



Solano Transportation Authority

SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Member Agencies:
Benicia ♦ Dixon ♦ Fairfield ♦ Rio Vista ♦ Suisun City ♦ Vacaville ♦ Vallejo ♦ Solano County

... working for you!

One Harbor Center, Suite 130, Suisun City, CA 94585-2473 ♦ Telephone (707) 424-6075 / Facsimile (707) 424-6074
Email: staplan@sta-snci.com ♦ Website: solanolinks.com

Elected Representatives

Mike Ioakimedes, City of Benicia
Kay Caylor, City of Dixon
Rick Vicarro, City of Fairfield
Jack Krebs, City of Rio Vista
Mike Hudson, City of Suisun City
Dilenna Harris, City of Vacaville
Erin Hannigan, City of Vallejo
Linda Seifert, County of Solano

Residential Developers

Nick Faklis, AG Spanos Company
Jay Torres-Muga, Seeno Homes
Mike Rice, Main Street West Partners, LLC
Anthony Russo, B & L Properties
Fran Spero, Solano/Napa Habitat for Humanity

Agricultural, Business,

Environmental and Taxpayers Groups

Mike Amman, Solano EDC
Christina Wong, Greenbelt Alliance
Larry Clement, Solano Farm Bureau
Jim Immer, Lewis Planned Communities & Home Builders Association of Northern CA
Jim Williams, Solano County Taxpayers Association
(one vacant seat remaining)

Commercial & Industrial

Developers

Bob Hammons, Garaventa Properties
Troy Estacio, Buzz Oates Enterprises
Jason Quintel, Panattoni Development
(one vacant seat remaining)

Engineers & Brokers

Robert Jones, Creegan & D'Angelo Engineering
Brooks Pedder, Colliers International
Tom Philippi, Phillippi Engineering

Mixed Use/In-Fill Developers

Ricardo Capretta, Westrust
Curt Johansen, Triad Communities

Environmental Justice

Representative

Mary Frances Kelly Poh, Benicia Community Action Council

Transit Provider

Crystal Odum Ford, Vallejo Transit

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE (RTIF) STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTEE

~~1:30 p.m. — 3:00 p.m.~~ **9:00 a.m. — 10:30 a.m.**

Thursday, October 22, 2009

**Suisun City Hall Council Chambers
701 Civic Center Drive
Suisun City, CA 94585**

The purpose of this committee will be to review the study and development of a proposed Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) on new development (e.g., new homes, businesses, and industry) to help fund transportation projects in Solano County.

ITEM	STAFF/CONSULTANTS
I. CALL TO ORDER, SELF INTRODUCTIONS (9:00 – 9:05 a.m.)	Robert Macaulay, STA, Director of Planning
II. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 24, 2009 MEETING MINUTES (9:05 – 9:10 a.m.)	Sam Shelton, STA, Project Manager
III. ACTION ITEMS (none)	
IV. INFORMATION ITEMS	
A. STA Travel Demand Modeling Update Process (9:10 – 9:20 a.m.)	Robert Macaulay, STA, Director of Planning
B. Project Selection Criteria and Impact Fee Program Implementation Options (9:20 – 10:10 a.m.)	Jason Moody, Economic Planning Systems
C. RTIF Stakeholder Committee Contact Information (10:10 – 10:15 a.m.)	Sam Shelton, STA, Project Manager
V. STAKEHOLDERS COMMENTS (10:15 – 10:25 a.m.)	Robert Macaulay, STA, Director of Planning
VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS & TOPICS	
ACTION: Project Selection Criteria and Impact Fee Program Implementation Options.	Robert Macaulay, STA, Director of Planning
INFORMATION: Draft Project Lists & Costs, based on draft criteria.	

ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Stakeholders Committee is scheduled for **Thursday, December 17, 2009, 1:30 p.m., Suisun City Hall Council Chambers.**



**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE (RTIF)
Stakeholders Committee Meeting
Minutes for the meeting of
September 24 2009**

I. PURPOSE OF THE RTIF STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTEE

Daryl Halls welcomed the various stakeholders to the meeting and gave a brief overview of the reasons a Regional Transportation Impact Fee is being considered in Solano County.

