



**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE (RTIF)  
TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP**

**1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
Monday, June 13, 2011**

**STA Main Conference Room  
One Harbor Center, Suite 130,  
Suisun City, CA 94585-2473**

**I. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS** Sam Shelton, STA  
(1:30 – 1:33 p.m.)

**II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**  
(1:33 – 1:35 p.m.)

**III. CONSENT CALENDAR**  
(1:35 – 1:40 p.m.)

**A. RTIF Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes of  
January 13, 2011 and April 17, 2011.** Jessica McCabe, STA  
*Recommendation:*  
*Approve the RTIF Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes of  
January 13, 2011 and April 17, 2011.*

**IV. ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Preliminary Project Cost Estimates** Sasha Dansky,  
Mark Thomas & Co.  
*Recommendation:*  
*Approve the use of the Preliminary Project Cost Estimates for  
the RTIF Nexus Study as shown in Attachment A.*  
(1:40 – 2:00 p.m.)

**B. Maximum Nexus Methodology & Draft Calculations** Jason Moody, EPS  
*Recommendation:*  
*Approve the use of the Maximum Nexus Methodology for the  
RTIF Nexus Study as shown in Attachment B.*  
(2:00 – 2:20 p.m.)

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

<u>City of Benicia</u>	<u>City of Dixon</u>	<u>City of Fairfield</u>	<u>City of Rio Vista</u>	<u>City of Suisun City</u>	<u>City of Vacaville</u>	<u>City of Vallejo</u>	<u>County of Solano</u>
Charlie Knox	Janet Koster	George Hicks	Dan Christians	Dan Kasperson	Rod Moresco	David Kleinschmidt	Bill Emlen
Melissa Morton	Dave Dowswell	Erin Beavers		April Wooden	Maureen Carson	Michelle Hightower	Paul Wiese

**RTIF Committee packet information is available on  
STA's website: [www.solanolinks.com](http://www.solanolinks.com)**

**C. Revised RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Estimates**

Jason Moody, EPS

Recommendation:

*Forward to the RTIF Policy Committee the list of feasible RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Projections as shown in Attachment A.*

(2:20 – 2:40 p.m.)

**V. NEXT MEETING TOPICS**

- **Direction from RTIF Policy Committee on Program Development & Fee Schedule,**
- **Draft Nexus Study & Economic Analysis**

Sam Shelton, STA

**VI. CLOSING COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Committee Members

(2:40 – 3:00 p.m.)

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

The next Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Technical Working Group Meeting will be determined, based on input from the RTIF Policy Committee in July 2011.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

<u>City of Benicia</u>	<u>City of Dixon</u>	<u>City of Fairfield</u>	<u>City of Rio Vista</u>	<u>City of Suisun City</u>	<u>City of Vacaville</u>	<u>City of Vallejo</u>	<u>County of Solano</u>
Charlie Knox	Janet Koster	George Hicks	Dan Christians	Dan Kasperson	Rod Moresco	David Kleinschmidt	Bill Emlen
Melissa Morton	Dave Dowswell	Erin Beavers		April Wooden	Maureen Carson	Michelle Hightower	Paul Wiese

RTIF Committee packet information is available on STA's website: [www.solanolinks.com](http://www.solanolinks.com)



**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)  
Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes of  
Thursday, January 13, 2011**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The RTIF Technical Working Group was called to order at approximately 1:30 p.m. in the Solano Transportation Authority’s Main Conference Room.

**MEMBERS  
PRESENT:**

Melissa Morton	City of Benicia
Wayne Lewis	City of Fairfield
April Wooden	City of Suisun City
Dan Kasperson	City of Suisun City
Jeff Knowles	City of Vacaville
Paul Wiese	County of Solano

**MEMBERS  
ABSENT**

Charlie Knox	City of Benicia
Royce Cunningham	City of Dixon
Dave Dowswell	City of Dixon
Erin Beavers	City of Fairfield
Morrie Barr	City of Rio Vista
Maureen Carson	City of Vacaville
David Kleinschmidt	City of Vallejo
Michelle Hightower	City of Vallejo
Bill Emlen	County of Solano

**STAFF  
PRESENT**

Daryl Halls	STA
Janet Adams	STA
Robert Macaulay	STA
Sam Shelton	STA
Jessica McCabe	STA
Karen Koelling	STA
Jason Moody	Economic Planning Systems
Julie Morgan	Fehr & Peers
Sasha Dansky	Mark Thomas & Company

**II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

With a motion from Melissa Morton and a second from Wayne Lewis, the STA

RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously approved the agenda.

