction and funding of an on-site corporation yard and Cordova Hills shuttle service, which is planned to include shuttle busses.

A90b. Developers would be credited for any overlap between RT transit costs in the SCTDF and costs within a Special Finance District or similar funding mechanism. Specific details of overlaps with Special Finance Districts are still in process. The County is also in the process of establishing an agreement with RT to collect and transmit the transit fees to SacRT for the work to be implemented by SacRT; this agreement would also address future Special Finance Districts that create new overlaps with transit improvements in the SCTDF.

Q90c. On page 7 of the memo, it states that the cost of High Bus Corridor improvements is allocated based on "the share of total ridership on High Bus routes from each district". As Cordova Hills' residents will not have access to RT busses travelling these High Bus routes, there is no nexus to allocating any of these costs to Cordova Hills.

A90c. Page 7 of the memo states that "The cost allocated between the urban (Districts 1-4) and rural (District 5) areas is based on the SACSIM model's estimate of the share of total ridership on High Bus routes from each district. As noted in the Response to Q90a, new development throughout the unincorporated portions of Sacramento County, including Cordova Hills, will contribute traffic to roadways that will operate at LOS F conditions with the maximum number lanes allowed in the General Plan. Thus new development should help fund alternative improvements – including transit, bikeways walkways and ITS – that will help reduce their impact on those roadways.

Q90d. On Page 7 under the Circulator Bus Service Expansion, it states that "the cost allocation of neighborhood shuttles is based on the usage of those shuttles". Again, Cordova Hills' residents will have their own shuttle system and thus should either not have to fund this component of the SCTDF or get credit for the cost of Cordova Hills' shuttle system.

A90d. Developers would be credited for any overlap between RT transit costs in the SCTDF and costs within a Special Finance District or similar funding mechanism. Specific details of overlaps with Special Finance Districts are still in process. The County is also in the process of establishing an agreement with RT to collect and transmit the transit fees to SacRT for the work to be implemented by SacRT; this agreement would also address future Special Finance Districts that create new overlaps with transit improvements in the SCTDF.

Q90e. Given comments above, Cordova Hills should not be allocated any of the costs for the first four items on Table 1, or, alternatively, should receive credits for its construction of transit facilities. Cordova Hills is fully funding its own internal and sub-regional transit system both the capital costs and operational costs. It is not fair for Cordova Hills to also fund other sub-regional transit projects for capital or operational costs. However, it is fair Cordova Hills contribute to the backbone system consisting of paratransit, Gold Line, Horn LRT Station, and Metro Light RailYard.

A90e. Developers would be credited for any overlap between RT transit costs in the SCTDF and costs within a Special Finance District or similar funding mechanism. Specific details of overlaps with Special Finance Districts are still in process. The County is also in the process of establishing an agreement with RT to collect and transmit the transit fees to SacRT for the work to be implemented by SacRT; this agreement would also address future Special Finance Districts that create new overlaps with transit improvements in the SCTDF.

Q91. The proposed Horn LRT Station is located along Folsom Boulevard in the City of Rancho Cordova. It is therefore not clear why the SCTDF should have to fund 24.1% of this \$10.2 MM improvement.

A91. The 24% estimate is based on the usage of that station from growth in unincorporated Sacramento County. As noted in the memo, the remainder reflects riders from existing development and from the City of Rancho Cordova.

Q92. In the first paragraph of Page 7, DKS notes that the "SACSIM model provides the projected origin and destination of transit riders, which was used to assist in the cost allocation between SCTDF fee districts and between the cities and unincorporated areas in Sacramento County. The model assumes transit routes and services in SACOG's 2036 MTP plus the following planned transit services: - The transit routes planned as part of major new specific plans (Cordova Hills Master Plan,...." Given the inconsistencies between the growth assumptions underlying SACOG's 2036 MTP and Sacramento County's own General Plan, clearly the resulting projected transit routes, incl. projections of congested corridors driving the need for High Bus Corridor improvements, are questionable and highly unlikely with realistic growth projections. This, then, would also bring into question the resulting fee allocations. (Also, Cordova Hills is not a specific plan, but rather an SPA).

A92. As noted in the response Q87, SACOG's growth assumptions were not the inputs to the SACSIM model runs used for the Draft 2018 SCTDF update and the SCTDF assumed full buildout of the major adopted and proposed specific plans in the County, some of which were not included in the 2011 General Plan. The growth assumptions in the SCTDF are a sound basis for the Nexus Study and for the transit ridership forecasts.

Q93 Table C-1 (Nexus) contains the percentage use of roadway segments attributable to new development in each SCTDF district based on trip distribution, and Table C-3 shows the percentage allocation of costs of roadway segments to each district. The roadway usage percentages do not match with the cost allocation percentages. From these two tables, it is not possible to determine the relationship between the trip distribution and the funding obligation or the nexus for the cost allocations. Attached is a table summarizing a few of the roadway segments and demonstrates the inconsistencies between Table C-1 percent allocations and Table C-5 cost allocations.

As noted in the attached examples of SCTDF update allocation inconsistencies, which is a small sample of the segments in the SCTDF, District 3 is allocated \$152,172,366 of the \$683,527,096 of roadway segment improvement costs. However, District 3 should only have an \$115,816,621 fair share based on the percentage uses provided in Table C-1. Under the current SCTDF, District 3 is being allocated \$36,355,745 more than its fair share based on Table C-1 Percentage of Use. We are not sure why there is this apparent \$36,355,745 over allocation. Table 17 (Nexus) in the last column even concludes allocating costs will be based on the "Percent use of roadway by trips from each fee district." It is not clear to us the consistency between the percent of use and allocation of costs?