II. CALL TO ORDER

The RTIF Stakeholders Committee was called to order at approximately 1:30 p.m. in the Chambers of Suisun City Hall

Present:

Elected Representatives:

Mike Ioakimedes	City of Benicia
Kay Cayler	City of Dixon
Rick Vicarro	City of Fairfield
Jack Krebs	City of Rio Vista
Mike Hudson	City of Suisun City
Dilenna Harris	City of Vacaville
Erin Hannigan	City of Vallejo
Linda Seifert	County of Solano

Residential Developers:

Mike Rice	Main Street West Partners
-----------	------------------------------

**Agricultural Business,
Environment & Taxpayers Group**

Mike Amman	Solano EDC
Derrick Lum	Solano Farm Bureau
Jim Immer	Lewis Planned Homes
Bob Glover	HBANC
Jim Williams	Solano County Taxpayers Association

**Commercial & Industrial
Developers**

Bob Hammons	Garaventa Properties
-------------	----------------------

Engineers & Brokers

Ben	Buzz Oates Enterprises
Robert Jones	Cregan & D'Angelo
Brooks Pedder	Colliers International
Tom Philippi	Philippi Engineering

**Mixed Use/In-Fill Developers
Environmental Justice
Representative**

Mary Frances Kelly Poh Benicia Community
Action Council

STA

Walter Kieser Economic Planning
Systems
Daryl Halls STA Staff
Robert Macaulay STA Staff
Sam Shelton STA Staff
Elizabeth Richards STA Staff
Robert Guerrero STA Staff
Kenny Wan STA Staff
Karen Koelling STA Staff

Also Present

Ozzie Hilton City of Vacaville
Gene Cortright City of Fairfield
April Wooden City of Suisun City
Dan Kasperson City of Suisun City
Paul Wiese County of Solano
Frank Andrews ASB Properties
Anthony Binswanger Colliers International
George Guynn, Jr.
Walter Binswanger
Kurt Hahn
John Takeuchi

Absent

Christina Wong Greenbelt Alliance
Jason Quintel Panattoni Development
Ricardo Capretta Westrust
Anthony Russo B & L Properties
Fran Spero Solano/Napa Habitat for
Humanity
Curt Johansen Triad Communities
Crystal Odum Ford Vallejo Transit
Nick Faklis AG Spanos Company

Transit Provider

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Introduction to Development Impact Fees and Solano County Housing Economic Analysis

Walter Kieser began an overview of the impact fees and a Solano County Housing Economic Analysis.

Mike Ammann asked if EPS staff planned to conduct additional forecasting for jobs for Solano County. Mr. Ammann noted that the Solano EDC recent economic index shows some growth compared to the relatively flat projects shown in Walter Kieser's presentation charts. Walter Kieser answered that his chart uses data from the California Department of Finance and the Association of Bay Area Governments

(ABAG). Mr. Kieser stated that EPS's economic analysis as part of the nexus study will incorporate stakeholder committee input about what are realistic projections for Solano County.

Linda Seifert asked how "through traffic" will be excluded when measuring new development impact for the nexus study. Walter Kieser answered that the STA's Travel Demand Model will be able to discern the difference between through trips (those trips that do not begin or end in the county) and regional impact trips (trips that both do not begin and end within a city). Mr. Kieser stated that the model would be able to show us a percentage of trips in both categories.

Linda Seifert asked what would the role of the RTIF be in CEQA mitigations for traffic congestion. Walter Kieser answered that developers would pay the RTIF fee to mitigate for their regional transportation impacts. Ms. Seifert also asked what agency would approve a mitigation measure project. Mr. Kieser answered that no projects are approved, only fees collected to mitigate impacts. Mr. Kieser stated that RTIF projects would be funded and approved by the RTIF JPA.

Jim Immer stated that the current poor economy is not generating development let alone home prices that could generate fee funds. Mr. Immer concluded that any reasonable fee would have to be a very low fee. Walter Kieser stated that a RTIF would need to be flexible yet provide certainty that fee funded projects would be delivered. Mr. Kieser stated that fee level flexibility could come from indexing fee levels to construction costs. Mr. Kieser stated that the stakeholders committee would help EPS staff craft recommendations for fee levels.

Frank Andrews asked what assumptions on jobs was included in the STA Travel Demand Model. Walter Kieser stated that EPS staff will look at that and bring the stakeholders committee more information about the model at their next meeting.