### III. CONSENT CALENDAR

With a motion from Melissa Morton and a second from Dan Kasperson, the STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously approved the Consent Calendar Item A.

#### A. RTIF Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes of November 18, 2010

Recommendation:

*Approve the RTIF Committee Meetings of November 18, 2010*

### IV. ACTION ITEMS

#### A. Revised RTIF Project List

Recommendation:

*Forward a recommendation to the RTIF Policy Committee to approve the Revised RTIF Project List as shown in Attachment A.*

Sam Shelton stated that he had received comments from the committee member and had incorporated them into the the project list. A few last minute comments that had not been received until just before the meeting were not included in the map. Comments are green, deletion /changes in yellow, addition in Blue. Mr. Shelton explained that Bob Macaulay had created a map with the same color coding. Bob Macaulay, 2010 CTP projects, narrowed down to 60 and asked the cities to give feedback.

Regarding Jepson Parkway, Wayne Lewis suggested that they have different funding sources to cover their portions and did not want to ask the developers to have the extra fees with the RTIF. After a brief discussion it was decided to keep the Jepson Parkway on the list for future funding from the RTIF.

There were no comments or descent regarding the following projects on the list: 2) North Connector, 3) SR12 East Improvements, 4) Columbus Parkway Reliever Route and 5) SR12 and Red Top Road/Business Center Drive Interchange.

Regarding project number 6, the SR12 and Pennsylvania Avenue Interchange, Wayne Lewis, stated that it is a question of how real the project is in the near term and if there is a perceived benefit from the developers and other involved. Dan Kasperson noted that, though the project is not a priority for Fairfield, it is a major a priority for the City of Suisun, since Suisun has a large development planned adjacent to the project. Mr. Kasperson stated that Suisun's recommendation is to keep the project on the list. Daryl Halls, STA, stated that it is needed for the part of the I-80/680 project, and that there is the potential for state matching funds (i.e. – SHOPP)

The projects 7) McCormack Road and 8) I-680/Lake Herman Road Interchange install traffic signals and construct interchange improvements were kept on the list. With respect to project #8, Melissa Morton noted that the wording had been

changed to include improvements to Industrial Way, to include all transportation modes and to include a link between the interchange and the intermodal station that is planned. Sam Shelton commented that, with respect to modeling, it will be important to understand capacity enhancements of the scope. Ms. Morton noted that the project is focused more on multi-modes, as opposed to expanding the capacity of the roadway.

There was no discussion on Dixon projects that were on the list. Bob Macaulay noted that 10a and 10c were the same project.

It was agreed upon by members to delete Projects 11) SR12 and Beck Avenue Interchange, 12) Manuel Campos Pkwy and 13) I-80/West Texas Street Ramp , since these projects would be covered through local AB1600 fees

Projects 14) SR12/Church Road and Amerada Intersections, 15) Main Street Improvements and 16) Railroad Avenue Extension were left on the list. Also included on this list to keep was 17) I-505/Vaca Valley Pkwy Interchange, 18) I-80/California Drive Extension and Overcrossing, 19) SR37/Fairgrounds Interchange & Roadway Improvements and number 20) Widen Peabody Road.

The projects 21) North gate of Travis Air Force Base and 22a) Cordelia Road from I-680 to SR12 were deleted from the list . With respect to project #21, Wayne Lewis noted that with the development and the probable realignment of Canon Road, it could be built with existing earmarks and developer fees. It was also noted by Wayne Lewis that the North Connector provides access to Cordelia and so project 22a is not needed. Paul Wiese, County of Solano, stated that Midway Road from I-80 to SR113 (22b) and Pedrick Road from Dixon Avenue East to UPRR .(22c) are realms regional significance in the County's adopted segments and would like to add these projects. Melissa Morton asked what the general nature of the improvements were for 22b and 22c. Paul Wiese responded that the improvements were to make standard lane width and shoulders, and not multi-lane improvements.