A93. Section 5 of the Draft Nexus Study describes the allocation of costs for roadway improvements in the SCTDF. It discusses how total roadway improvement costs are adjusted to reflect 1) other funding sources, 2) segments with existing deficiencies and 3) roadway segments that are shared with another jurisdiction. The adjusted "SCTDF costs" are then allocated to new unincorporated Sacramento County. The SCTDF roadway improvements are needed to accommodate growth and the allocation of the adjusted SCTDF costs does not include the percentage of trips from existing development or from growth in "thru" trips (those that have neither end of the trip in unincorporated Sacramento County).

Table C-1, which was not used to allocate costs, reflects the estimated total usage of each roadway segment – including vehicle trips from existing development and from growth in "thru" trips. Table C-3, which was used to allocate SCTDF costs, eliminates trips from existing development and thru trips.

This cost allocation methodology for the 2018 SCTDF Program update is consistent with the methodology used in the 2010 SCTDF Program (the current program).

Q94. Cordova Hills 2013 certified EIR (Table TC-21 in Nexus) concluded there would be no significant impacts on Madison, Hazel and Florin. In fact, the EIR traffic modeling did not reflect any traffic impacts on these roadways, especially Madison, which is on the other side of the County. The DRAFT SCTDF has concluded District 3 should be allocated \$40,483,828 for these three roadway segment improvements. This equates to \$2,101 per DUE in District 3, or a total cost of \$18,911,785 to Cordova Hills when applied to its approximate 9,000 DUE. It does not seem fair Cordova Hills should be paying \$18.9 million to improve these three roadways when its own EIR concluded there would be no impacts. This large of a cost obligation to Cordova Hills with no nexus raises questions regarding the accuracy of the nexus study.

| | Table 18 Total Cost of Project | Table C-5 Cost Allocation |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Maddison, Hazel, and Florin Impacts | \$178,215,604 | \$40,483,828 |
| Cost Per District 3 DUE (19,266) | \$9,250.26 | \$2,101.31 |
| Cost Per Cordova Hills DUE (9,000) | \$83,252,384 | \$18,911,785 |

A94. The EIR traffic impact analysis identifies roadway improvements that are “triggered” by the addition of trips from a development project. The SCTDF cost allocation is based on the usage of a roadway segment by trips from new development in all of the SCTDF Fee Districts. Some of the trips using Madison Avenue, which located in Fee District 2, will have an origin or destination in Fee District 3. Likewise, some of the trips using a portion of Grant Line Road located in Fee District 3 will have an origin or destination in Fee District 2. While Fee District 3 will pay for a portion of the improvement cost for Madison Avenue, Fee District 2 will pay a portion of the improvement cost for Grant line Road.

This aspect of the cost allocation methodology for the 2018 SCTDF Program update is consistent with the methodology used in the 2010 SCTDF Program (the current program).

Q95. All frontage improvements associated with curb, gutter, and sidewalk within development projects should be excluded from the SCTDF Program in order to create a less costly SCTDF program and more fair nexus. Currently, the Draft Nexus Study treats different roads differently. For example, the frontage for Cordova Hills onsite roads is excluded from the SCTDF Program, which is appropriate. However, frontage on other development projects that include curb, gutter, and sidewalk e.g. Elverta are included. The SCTDF should be consistent and exclude all frontage improvements with curb, gutter, and sidewalk within development projects

A95. As noted in the Draft Nexus Study, the SCTDF Program includes frontage improvements (curb/gutter and sidewalks) except on improvements within major new developments where frontage improvements would clearly be funded by adjacent development. Frontage improvements were also not included in the 2018 SCTDF Program on some existing roadways that would be widened from two to four lanes where: 1) the General Plan allows six lanes, 2) adjacent development is not assumed by 2047 and 3) there is limited existing adjacent development.

The SCTDF Program intends to be consistent in its treatment of frontage improvements. If additional locations are identified where adjacent development would clearly fund frontage improvements, they will be removed from the SCTDF Program.

Q96. We commend DOT Staff for aligning Grant Line with its General Plan and the Capital Southeast Connector's expressway designation for Grant Line. We would like to reiterate our previous comment and encourage DOT to continue collaborating with the Capital Southeast Connector and find opportunities where the Capital Southeast Connector can utilize and leverage SCTDF dollars for expressway improvements along Grant Line.

A96. Comment noted.

Q97. Figure 5 (Nexus), intersection improvements are not included for North Loop and Grant Line (see Figure 5). The right-in and right-out portions of this intersection are permanent improvements and should be included in the SCTDF Program. The left turn lanes are temporary and should not be included.

A97. The SCTDF, which based on a 2050 year horizon, assumes that North Loop will be re-aligned to intersect Grant Line Road at Douglas Road. The interim North Loop segment south of Douglas Road will ultimately be a collector roadway. The cost of right-in and right-out portions of this intersection are thus not in the SCTDF.

Q98. On Figure 6 (Nexus), why are future deficiencies shown on Grant Line between Jackson and White Rock? If the deficiencies can be mitigated through intersection improvements, the costs of the intersection mitigation should be included in the SCTDF Program.

A98. The County has estimated the Connector alignment as a standard County road solely for the purposes of establishing development impact fees. The County's position is that the Connector facility is a regional facility, above the typical County standards, that should receive regional funding for improvement costs above the County standards.