Mike Hudson asked how can we create a new fee and still create incentives for development. Walter Kieser stated that there are ways to shape a fee program to encourage and discourage specific types of development, such as making the fee lower for infill or commercial development. Mr. Kieser stated that this is a policy questions that will be debated with the stakeholders committee later, which is connected to economic development.

Mike Hudson asked if impact fees make things harder for redevelopment projects. Walter Kieser answered that impact fees do make things harder for redevelopment projects, but it depends on how that fee is shaped.

Tom Philippi stated that city fees are too high now and that an RTIF will not happen if cities maintain their high fees. Walter Kieser stated that a review of local fees is part of our work plan.

Robert Macaulay stated that there would be time for more questions after Walter Kieser presents his work plan for the nexus study.

B. STA Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Nexus Study Work Plan

Walter Kieser walked the stakeholders committee through EPS' nexus study development work plan.

C. RTIF Nexus Study Committee Meeting Schedule

Sam Shelton briefly reviewed the RTIF Working Group, RTIF Stakeholders Committee, and RTIF Policy Committee future meeting dates and agenda items in 2009 and 2010.

IV. STAKEHOLDERS ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

Robert Macaulay asked the Stakeholders Committee if they had any additional comments or questions.

Tom Philippi stated that existing fees are too high and requested that the STA coordinate fee levels with other agencies to decrease fee levels. Tom Philippi clarified his comment with an allusion that cities have "rolex watch" projects and fee levels that developers can no longer afford.

Bob Glover requested to see other RTIF nexus studies and fee levels, such as East Contra Costa county's fee programs (which are at about \$15,000/DUE) and the Tri-Valley's fee program. Mr. Glover emphasized that a fee program should focus on getting complete funding for key projects.

Brooks Pedder stated that the jobs/housing imbalance in Solano County will never be reconciled. Mr. Pedder stated that locally developed job growth can actually reduce regional trips.

Mike Hudson stated that the RTIF could only fund new projects and not the maintenance costs of existing infrastructure. Mr. Hudson continued that the STA needs to have the whole system improved and not just focus on impact fees for new projects.

Derrick Lum stated that he wanted to know more about how this new fee would impact farms and farm related industrial uses, such as the Campbell Soup complex in Dixon. Mr. Lum was concerned that any new fees would scare off new development.

Daryl Halls stated that one option under consideration is to not have a fee. Mr. Halls reminded that committee that without a fee, the current funding projected to be available limits Solano County's future to 7 new projects in the next 25 years (e.g., Jepson Parkway, North Connector, etc.). Mr. Halls stated that there is a nature tension between not having a fee program and the need for additional transportation infrastructure.

Linda Seifert asked if there were more successful impact fee models to review. Sam Shelton stated that additional information on impact fee models are contained in both the STA's RTIF Feasibility Study and the RTIF Policy Committee's February 2009 meeting notes. Mr. Shelton stated that he would be available for more RTIF model questions after the meeting.

Jim Williams asked if the RTIF funds would be specifically spent on transportation infrastructure. Daryl Halls stated that project identification is part of the nexus study scope of work.

Frank Andrews stated that he was glad that a zero fee option was on the table. (dev) stated that the housing market trends are unstable and may need a fee to be phased in over time. Daryl Halls stated that phasing in a fee is still possible and will be discussed.

Erin Hannigan stated that Vallejo voters have voted in supermajority for a sales tax for transportation projects several times. Ms. Hannigan added that an RTIF would only charge fees for new growth while a sales tax would be shared by everyone. Ms. Hannigan was also concerned that new fees would discourage growth. Daryl Halls answered that an RTIF does not cover items included in previous sales tax attempts, such as road rehabilitation and mobility for senior citizens. Mr. Halls continued by stating that RTIF projects are about new development impacts only.

Mike Hudson asked what would be the governance authority for the RTIF. Daryl Halls answered that the STA Board preferred that the Solano Transportation Improvement Authority (STIA), the sales tax authority which was not dissolved, be the basis for the RTIF JPA. Mr. Halls reminded the committee that only those agencies who want to participate in the fee would be part of the JPA, guiding project fee funding and selecting projects to advance.

Mary Frances Kelly Poh asked if the RTIF would fail if a city did not participate in the JPA. Ms. Poh also asked if the environment and native plants have been considered in this fee development process.