Benicia Industrial Park Multi-modal Transit project (23), Dixon Multi-modal Transportation Center (24) and Fairfield/Vacaville Train Station were kept on the list and the Fairfield Transportation Center (26) was removed at the request of Wayne Lewis, city of Fairfield. Sam Shelton noted that while Dixon was not present to comment on project #23, it was a priority project for the STA. With respect to project #25, Wayne Lewis commented that it would need to have a funding package put together and with funding challenges; funds will need to be moved around. Jeff Knowles commented that, in being a regional project with multi-agency involvement, the project should stay on the list. It was agreed by both Mr. Lewis and Mr. Knowles to keep project #25 on the list. The remaining projects received no comments and were kept on the list for the Nexus study. Recommend the projects with the amendments from this group be submitted to Policy Committee for the analyses for , not recommending full funding, just keeping on the list for the Nexus study.

With a motion from Dan Kasperson and seconded by Jeff Knowles, the STA RTIF

Technical Working Group unanimously approved the motion.

**V. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**A. Maximum Nexus Modeling Process & Project Cost Estimates**

Jason Moody stated that the next step is to turn over the RTIF Project list to Fehr and Peers who will then produce a maximum fee level based on the nexus and that will be used as a starting point to allocate the fee for land issues, (commercial, residential) for the growth forecast to 2030. Mark Thomas & Company is the cost estimator then will take the list assemble the data to add in the fee estimate.

Jeff Knowles asked if a lump sum per project is what comes out of the Nexus study. Julie Morgan answered that the calculation is based on per unit of development. Mr. Knowles expressed concern with a per unit of development calculation because of how it would have to be broken down for residential uses and non-residential uses, and who takes greater the burden. Mr. Knowles added that there would need to be further discussion to figure out how the fee gets apportioned between the various types of development type. Jason Moody noted that they will continue to provide analysis on a per dwelling unit equivalent (DUE) basis.

Paul Wiese asked about what would be used as a base year in the cost estimate, given that the costs were high in 2007, but were very low in 2009 and 2010. Jason Moody answered that they typically do cost estimating with current year dollars. Mr. Moody noted that the cost estimating is not going to be the operative function in the fee level and the variability in the cost estimate won't affect the accuracy of the fee collected. Mr. Wiese commented that it would be best to make the estimate as accurate as possible, and not use historic lows.

**B. RTIF Implementation Options and Estimated Revenues**

Jason Moody reviewed the process to determine how the revenue will be distributed for the different project and or agencies. Mr. Moody explained the fees in the Nexus determine what the eligible projects are, and the next step would be to determine who gets the money and what it is spent on. Mr. Moody reviewed the handout provided, explaining that six different scenarios have been identified which illustrate funding allocation by return to source option. The RTIF working group followed with a discussion about issues surrounding the fee, return to source, and the political feasibility.

**VI. NEXT POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING TOPICS**

**A. Maximum Nexus Modeling Results & Revised RTIF Implementation Options**

**VII. CLOSING COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Wayne Lewis commented that he would have a discussion (with Fairfield) about if there is a dedicated transit component, potentially putting the Fairfield Transportation Center back on the list.

**VIII.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m. The next meeting of the STA RTIF Working Group will be on **Thursday, March 10, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. at the Solano Transportation Authority, Main Conference Room.**



**SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)  
Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes of  
Thursday, April 17, 2011**

**I.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The RTIF Technical Working Group was called to order at approximately 1:35 p.m. in the Solano Transportation Authority's Main Conference Room.

**MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:**

Matt Tuggle	Solano County
George Hicks	City of Fairfield
John Kearns	City of Suisun City
Janet Koster	City of Dixon
Paul Wiese	County of Solano
Erin Beavers	City of Fairfield
MJ Lanni	City of Vallejo

**MEMBERS**

**ABSENT:**

Charlie Knox	City of Benicia
Dave Doswell	City of Dixon
Gene Cortright	City of Fairfield
Morrie Barr	City of Rio Vista
Dan Kasperson	City of Suisun City
Gary Leach	City of Vallejo

Michelle Hightower	City of Vallejo
Jim Fiack	County of Solano
April Wooden	City of Suisun City
Emi Theriault	City of Rio Vista
Jeff Knowles	City of Vacaville

**STAFF**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Robert Macaulay	STA
	Jessica McCabe	STA
	Jason Moody	Economic Planning Systems
	Julie Morgan	Fehr & Peers
	Sasha Dansky	Mark Thomas & Company

**II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Bob Macaulay suggested moving Action Item III. A. Revised RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Estimates to Information Items, to allow RTIF WG members more time to review. On a motion from George Hicks and a second from Paul Wiese, the STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously approved the agenda.