Q99. Do the future deficiencies on Figure 6 account for planned transit improvements? Are Cordova Hills and other development area funded transit improvements accounted for in the overall travel demand model?

A99. The future transit improvements funded by the SCTDF are accounted for the travel demand model.

Q100. The high bus routes shown on Figure 7 (Nexus) are planned for roadways that will operate at LOS F, and thus have deficiencies in 2047 after being expanded to the maximum allowable lanes. Some of the high bus routes, however are on roadways without 2047 deficiencies (e.g., Bradshaw south of Jackson, Calvine, Elkhorn Blvd, Zinfandel). Do the high bus routes mitigate for deficiencies so that there are no remaining deficiencies in 2047? If not, we suggest eliminating these high bus routes.

A100. The SCTDF analysis shows that portions of some extended roadways would have LOS F conditions while other portions may operate at LOS D or E conditions. The trips using the LOS F portions have origins and destinations over longer distances than just the LOS F segments. Providing transit service only on the LOS F segments would not make sense or be effective. To be effective in reducing trips on the LOS F segments, routes need to be long enough and connect to other transit routes. While the high bus routes would not fully mitigate LOS F conditions, they meet General Plan policies including reducing the growth in VMT caused by new development.

Q101. Table 21 (Nexus) shows estimated growth in development and DUEs. Is there backup for these projections? What are the projections for the different major development plan areas within each district? Are the development projections based on the maximum development or is there a discount factor that is applied to each plan area (e.g., assumed 90% of maximum growth will occur)? If the projections are based on the maximum development, impacts on the transportation system may be overstated. The details behind the growth projections should be included in an appendix and disclosed before finalizing the SCTDF

update. The basis for the proposed SCTDF is derived from the growth projections. Without seeing what growth is assumed makes it impossible to determine if the SCTDF is appropriate.

A101. As discussed in the September 2018 Draft Nexus Study, the SCTDF assumed estimates of full development of the major specific/master plans. The revised Nexus Study now assumes that the majority of proposed North Precinct development would be developed by 2050. Additional information on the development assumptions in the revised Nexus Study

Q102. The growth projections seem overly aggressive. It appears the model assumes all the major plan areas listed in the document would absorb by 2047, which is unlikely. For example, if the total growth assumed were to develop within the 30-year period, the County would experience an annual average of approximately 3,200 dwelling units. The County has not averaged 3,200 new dwelling units in any given year recently. Also, the document indicated that assumed new retail development is tied to new residential development projections, maintaining the same ratio of retail space to residential units as exists today. For reference, the planned retail square footage equates to approximately 71 new retail building square feet per capita. This approach likely significantly overstates new retail development for the following reasons:

- a. Dynamically changing retail landscape (e.g., online retailing effects).
- b. Growth in retail in communities adjacent to new Sacramento County growth areas (e.g., Rancho Cordova, City of Sacramento, City of Folsom, City of Elk Grove etc.).
- c. Excess retail acreage included in many new growth area planning documents.

The question is whether travel demands and behavior might produce different outcomes if the amount of planned retail were less than indicated in the current nexus study?

A102. As discussed in the Draft Nexus Study, if you assume that dwelling units in Sacramento County (including cities) would grow at the same average annual rate as SACOG's 2012 to 2036 growth in the 2016 MTP/SCS, then the SCTDF development levels could be reached by 2047. Sacramento County acknowledges that this is an aggressive growth rate. If that level of development takes longer, the amount of transportation needs will also take longer.

The amount of retail development per dwelling unit in 2047 is consistent with SACOG's 2036 development assumptions in the 2016 MTP/SC. The balance between retail development and residential units in the SCTDF was based on growth in both the cities and unincorporated areas of Sacramento County.

Q103. The transit and trails costs are allocated to each district (except District 5) based on equal costs per DUE. There is no distinction made between improvements needed by the different districts. What is the nexus for allocating transit and trails costs in this manner?

A103. While the selected High Bus transit routes were focused on roadways that are projected to have some LOS F conditions in 2047, the range of improved transit services provide mobility to transit dependent residents in new growth areas, reduce county-wide VMT and help meet the goals of the County General Plan. The benefits are not just to help reduce traffic congestion on LOS F roadways. The

benefits, and thus costs of transit improvements were thus spread evenly across RT's service area, which includes the urban areas of the County (District 1-4 and 6) but not the rural areas (District 5). District 5, would not have new transit services but some new park-and-ride trips from District 5 would use some transit services.

The usage of individual bikeways and walkways cannot be estimated by the travel demand model. New trails would reduce county-wide VMT and help meet the goals of the County General Plan. The Nexus Study summaries in Tables 21 and 22 combine trails with other bikeway and walkway improvements. The documentation will be modified to clarify that trail costs were allocated to District 5 in the same manner as Districts 1-4 and 6. Thus all new development in Districts 1-6 would pay the same rate per DUE for trails. District 5 will help pay for bikeway and walkway improvements along new roadways as well as roadways that will be widened by the SCTDF based on its traffic usage of those roadways. District 5 is also allocated the majority of the cost of shoulder improvements in rural areas that provide bike lanes. The costs for other bikeway and walkway improvements located in the urban areas were not allocated to District 5.

This SCTDF allocation process generally reflects the usage and benefits of the various transit and trail improvements and thus provides a reasonable nexus.

Q104. Table 15 (Nexus) notes the bike lane cost at \$16,169,420 per mile. This appears to be an error and might significantly lower bikeway costs allocated to new development.