Frank Andrews stated that he liked the fact that elected officials are part of the RTIF stakeholders committee and hoped that much could be accomplished in this setting.

Mike Hudson requested that more seating be made available for the next meeting.

Linda Seifert requested that a detailed contact information list of RTIF stakeholders be made available.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next meeting of the STA RTIF Stakeholders Committee meeting will be scheduled for October 22 at 9:00 a.m. at Suisun City Hall.



**MODEL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MTAC)
AGENDA**

2:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 21, 2009
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

ITEM

STAFF PERSON

- I. INTRODUCTIONS (2:00 p.m.)** Robert Macaulay, STA

- II. JULY 16, 2009 TAC MEETING MINUTES** Model TAC
Recommendation: Approve the July 16, 2009 Model Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting minutes.
 (2:02-2:05 p.m.)
 Pg. 1

- III. ACTION ITEM**
 - A. Agreement on Intended Use of Model** Robert Macaulay, STA
Recommendation: Approve statement specifying intended and authorized uses of the Napa-Solano Travel Demand Model.
 (2:05 to 2:25 p.m.)
 Pg. 5

 - B. On-Call Modeling Service Request for Proposals** Robert Guerrero, STA
Recommendation: Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve an On-Call Modeling Consultant Request for Proposal (RFP) that includes the scope of services as identified in Attachment A.
 (2:25 to 2:40 p.m.)
 Pg. 8

- IV. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS- (2:40 – 2:55 p.m.)**
Pg 14
 - A. NCTPA/STA Model Agreement** Robert Guerrero, STA
 - B. Model Cooperative Agreement Status** Robert Macualay, STA
 - C. Model TAC 2009 Work Plan Status** Robert Guerrero, STA

- V. NEXT MEETING AGENDA TOPICS- (2:55 – 3:00 p.m.)** Model TAC

- VI. ADJOURNMENT- 3:00 p.m.**

Solano Transportation Authority
 Model Technical Advisory Committee (Model TAC) 2009 Work
 Plan

<u>Task</u>	<u>Tentative Date</u>
1. <u>Formalizing Model TAC</u> Complete MOU with all seven cities, the County of Solano and Napa County Transportation Planning Agency. The MOU will specify committee member and STA roles and responsibilities. Create a Land Use Subcommittee of the Model TAC and appoint new members based on the MOU.	November
2. <u>Completion of Model Technical Update</u> Provide input on land use changes within each jurisdiction for the Model Technical Update.	Complete
3. <u>Quarterly Land Use/Development Updates</u> Review with Model TAC the Congestion Management Program (CMP) Requirements for impacts on the CMP network related to development projects. Determine how often development updates are submitted to STA and include all submitted information in the Model Land Use database. Work with Land Use Subcommittee to prepare for 2010 Census update.	December
4. <u>Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Nexus Study Traffic Analysis Input and Review</u> Provide technical support for modeling data resulting from the RTIF Nexus Study Traffic Analysis.	On Going
5. <u>Traffic Counts Update</u> Develop purpose and needs statement for updating traffic counts. Identify funding to perform traffic counts and potential count locations.	December
6. <u>Tracking STA Model Requests</u> Update the Model User Agreement Form for future STA Model data requests. The Model User Agreement will be updated to ensure that other agencies using the model data maintain the integrity of the STA's model with product review and input by the STA Model TAC. Create a Model User tracking database that provides current status information for which agency is using the model and for what purpose.	Continuous

MEMORANDUM

To: Sam Shelton, STA

From: Jason Moody and Eileen Tumulad

Subject: Solano County RTIF: Project Selection and Program Implementation Options; EPS #19016

Date: October 19, 2009



The Solano County Regional Traffic Impact Fee (RTIF) would provide funding for transportation improvements that serve the regional and collective needs of participating jurisdictions. Given that the revenues would be generated by and allocated to multiple jurisdictions, decisions will need to be made about how the program would be administered, including the determination of eligible projects as well as the sharing and prioritization of funds. This memorandum discusses the range of potential mechanisms and organizational options for implementing the RTIF.