**III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Due to a lack of members present and time allotted for review, the STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously agreed to table the meeting minutes.

**A. RTIF Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes of January 13, 2011**

Recommendation:

Approve the RTIF Committee Meeting Minutes of January 13, 2011

**IV. ACTION ITEMS**

**A. None.**

## V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

### A. **Maximum Nexus Modeling Results, Project Cost Estimates, RTIF Funding Strategy, Fee Schedule**

Jason Moody described how they had looked at the amount of revenue that would be generated from the fee program, by starting out with an assumed fee of \$1000 per dwelling unit equivalent and looking at the revenue generation over a 10 year period. Mr. Moody explained that the total came out to \$33 million. Referencing the RTIF Implementation & Funding Options tables, Mr. Moody explained that the tables show how the \$33 million would be allocated by district, given various allocation scenarios. Mr. Moody noted that Table 6a illustrates what each district would receive and Table 6b illustrates what each jurisdiction would receive. Mr. Moody described how both the tables illustrate what would occur if STIA collected all the money and distributed it based on the priority projects approved through the RTIF process, and what would occur if the jurisdictions or district keep the money, and spend it on the priority projects approved through the RTIF process. Mr. Moody explained that the difference between the two scenarios depicted in the charts is that in one STIA is in charge of prioritizing which projects (which have already been approved) get the money first, whereas in the other scenario, the jurisdictions are in charge of deciding which projects get the money first. Mr. Moody added that, between these two scenarios, there are various permutations of both extremes, with different allocation percentages.

In reference to Chapter 5 of the draft RTIF Nexus Study, Mr. Moody explained that there is a discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of the various collection and application scenarios. Mr. Moody described the advantages and disadvantages of the implementation options in the Nexus Study, which included a description of decentralized control, centralized control, and joint control (a hybrid of decentralized and centralized).

With respect to the fee, Erin Beavers asked if we weren't financially constrained, what would the number be. Mr. Moody answered that \$1000 per dwelling unit was used because it was easy to multiply and figure out how much the revenue would be and how much each jurisdiction would get. Mr. Moody noted that the actual maximum fee will likely be high and will be based on the cost that comes up in the Nexus study. Mr. Beavers asked if STA adopts a fee, is there an opt-in/opt-out choice only at the time it gets adopted, or can a jurisdiction wait a few years to implement it. Bob Macaulay asked if there was a legal obligation that states that it is one time only option. Mr. Moody answered that a City Council would approve the fee, and it would be operative until such time that a Council decides to change that decision (i.e., - rescind the approved fee). Mr. Macaulay commented that there are two controlling factors – the state statutes and policy decisions made by the STA. Mr. Moody noted that an agreement on a mechanism to index the fee (fee escalation and start date), to a good indicator of economic recovery, and phase the fee in over time.

Mr. Macaulay asked the group if they thought the tables (Table 6A and 6B) adequately showed a range, and provided enough options from which they could make a recommendation from. Mr. Beavers commented that it is important to know the intent of the County relative to their own RTIF that they discussed. Paul Wiese commented that the County's position would likely be (if Option 4 was selected) to not pursue a separate TIF for the County area. Mr. Wiese added that the effort had been started to pay for the County's share of regional projects; however if it can be achieved through another mechanism, then there is no need to pursue both fees.

George Hicks asked how money would be allocated if it came back to a district. Mr. Moody answered that there would be individual working groups for each district, who would work together to figure out how the money would be allocated. Mr. Macaulay commented that he anticipated something similar to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between legal entities within a particular district. Julie Morgan suggested coming up with some type of five year spending plan, and decide on projects that will be included of the first five year cycle. Mr. Beavers commented that he would need to know what the actual fee amount would be before making a recommendation on the distribution. Mr. Moody noted that there will be a maximum fee that will be calculated, but the actual fee approved will be a policy-based fee; however the jurisdictions will agree upon and decide on a fee. Mr. Wiese commented that the fee should be based on what the market can bear, and based what type of project could be built based on each fee amount (compiling a list).