A104. The cost has been revised to \$10,108,520 per mile. This is the cost to widen LOS F roadways (that are currently at their GP maximum lanes) for bike lanes. This includes widening for the bike lanes, reconstructing frontage (curb gutter and sidewalk), and ROW acquisition (including curing impacts to existing properties).

Q105. Although credits are not a part of the Draft Nexus Study, it is important to understand the credit policies before the SCTDF fees are adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Cordova Hills has the following comments and questions on the credit policies.

Q105a. Cordova Hills may fund SCTDF improvements for which it has construction responsibility through a CFD, in which case, it would like assurance that credits would be assigned in the same way as if it had funded the improvements in another manner, such as through a plan area fee program.

A105a. The Nexus Study document itself establishes the eligible costs and fees for the SCTDF; the current review is intended to ensure those costs/fees are accurate not considering the credit for overlaps. How credits for overlaps with a CFD would be addressed would be part of the process of establishing a CFD.

Q105b. Table 18 in the Draft Nexus Study shows funding from adjacent jurisdictions (e.g., Rancho Cordova) for some improvements. If a designated jurisdiction ultimately does not construct the improvement, how will it be funded? If Cordova Hills must construct the improvement instead, how will Cordova Hills be reimbursed? Will the other agency be required to keep the improvement in its plan area fee program? We suggest a reciprocal funding agreement or another funding mechanism be established with Rancho Cordova and other jurisdictions where the SCTDF is relying

on funding. This will ensure there are no funding shortfalls to construct and reimbursement facilities in the SCTDF.

A105b. The County has a cooperative relationship with the adjacent jurisdictions. However, work within other jurisdictions is under the control of those jurisdictions, including prioritizing improvements and the amount of funding allocated to those improvements. While the County endeavors to work out agreements with other jurisdictions to deliver projects, we cannot guarantee agreement will be in place or that those jurisdictions will have funding. Ultimately it is beyond the control of the County to ensure their participation.

Q105c. Are credits available for construction of transit facilities? Cordova Hills must construct and fund an on-site corporation yard and shuttle service facilities, including shuttle busses and should receive credits against the SCTDF for these improvements or be exempt from sharing in the cost of some SCTDF transit improvements. See our previous comments regarding the SCTDF transit section and what components of the SCTDF transit fee we believe should be applicable to Cordova Hills.

A105c The majority of the transit related impact fees are anticipated to be fee implemented by Regional Transit but collected by the County (a portion of the transit components involve roadway improvements and will be included in the County portion of the fee). Credit for the transit components would have to be arranged with and approved by Regional Transit. See A90b. above.

Q105d. Only 39% of the required bike and pedestrian trails are included in the SCTDF Program. How will the remaining amount be funded? How will credits and reimbursements be calculated? If Cordova Hills constructs trails in excess of its fair share, will Cordova Hills be granted credits for up to the entire trails fee portion of the SCTDF?

A105d. The SCTDF only funds the costs associated with new development. If the County is constructing the improvement the County will undertake construction after it has secured other funds (e.g., local, state, federal). If the developer is constructing improvements, costs above the amounts funded by the SCTDF may be reimbursable/creditable through a Special Finance District or similar mechanism if the work was specifically included within the district of other mechanism. If the project is a condition of approval and the County does not have other identified funds for the project, the costs above the amounts funded by the SCTDF will likely be borne by the developer.

Q105e. Table 8-1 (Nexus) details the roadway improvement costs in the SCTDF Program, including onsite right of way, utility, and environmental mitigation costs. Will credits be available for these improvements that Cordova Hills constructs? If not, they should not be included in the SCTDF Program.

A105e. The SCTDF roadway projects assume certain costs for on-site ROW, utility relocation, and environmental mitigation, which are eligible for reimbursement/credit. It assumes utility relocations costs for work which are usual and customary obligations normally paid by the County DOT for its roadway work, and are reimbursable/creditable. However these utility costs should not be confused with new utility service or relocation costs that are not usual and customary County DOT obligations.

Q105f. The costs of onsite easements for onsite trails are included in the SCTDF Program. Will credits be available for these improvements that Cordova Hills constructs? If not, they should not be included in the SCTDF Program.

A105f. The SCTDF assumes certain trail ROW acquisition costs, which are eligible for reimbursement/credit.

Q106. In Table C-1, (Nexus) there is overlap in roadways. #197 Chrysanthy to Kiefer overlaps with #1009 University to Kiefer. Also, Table C-5 has the overlap. Chrysanthy to Kiefer includes \$1.8 million and University to Kiefer includes \$6.8 million in funds. The duplication should be eliminated.

A106. There is no duplication in costs or funding. Segment 197 was mislabeled. The tables will be corrected to show that Segment 197 is from Chrysanthy to University.

Q107. Was the internal roadway allocation methodology described on Page 63 of the 2018 SCTDF Draft Nexus Study based on the percentages in Table C-1 or Table C-?

A107. The allocation of all segment costs were based on Table C-3. For an “internal roadway”, the allocation of costs to the specific plan where the internal roadway is located was then removed from the SCTDF allocation to the remainder of the fee district that the specific plan is located in.

Q108. Were the benefits to providing parallel capacity considered when determining what roadways are considered internal roadways for the purpose of cost allocation and regional benefit?