It should be noted that the RTIF Policy Committee has already recommended that the Solano Transportation Improvement Authority (STIA) administer the RTIF program. The STIA is a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) created by the Solano County Board of Supervisors in 2004 to develop a Solano County Transportation Expenditure Plan and administer a transportation sales tax. Although the sales tax measure was not approved by the required two-thirds majority vote, the STIA remains in place. The STIA board of Directors is made up of representatives appointed by elected officials from all the County jurisdictions.

In its role as administrator of the RTIF program, the STIA will have a number of baseline responsibilities that may expand depending upon the choice of implementation mechanisms selected and described herein. At a minimum, the STIA will be responsible for maintaining and updating the RTIF model, calculating the applicable fee(s), approving the list of eligible RTIF projects, and promulgating/monitoring the RTIF implementation process. More expanded responsibilities could include the prioritization and allocation of RTIF expenditures.

While the STIA will serve as the RTIF administrative entity, there exist a variety of options for selecting eligible projects, determining fee levels, and allocating fee revenues among various jurisdictions. Three primary issues are addressed herein: (1) selection of eligible projects, (2) the determination of fee levels by location, and (3) the distribution of fee revenue. As should become clear, these critical program elements are inter-related since decision in one area will affect the implementation and function of others.

Project Selection Criteria Options

Most regional transportation fee programs articulate clear criteria regarding the type of projects or improvements that are eligible to be included. The purpose of these criteria is to ensure that truly regional projects are selected as opposed to more local improvements that may not benefit all the participating jurisdictions. A list of potential selection criteria, and the advantages and disadvantages of each, is summarized in **Table 1**. Although not exhaustive, the list does include the range of selection criteria commonly used in programs of this nature. The list does not constitute a recommendation and some of the criteria listed are mutually exclusive. In addition, regardless of what screening criteria are ultimately selected, all projects must comply with AB 1600 and cannot be already fully funded by another source.

As shown, **Table 1** distinguishes between "absolute" and "relative" criteria. Absolute criteria refer to conditions or factors that must be met in order for a project to be included on an RTIF program. Relative criteria represent more of a ranking mechanism which allows projects to be compared and prioritized based on factors of concern to participating jurisdictions. Most relative criteria can be converted to absolute criteria and vice versa if desired. By way of example, the Regional Significance criteria would rank and prioritize projects based on the absolute or relative number of trips accommodated by the facility that start in one jurisdiction and end in another.¹ Conversely, the criteria could be converted to absolute criteria by eliminating facilities that carry less than an absolute or percentage number of regional trips (e.g., 20 percent).

Fee Levels by Location (Fee Districts)

The RTIF can consist of one County-wide fee or a number of different Fee Districts. A Fee District is the geographical area that contains the inter-community travel patterns that provide the basis for evaluating trip distribution and transportation needs. Fee Districts would separate the County into geographical sub-areas with distinct transportation patterns and needs. Generally speaking separate fee levels are calculated for each fee district (of course, individual jurisdictions are free to develop their own local fees). **Table 2** summarizes the primary Fee District options available.

In addition to reinforcing the regional nature of the fee program, the primary advantages of a single Fee District include ease of implementation and simplicity in transportation modeling. The primary benefit of multiple fee districts is that they can more accurately account for sub-regional differences in growth, transportation needs, trip patterns, and corresponding RTIF contributions. This allows for a more precise "nexus" between the fee level of a particular district and the RTIF program investments that serve it. A disadvantage is that multiple districts may run counter to

¹ A regional trip is one that starts in one jurisdiction and ends in another. For the purposes of the RTIF it could be defined as one that both starts and ends in the County or that contains only one "trip end" in the County