Mr. Macaulay asked for some feedback from Dixon and Vallejo. Janet Koster commented that it would be helpful to have a master list, and have a certain dollar amount to charge to fully fund the list, and identify if there is a priority project to regionally fund. Ms. Koster added that, while it is good to show, it didn't make much sense to return everything top source (as shown in Option #6). MJ Lanni commented that she didn't understand how the region fee interacts with each jurisdictions AB 1600 program. Ms. Lanni asked if the projects that participate in the RTIF would be projects that AB 1600 fees are collected on, and would the percentage be based on the scenario that is selected. Mr. Moody answered that it was agreed at a previous fee that the AB 1600 would not be eliminated even if a certain project was part of the RTIF, because some projects do need multiple funding sources. Mr. Moody added that, as part of the requirements of the Nexus, a developer cannot be charged the same fee twice, but can be charged a local and a regional impact fee.

In reference to Table 6b and scenarios #1 and #2, Ms. Koster asked why the percentage shifts toward the local agencies with other non-STIA projects, and asked if there were an previous discussions about an option between scenario #1 and #2 that would keep the majority at the STIA level. Mr. Macaulay answered that there was general consensus from the group that it would be better to have options that show more local control, and the previous option of 75% STIA and 25% return to local didn't have much traction with the group.

**B. Maximum Nexus Modeling & Methodology**

Julie Morgan described how the 2010 base year condition was established for the model and described the process of developing a list and narrowing the list of projects that could be eligible for funding through the RTIF. With respect to what can be used in the model, Ms. Morgan explained that the model will primarily use roadway projects, and the 22 roadway projects are illustrated on the map. Ms. Morgan noted that transit related projects are not listed in the model because they are not easily represented within the model; however they are still on the list for eligible RTIF funding.

Ms. Morgan explained that the 22 projects were put into the model, some year 2030 analysis was completed, and a series of analytical methods to track trips at the facilities that are local or regional in nature. Ms. Morgan explained that they want to focus on projects that serve a high proportion of regional need, so they separated out the trips that were local from those that cross jurisdictional boundaries.

Mr. Macaulay asked Ms. Morgan to discuss how certain roadways that have multiple segments in the model got averaged and displayed in the handout (Figure 2 – Components of Year 2030 Traffic). Ms. Morgan explained that there are several projects that cover long distances, and within the model, those projects will be represented by dozens of individual links that are individually coded in the model. To simplify and capture what is going on with the projects, a sampling of links were selected and the results were averaged over those links. Mr. Beavers asked about projects that were 100% local or regional, and asked how #17 (Vaughn Rd Railroad Bypass in Dixon) was 100% regional in traffic. Ms. Morgan explained that local is defined by those trips that begin and end within a jurisdiction, while regional represented trips that begin in a jurisdiction and end in another jurisdiction. Ms. Koster explained that particular road section is right on the edge of the city limits, and it is extremely rare that someone start and end that trip in Dixon versus ending in another jurisdiction. Ms. Morgan noted that the focus should not be on the raw trip numbers, and should be on the percentages. Ms. Moody also noted that it is important to focus on the 22 projects in the model to make sure that they reasonably fall into a level of being regionally significant projects. Mr. Moody clarified that the modeling results show percentage of new trips that are regional in nature, and also clarified that they separated out trips coming from existing development (since they won't be subject to the fee), and separated out through trips from regional percentages.

George Hicks commented that when they went through the nominations of projects for the list, his understanding was that if you had projects on the list you were opting in, and if you didn't have projects on the list you were opting out. Mr. Hicks noted that that was a misunderstanding on his part, and asked if it was still possible to add projects, noting that if it were possible, they would rather opt in later. Mr. Macaulay answered that he would need to defer to the Daryl, and added that it was important to look at the schedule and the role that Fairfield plays.

### **C. Project cost Estimates & Methodology**

Sasha Dansky explained that they have been working to establish a good methodology that offer a basis for the costs, and will provide conservative cost estimates. For the projects. Mr. Dansky explained that they are not try to narrow the costs down by each project (bid cost estimates), but are trying to get in the right ballpark since there are a broad range of projects, projects on different scales, and projects in various stages of development. Mr. Dansky explained the goal is to develop a consistent methodology to be used across the projects, and get within 15-20% of the actual project costs.