A108. If a roadway segment provides a significant amount of benefit to parallel regional roadways, the percent of trips that have neither an origin nor destination in the specific plan would be more than 10 percent. In those cases, the allocation of costs to the specific plan where the internal roadway is located was not removed from the SCTDF allocation to the remainder of the fee district that the specific plan is located in.

Q109. Please make available the base and future year travel demand forecasting models used for the 2010 SCTDF.

A109. Model be has been made available

Q110. Please make available the base and future year travel demand forecasting models used for the 2018 SCTDF.

A110. Model is being updated and will be made available

Q111. Combining of Districts 1 & 6: Section 1.2 of the (Nexus) draft states “Districts 1 and 6 share many of the same roadway needs. Thus these two fee districts have been combined for the 2018 SCTDF Program update”. We believe the Districts 1 & 6 share very few of the same roadway needs and would point out that the 2010 Program reveals that. In reviewing the costs allocations of the facilities located within the two districts, except for a section of Elverta Road, there are large differentiations in obligation. The tables in the report clearly shows a shift in responsibilities between facilities located east or west of CA-99, which was the dividing line between the two districts. There clearly was a conclusion in the 2010 nexus study that supported the need to establish 2 districts to insure a fair distribution of cost obligations. Now in 2018 the two districts are being combined. We would ask for further details concerning the reasoning to combine

the two district and further request that DOT provide an analysis with the two 2010 districts remaining as is.

A111. District 6 will be maintained in the revised 2018 SCTDF Nexus Study

Q112. Reduction of DUEs in the Combined Districts 1 & 6: The 2018 Draft Study lists a significant reduction (37%) in the expected growth DUEs in the new combined District 1. The tables show the vast majority of the reduction is in residential DUEs which were almost exclusively located in the 2010 district 1. This further increases the effects on current district 6 if the districts are combined. Please explain the justification for lowering the residential DUEs in District 1.

A112. The difference DUEs between the 2010 and 2018 analyses is almost entirely related to development in the area within or near the proposed North Precinct development. The North Precinct development was not included in the September 2018 Draft Nexus Study but will be included in the revised 2018 SCTDF Nexus Study.

Q113. Growth Assumptions: In connection the revised DUE growth assumption, we would like a map and corresponding summary of the land use growth assumptions used to prepare the SCTDF (i.e., for significant approved/planned/proposed development inside/outside Sacramento County). It would also help our understanding of the changes if the land use summary compares the land use growth assumptions in the 2010 and 2018 SCTDFs.

A113. A summary table will be provided

Q114. Sacramento International Airport (SIA): In the spring of this year SIA solicited bids for partners in the commercial development of airport property on both the north and south side of I-5 as well as along Elverta Road (see attached). Their proposal stated that proper zoning was in place and the properties were ready for development. Is development at SIA subject to the SCTDF and if so how it is calculated into the Draft Study?

A114. The SCTDF assumes SACOG's estimated change in travel demand from passengers and employment at SIA. If private development occurs on the SIA properties it will be subject to fees under the SFTDF program. The amount of assumed non-residential growth in District 6 (21.4 million square feet) over the next 30 to 35 years is adequate to capture private development that may occur at SIA.

Q115. General. The entire Connector alignment was adopted into the County's General Plan in 2014 after certification of a Programmatic EIR in 2012. As such, the entire Connector project must be included the SCTDF update.

A115. The entire length of the Connector is included in the SCTDF. The County has estimated the Connector alignment as a standard County road solely for the purposes of establishing development impact fees. The County's position is that the Connector facility is a regional facility, above the typical County standards, that should receive regional funding for improvement costs above the County standards.

Q116. Estimates. We do not believe the estimates for the Connector are correct. It does not appear that the

County has used the correct cross section for the Connector to develop construction estimates and technical memos indicate that the existing road is to be widened. The Connector is not a 4-lane arterial with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. All estimates for the Connector must be updated to reflect the correct

cross section. Additionally, it is unclear how work efforts that are either underway or completed are accounted for in the estimate.

A116. The County has estimated the Connector alignment as a standard County road solely for the purposes of establishing development impact fees. The County's position is that the Connector facility is a regional facility, above the typical County standards, that should receive regional funding for improvement costs above the County standards.

Q117 Estimates. Please clarify how the Connector's Class 1 Multi-Use path is accounted for in the estimates.

A117. The County has estimated the Connector alignment as a standard County road solely for the purposes of establishing development impact fees. As a standard County road estimate, it does not include a separate class 1 trail. The County's position is that the Connector facility is a regional facility, above the typical County standards, that should receive regional funding for improvement costs above the County standards.

Q118. Roadway Needs Analysis. The County's General Plan Level of Service ("LOS") policy does not apply to the Connector alignment. It is unclear how the Connector's LOS standards are incorporated into the needs analysis.

A118. The County has estimated the Connector alignment as a standard County road solely for the purposes of establishing development impact fees. The County's position is that the Connector facility is a regional facility, above the typical County standards (including LOS), that should receive regional funding for improvement costs above the County standards.

Q119. Roadway Needs Analysis. Please coordinate with our (JPA Connector) office to establish a method to capture needs and costs for Phase 1 Connector improvements and Phase 2. We urge the County to provide disclosure in the final documents on how the different phases of the Connector project were accounted for when establishing the fees.

A119. The County has estimated the Connector alignment as a standard County road solely for the purposes of establishing development impact fees. The County's position is that the Connector facility is a regional facility, above the typical County standards (including LOS), that should receive regional funding for improvement costs above the County standards.