**Table 1
Potential RTIF Project Screening Criteria¹**

Screening Criteria ²	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	STA Travel Demand Model Role
Absolute Criteria				
Included in the CTP, RORS, TFORS, or defined RTIF network	Only include projects in Comp. Trans. Plan, Routes or Transit Facilities of Regional Significance, or other defined network	Defines parameters of program and narrows the universe of eligible projects	May reduce flexibility to fund desired projects	Not needed
Exclude projects in local fee program(s)	Eliminate projects already included in local fee programs	Avoids overlap and complex cost allocation / technical analysis	Reduces opportunities for regional / shared funding	Not needed
Policy Committee Priority Projects	Include projects selected / approved by Policy Committee	Reflects stakeholder input / consensus. May enhance flexibility.	May not reflect objective, quantified criteria	Not needed
No existing deficiencies	Eliminate projects that address existing deficiencies	Eliminates projects and simplifies nexus	May reduce flexibility to fund desired projects	Actual traffic counts are better for measuring existing deficiencies
Exclude State / Federal Facilities	Exclude projects located on State or federally maintained facilities	Eliminates projects outside local responsibility	Eliminates projects important to regional mobility. Program cannot be used as partial mitigation for impacts on State facilities.	Not needed
Located in unincorporated area	Only include projects at least partially located in unincorporated areas	May help ensure regional nature of RTIF program	May reduce flexibility to fund desired projects	Not needed
Relative Criteria				
Regional significance	Prioritize or rank projects based on the absolute or relative number of regional trips (e.g. 30% regional trips)	Provides an objective basis for ranking projects	Requires technical / modeling accuracy regarding origin-destination patterns	Should be used cautiously - more reliable if one looks a project as part of a screenline. Results can be compared to Census, MTC, and SACOG data.
Regional equity	Focus on achieving regional equity (e.g., roughly equal proportion of project costs by jurisdiction or fee district)	May promote regional buy-in and geographic equity	May preclude projects with higher utilization	Can be used to predict roughly what % of a given project is used by traffic originating in the different cities within Solano County
Existing / projected traffic characteristics	Select projects that exceed a desired traffic threshold (such as LOS, Vehicle Hours of Delay, AADT, Volume to Capacity ratios, travel time reliability)	Focuses on highly utilized facilities and/or the most needed improvements	Requires technical / modeling accuracy on detailed traffic volume projections. May duplicate or conflict with existing plans / processes.	If existing traffic levels are used, then actual traffic counts would be better. Model can be used in tandem with counts for forecasting traffic levels.
Constrained time horizon	Prioritize projects expected to be initiated within defined time frame	Eliminates more speculative, long-term projects (5-year updates)	May not capture complete set of projects needed to accommodate future growth	Not needed
Also address existing deficiencies	Prioritize projects that address both existing deficiencies and future needs	Ensures existing facilities do not get worse	May reduce flexibility to fund desired projects. Adds complexity to cost allocation.	Actual traffic counts are better for measuring existing deficiencies
Reduction in GHG	Prioritize projects that reduce emission of Green House Gases	Addresses State / Federal GHG policies	May be difficult to accurately measure given variety of factors at play	Can be used to determine relative VMT and a proxy for GHG.

(1) List is neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive. It is possible that a hybrid of these options, or others not considered here, can serve as the basis for the final fee.

(2) Screening criteria assume all projects comply with AB 1600 and are not already fully funded by another source

(3) Absolute criteria determine whether a project is "in" or "out" while relative criteria rank projects that are "in". Most relative criteria can be converted to absolute and vice versa.

the regional nature of the RTIF program. In addition, multiple fee districts generally require more complex, precise and reliable transportation modeling capabilities and results.

It is also possible to create separate fee "sub-districts" that serve as hybrid between the single and multiple fee district approaches. The sub-district approach maintains a single Countywide fee but allows for separate fee layers for a particular set of improvements to be unique to particular geographic areas. For example, a Vallejo-Benicia "sub-district" could include a special "transit fee" on new development in this area to cover a portion of the costs of transit projects that serve these jurisdictions. Ultimately, the RTIF could consist of variety of "sub-district" fees along with one countywide fee.

Table 2: Fee Level by Location (Fee Districts)

Implementation Option	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Single County-Wide Fee	One fee is calculated for the entire County	Simplifies the fee modeling requirements and reinforces the regional nature of the RTIF program.	Less precise accounting of sub-regional differences in transportation needs and impacts
Multiple Fee Districts	Separate fee levels for defined sub-areas in the County based on unique trip distribution.	Accounts for sub-regional differences in growth, transportation needs, trip patterns, and corresponding RTIF program fee contributions.	Counter to the regional intent of RTIF program. Requires more complex modeling and administration process.
Fee Sub-Districts	Allow for special fee layers to be included on top of single RTIF fee with unique "sub-districts" to fund desired projects that only benefit the fee sub-district (e.g., HOV lanes, transit, etc.)	Allows for specific areas in the region to provide increased funding for specific priority projects without sacrificing the regional nature of the RTIF program.	May require more complex modeling and administration and with multiple "special districts" with separate priority projects.