Q120. The City of Elk Grove and the County of Sacramento have several joint transportation facilities that are covered under existing agreements. The SCDTF excludes the following joint facilities roadway segments that are shown as Pre-2030 widened roads in the County's Adopted General, Plan Circulation element. This is not discussed or addressed in any way that I could find. The City of Rancho Cordova is also being handled very differently will all joint facilities roadway segments being included in the fee program. Below are the missing joint roadway segments in questions.

Q120a. Grant Line Road from 350 Ft North of Poppyseed Ln to Calvine Road

A120a. This segment has been added to the SCTDF.

Q120b. Kammerer Road from Highway 99 to Bruceville Road.

A120b. This segment has been added to the SCTDF.

Q120c. Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Bilby Road.

A120c. The future traffic demand for this roadway segment requires only two lanes and thus is not included in the SCTDF.

Q120d. Willard Parkway from Bilby Road to Kammerer Road.

A120d. The future traffic demand for this roadway segment requires only two lanes and thus is not included in the SCTDF.

Q120e. Franklin Boulevard from Big Horn Boulevard to the Sacramento City boundary line.

A120e. This segment currently has four lanes which is adequate to accommodate future traffic demand.

Q121. The current Sacramento County Transportation Development Fee Program (SCTDF) includes Kammerer Road from I-5 to SR 99 roadway segment but the proposed update removes it. In addition this segment is shown as Pre-2030 widened roads in the County's Adopted General, Plan Circulation element. Why has it now been eliminated?

A121. The future traffic forecasts for the 2010 SCTDF Program and the Draft 2018 SCTDF both assumed the planned Kammerer Road project from I-5 to SR 99. Funding for that project was not included in the 2010 SCTDF Program. A share of funding for this project will be included in the 2018 SCTDF.

Q122. No Intersection improvements are identified on any of the joint facilities roadway segments with the exception of Calvine Road. However, in the City of Rancho Cordova for instance these improvements are identified. Why are different jurisdiction being handled differently.

A122. The cost of intersections on roadway segments the County shares with cities does not include the legs of the intersections that are within the cities. For the SCTDF Update the cost of improvements on Kammerer Road are based on estimates prepared by the City of Elk Grove which include the cost of intersections along Kammerer Road.

Q123. Section 3.1 Roadway Capacity Needs incorrectly describes or at least omits Segment A1 and A2 of the Capital SouthEast Connector (Connector). Please correct.

A123. The roadway capacity needs analysis was conducted to define most improvements in the SCTDF. In some cases, the definitions of improvements were defined by other studies. The costs for Segments A1 and A2 are based on estimates prepared by the City of Elk Grove and thus reflect the City's definition for this improvement.

Q124. Section 3.1 Roadway Capacity Needs, Capital SouthEast Connector (Connector) says the SCTDF Program does not include the full cost of the ultimate expressway facility and that additional regional

funding would be needed. This does not appear to be a reasonable assumption with the failure of Measure B to pass. If there is another regional funding program it should be discussed.

A124. The future traffic forecast for the Draft 2018 SCTDF does not indicate that the full expressway is needed during the analysis period. Additionally, the Connector facility is designed to standards that exceed those required for typical standard Sacramento County roads due to its regional function and importance. The higher standards for the connector need to be borne by regional funding sources or grants, not by unincorporated County development even if those sources are currently unidentified.

Q125. The High Bus Routes included in the SCTDF Program appears to exclude Pre-2030 HI Bus Routes and include post 2030 routes from the County's Adopted General, Plan Circulation element. This appears to be a general plan consistency issue.

A125. The candidate High Bus routes for the SCTDF Program come from SacRT's Capital improvement program. The nexus for new growth in unincorporated areas to help fund High Bus routes is focused on roadways that would operate at LOS F conditions with the maximum number of lanes allowed under the County's General Plan. High Bus routes in the SCTDF most also primarily serve trips with origins and destinations within the unincorporated areas of the County. The selected routes from SacRT's list meet those nexus criteria.

Q126. The Florin Road HI Bus Route within the City of Sacramento is included, but not the East Stockton/Bruceville Road High Bus Route. Elk Grove is studying the extension of this HI Bus Route into Elk Grove as a separate public works study. The East Stockton/Bruceville Road High Bus Route or at least the portion in the County should be included in the fee program.

A126. It does not appear that this route is included in SacRT's Capital Improvement Program. It is unlikely that this route would meet the nexus criteria described in the response to Q 125.

Q127. The SCTDF does not include the Capital SouthEast Connector (Connector) Regional Trail. Please add.

A127. The County has treated the Connector as a typical County roadway facility for purposes of the determining the SCTDF share of construction costs attributable to development within the unincorporated County. Typical County roadway facilities do not include Class 1 trails so they are omitted from the project assumptions used to establish costs. The Connector is a regional facility that should receive other regional funding to support the enhanced Connector facility.

Q128. The SCTDF includes the Iselton-Stone Lake Trail in the fee program. However it is missing a connection to the Capital SouthEast Connector (Connector) Regional Trail along Hood Franklin Road. Please address this missing connection.

A128. This connection is identified as a class 2 facility in the Bicycle Master Plan and is thus part of the roadway facility, not a separate facility.

Q129. City of Sacramento's Auburn Boulevard project (#29 – Winding Way to I-80 Ramps) is listed as a \$4M improvement when our most recent engineering estimates has it closer to \$8M.

A129. Upon coordination with City staff it was concluded that their project included non-capacity increasing components and that the estimated cost for capacity improvements in approximately \$3 million, with the SCTDF share being \$1 million.

Q130. The City of Sacramento is listed for cost sharing on Jackson Highway Improvements from 14th Avenue to South Watt Avenue (#234 - 14th Avenue to Rock Creek Parkway, #235 - Rock Creek Parkway to Aspen 1 Driveway, and #236 - Aspen 1 Driveway to South Watt Avenue). We don't have these improvements listed in our transportation programming guide and so I don't think we have a funding mechanism in place for a fair share contribution. I also believe Jackson Highway within these limits is Caltrans R/W. The contribution for each segment is nominal (\$60,960 each).

A130. Upon coordination with City staff it was concluded that their current TPG is through 2035 and that for such a nominal amount and long-term horizon the assumptions are reasonable for the SCTDF.

Q131. Greater Clarity and Confirmation on How SCTDF Fee Credits Will Work: Attached is Table 1 (not shown) that EPS compiled to summarize SCTDF funding for Cordova Hills CEQA obligation improvements. Hypothetically, if Cordova Hills constructs all improvements listed in Table 1 with no throw-away costs, would Cordova Hills maximum SCTDF credit be \$138,673,152?

A131. At our February 6th meeting we discussed the concept of Table 1 being correct except that a lower creditable component of the "internal roadways", as shown in table C-7 in the draft 2018 SCTDF Update, should have been used. The creditable values are shown in table C-5 and C-6, not in Tables 18 and 19. However, following our meeting the County made a change to the treatment of internal roads. The latest 2018 SCTDF Update now treats the "internal roadways" the same as other roadways in the SCTDF. As such, table C-7 has been deleted and table C-5 has been revised to show a larger cost share for the "internal roadways" which has also increased the fee per DUE; this was discussed on the phone on February 26th and the revised table C-5 was emailed to you. The revised Table 1 you sent on February 28th, using the latest data is the correct methodology. We just spot checked a few values as we did before and have assumed that EPS accurately copied the data into Table 1, thus we are confirming the methodology note the actual totals.

Q131.a. University/Grant Line Connector Consistency: Another Example, if Cordova Hills constructs the intersection of University and Grant Line to Connector standards (currently working on redesign with DOT/Connector) at a total cost of approximately \$5 million (rough estimate), would Cordova Hills maximum fee credit be \$4,104,440 as noted in Table 1? Plus, future credits/reimbursements from other funds as noted further below?

A131.a. Yes, the SCTDF includes approximately \$4.1 million in cost for this intersection and that would be the maximum permissible credit/reimbursement for this individual improvement. As part of our planned credit/reimbursement policy the DOT will be considering how to maximize the eligible reimbursement amounts when constructing multiple projects.

Q131.b. Full SCTDF Credit for Grant Line Construction: If Cordova Hills constructs two additional lanes on the County side consistent with the County standards, and based on agreed preliminary designs with no throw-away costs, will Cordova Hills receive 100% credit for building the two additional lanes? \$68.8 million in total SCTDF credits as illustrated in Table 1.

A131.b. The ultimate Grant Line configuration is 4-lanes. Given two lanes exist today, and two future lanes remain to be constructed, the SCTDF cost share includes one of the two planned roadway lanes. The other new roadway lane is assumed to be in the City of Rancho Cordova's roadway fee program. So, in the scenario described above, Cordova Hills would receive credit/reimbursement for one-lane, which is all the Grant Line Road widening costs as included in the SCTDF. In essence, if Cordova Hills constructs two new lanes on the County side there would be a total up to \$68.8 million in credits/reimbursement available from the SCTDF for

roadway segment improvements as noted in the attached table.

Q131.c. Maximizing fee credits: We assume fee credits can be maximized up to the SCTDF fee amount for each village?

A131.c. The County has yet to finalize its fee credit policy related to the SCTDF. Although the amounts have yet to be determined, we verbally discussed a scenario where priority roadways within a given SCTDF district could be eligible to take fee credits up to 67 percent of the SCTDF obligation and non-priority roadways could be eligible to take fee credits up to 33 percent of the obligation. To be clear, the 67%/33% scenario is one of several potential proposals being considered and should not be assumed at this time. Priority projects would be those identified in the County's five-year Transportation Improvement Program Guide (TIPG). DOT will propose to the BOS the inclusion of the Connector in the next adoption of the TIPG, making it a priority project. To clarify, these proposed credit percentages would apply to the roadway portion of the SCTDF exclusive of the transit and administrative portions of the fee.

Q132. Full Transit Fee Credit: Cordova Hills respectfully requests the County support a full transit fee credit specifically to Cordova Hills. Cordova Hills is already fully funding by itself the capital and operational costs of a major transit system connecting Cordova Hills and Hwy 50 light rail system. The transit system Cordova Hills is fully funding will have better levels of service than RT, which will consist of 15-minute headways during peak hours onsite and offsite. Cordova Hills is contributing approximately \$2 million a year to fund this transit system that will be open to the public in Cordova Hills and all areas between Cordova Hills and the Hwy 50 light rail system. We are not aware of any other project in the region that is fully funding a sub-regional transit system entirely by itself, and will be open to the public? It is not fair that Cordova Hills is providing all capital and operational costs for a major sub-regional transit system that will benefit many others in the region and asked to fund other sub-regional transit systems as part of the SCTDF update (e.g. bus routes along Watt, Elkhorn, Madison and many other high bus routes currently in the SCTDF update).