Fee Collection and Distribution

This analysis has identified three "prototype" models for allocating fee revenues among various jurisdictions that range from minimal to more centralized control, as described below and summarized in **Table 3**. Of course, a range of permutations exists within this spectrum depending on the specific organization requirements and goals of the entities involved.

- 1. Decentralized control:** Each jurisdiction can collect and bank the RTIF revenue generated within their boundaries. The resulting funds can then be applied to a "pick list" of eligible transportation projects approved as part of the RTIF process. This approach will provide maximum flexibility to participating jurisdictions in the prioritization and application of RTIF funds. This "return to source" approach can minimize the need for inter-jurisdictional negotiations regarding the prioritization of investments. Of course, some coordination will still be required for improvements that span jurisdictional boundaries.

Table 3: Revenue Collection and Distribution Options

Implementation Option	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Decentralized Control	Each jurisdiction collects and keeps the RTIF revenue generated within its boundaries and applies the funds to eligible RTIF projects of their choice.	Provides maximum flexibility to participating jurisdictions in the prioritization of RTIF funds. Can also minimize the need for inter-jurisdictional negotiations for prioritization.	Requires inter-jurisdictional coordination for funding multi-jurisdictional projects.
Centralized Control	RTIF revenue collected by each jurisdiction and forwarded to STIA for prioritization and expenditure on approved RTIF projects.	Builds in the need for multi-jurisdictional planning and coordination using an established multi-jurisdictional JPA.	Jurisdictions relinquish direct local control of RTIF revenues and ability to prioritize "their" projects.
Joint Control	A "hybrid" approach which allows jurisdictions to retain a percentage of the funds collected and forward the rest to the STIA.	Provides a "happy medium" between complete local versus complete centralized control.	Depending on the "return-to-source" percentages, may still have issues with coordination of investments or loss of local buy-in.

- 2. Centralized control:** Under this approach the STIA would both administer the RTIF program and be responsible for applying the funds to established RTIF projects. In other words, RTIF revenue collected by each jurisdiction would be transferred directly to the STIA. Funding decisions would be based on input from the STIA Board and would require a multi-jurisdictional agreement on the prioritization and application of RTIF funds. This approach builds in the need for multi-jurisdictional planning and coordination, which requires jurisdictions to utilize a network approach to transportation planning and recognizes the holistic nature of transportation systems.

The operating agreement for the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Financing Authority (the Authority) is an example of the "centralized control" prototype. Revenues collected from each jurisdiction are forwarded to the Authority for the funding of transportation projects.

- 3. Joint control:** This approach represents a hybrid of the centralized and decentralized models above by allowing for a percentage of the funds collected by each jurisdiction (e.g., 50 percent) to remain and be controlled by that jurisdiction. The remaining revenue would be forwarded to the STIA for administration and application of RTIF funds for eligible projects. This alternative allows for the ability of each jurisdiction to prioritize and apply a portion of RTIF funds, while facilitating the funding of multi-jurisdictional projects. It strikes a balance between a complete "return-to-source" approach and more centralized control.

The operating agreement for the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) is an example of the "joint control" prototype, where a portion of fee revenues collected by each jurisdiction is paid to SJCOG for funding regional transportation improvement projects. Each

participating jurisdiction retains the remainder of the fee revenue and can prioritize and apply funds to selected transportation projects.

Implications and Next Steps

The program implementation and project selection options described above span the spectrum from a more centralized and integrated system to a more decentralized and heterogeneous one. In addition, they can vary significantly in terms of the number of projects covered and the level of transportation model accuracy required. At one end of the spectrum would be a single County-wide fee focused on a relatively small number of projects with the transportation investment decisions funneled through the STIA. On the other end would be multiple fee districts covering numerous projects with individual jurisdictions responsible for distributing fee revenue. Within this spectrum, multiple permutations are possible. The selection of the most appropriate set of implementation mechanisms will depend on the goals of participating jurisdictions. In other words, form should follow function when designing appropriate programmatic approaches.

It is expected that the development and refinement of the appropriate RTIF implementation process will occur concurrently with the development of other program elements, including the modeling process and project selection criteria. The STA intends to incorporate input from the Policy, Steering, and Stakeholder Committees as well as the project consultants to formulate the most effective and palatable approach.