A132. Transit capital facilities in the SCTDF are for the benefit of Sacramento Regional Transit (Sac RT) and are based on the needs identified by Sac RT. SCTDF transit capital facilities are intended to build upon and expand the existing Sac RT transit network and would complement capital facilities and services that may be provided by others, such as is planned in Cordova Hills. If there were any potential overlap in capital facilities between the SCTDF and what Cordova Hills is conditioned to provide, the specifics of the overlap and potential transit fee credit would need to be memorialized with Sac RT. To the extent an overlap existed, the County would work with Sac RT and Cordova Hills to identify the appropriate credit amount.

Q133. Reimbursement Rights to Other Funding: In Table 1 of the attached, will Cordova Hills and other developments participating in the SCTDF have all reimbursement rights to "Other Funding" if a roadway segment includes "Other Funding", Cordova Hills constructs the improvement, and funds are realized by the County through Measure A and the Folsom SOI? The same question with respect to funds from "Other Jurisdictions". If development constructs a SCTDF improvement, will development have all rights to other jurisdictional funds once the funds are realized through reciprocal funding agreements or other mechanisms? Will this reimbursement come directly from the City or the City will pay the County and the County reimburses the development?

A133. The answer depends on the circumstances and source of funding. For example, the Folsom SOI funding provided to Sacramento County is identified for specific roadways and would only be available to a developer if 1) they are building an identified road and 2) sufficient SOI funds have been received

by the County. Measure A is also limited to specific projects but Measure A funding must also be available at the time the project is constructed in order for the constructing entity to use Measure A funds. Additionally, Measure A funds identified for the Connector are not allocated to the County, but to the Connector JPA, so any Measure A funds available would be through the JPA Board. The County is clear on two points. If the funding is from another jurisdiction, then the County does not have any say in the availability of such funding but would advocate for timely reimbursement. Secondly, if funding from an identified source (e.g., Measure A revenues) is not allocated at the time of project construction, then that funding may not be available to the constructing entity to help fund construction. In no case will Measure A funding be available to “reimburse” a construction entity’s already incurred construction expenditures.

“Other Funding” that is governed by agreements with other jurisdictions are subject to the provisions of those agreements. The current “Shared Roadway Improvement Agreement (Cordova Hills)” adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 11, 2017 addresses SCTDF funded roadways shared with Rancho Cordova. This agreement contains provisions, subject to a future Joint Agreement, for the County to retain funds paid by Cordova Hills intended for roadways entirely within Rancho Cordova to pay for improvements on shared roads. It also describes priority and timing of credits and reimbursements. Cordova Hills, LLC should review that agreement for more details.

Q134. Plan Area Fee Credit: The City of Rancho Cordova and Sacramento County have established a reciprocal funding agreement to fund Cordova Hills fair share payments to the City of Rancho Cordova. To our knowledge, no such reciprocal agreement has been established for the City's impacts on County roads. Will Cordova Hills receive credit to its reciprocal funding agreement, which will be established as part of Cordova Hills plan area fee when Cordova Hills constructs part of any improvement within the City of Rancho Cordova e.g. Grantline and Jackson improvements.

A134. The County and City of Rancho Cordova (City) have multiple agreements including: 1) a master agreement for roadways entirely within the County or City, 2) an operational agreement specific to Cordova Hills regarding the roadways entirely within the City, and 3) an agreement specific to Cordova Hills (as noted above) for shared roadways. The County and City have yet to adopt an agreement for a specific City development impacting County roadways. Sacramento County does not have control over other agencies’ fee program or funding sources. If Cordova Hills constructs roadway or other capital improvements that are included in another agency’s fee program, without a specific reciprocal funding agreement executed between the County and the City regarding that infrastructure, the County would not have any means to effectuate reimbursements or fee credits from the City. Cordova Hills is advised to review the agreement noted above for their details. As noted above, the “Shared Roadway Improvement Agreement (Cordova Hills)” between the County and the City contains provisions, subject to a future Joint Agreement, for the County to retain funds paid by Cordova Hills for roadways entirely within Rancho Cordova to pay for improvements on shared roads. Although not a credit as noted above, this could allow for faster reimbursement for expenses within the City. This also establishes some intent to effectuate this reimbursement however the City and County must agree to a Joint Agreement. The County does want to work with Cordova Hills to identify these specific situations in order to offset or otherwise credit the completed work.

Q135. Discrepancy: Why is there a \$3.3 million and \$2.8 million difference highlight in yellow in the attached Table 1? This is the difference between what is funded in the SCTDF and what the estimated cost is? All others are equal except for the two highlighted.

A135. The discrepancy is due to the added phasing cost of certain roadway segments; Table B-3 lists those roads where 20% was added to the cost to account for phasing and the difference in the two line items

does not have any impact on the fee calculation.

Q136. Connector Set Aside Account: Will there be a Connector set aside account with the SCTDF to support the Capital Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority (JPA) leverage federal and state dollars for the construction of the Connector? Essentially an “asterisk” as Mr. Nottoli suggested in the January 2019 JPA board hearing?

A136. There will not be a set aside account within the SCTDF for the Connector. However, staff will be recommending to the County Board during adoption of the 5-year TIPG the addition of a project allocating about \$2 million to the Connector. The Project would cover the entire Connector alignment within the County and note it is eligible for any segment with the actual location being determined in consultation with the JPA. This would allow the Connector JPA to identify these funds in grant applications and leverage local dollars for state and federal grants. This would also identify the Connector as a priority project for credit/reimbursement.