Mr. Dansky explained that they will rely heavily on the Contra Costa Transit Authority's (CCTA) cost estimating guidelines, using 10% of the project cost in their cost estimating methodology. Mr. Dansky described how they put together in draft form, a cost estimate for Jepson Parkway as an example, which illustrates the project limits and provides a cost estimate summary.

Mr. Dansky explained that they struggled a bit with how much of unit bid prices to use, and asked the group for input. Mr. Hicks commented that he strongly preferred the use of minor item contingency, using an accurate unit price. Mr. Dansky explained that his preference would be to use closer to actual bid prices in today's environment with appropriate contingencies factored in. Mr. Hicks asked how environmental permitting would be handled. Mr. Dansky answered that they have allowances for environmental studies, but not the actual permitting costs; however a discussion about consistent methodology will need to occur, considering this point. Mr. Moody noted it is important to consider costs that are legitimately attributable to a developer. Mr. Macaulay noted that it is important to be thorough and conservative when estimating the costs. Paul Wiese noted that if current prices are being used, it needs to be considered that they are extremely low. Mr. Moody commented that they will probably use an escalator in the fee. Ms. Morgan noted that, if it's a JPA or some agreement, then all of the jurisdictions would need to apply the same escalator, because the fee needs to be uniform across all jurisdictions. Mr. Dansky explained that if the group notices anything that was missed, then they should let him know, so that it can be accounted. Mr. Macaulay noted that they should send comments to Sam Shelton, and then Mr. Shelton can forward those comments on to the consultant.

## **VI. NEXT POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING TOPICS**

### **A. Maximum Nexus Modeling Results, Project Cost Estimated, RTIF Funding Strategy, Fee Schedule**

#### **CLOSING COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

No closing comments from committee members.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m. The next meeting of the STA RTIF Working Group meeting will be on **May 5, 2011 at 1:30 p.m.** at the **Solano Transportation Authority, Main Conference Room.**



DATE: June 7, 2011  
TO: RTIF Working Group  
FROM: Sam Shelton, Project Manager  
RE: Action and Information Item Summaries

**Agenda Overview:**

The purpose of this RTIF Working Group meeting is to understand if working group members are comfortable with RTIF technical information prior to discussing RTIF fee program potential with the RTIF Policy Committee, composed of mayors, city managers, a county supervisor, and the county administrator. This agenda's action items propose the approval of nexus study technical information and do not request the RTIF Working Group to support or oppose a potential RTIF Program.

**Action Item Summaries:**

**Item IV. A. Preliminary Project Cost Estimates** (Sasha Dansky, Mark Thomas & Co.)

At the April 2011 RTIF Working Group meeting, Sasha Dansky described his project cost estimation methodology. As a first step towards estimating project costs for a maximum nexus calculation, Mr. Dansky calculated preliminary project cost estimates for RTIF projects approved at the January 2011 RTIF Working Group meeting. The following are a few of Mr. Dansky's assumptions:

- New Roadway: \$8,000,000/lane mile
- "Enhancements" with no new capacity: \$6,000,000/mile per each side of the road (for a total of \$12,000,000/mile)
- Interchange Modifications: \$20,000,000
- Intersection Modifications: \$2,000,000 (Only used on the SR 12/Church Road and Amerada Intersections)
- New Interchange: \$50,000,000

Using these preliminary project cost estimates, Mr. Dansky estimates the total cost of RTIF listed projects including \$61M of Fairfield's estimated share of the Jepson Parkway project would be \$1,165,500,000 (see Attachment A).

STA staff recommends more rigorous project cost estimation after the RTIF Policy Committee decides to pursue the development of an RTIF fee program with specific agencies. Mr. Dansky will discuss his preliminary project cost estimates with the RTIF Working Group and answer any questions.

Recommendation:

*Approve the use of the Preliminary Project Cost Estimates for the RTIF Nexus Study as shown in Attachment A.*

**Item IV. B. Maximum Nexus Methodology & Draft Calculations** (Jason Moody, EPS)

At the April 2011 RTIF Working Group meeting, Jason Moody and Julie Morgan described how the STA's Travel Demand Model was accepted by the STA Model TAC and described the model's regional trip allocations by RTIF project. On average, 55% of trips from regional growth as a percentage of all 2030 project trips are projected to travel along RTIF projects (see Attachment B).

Jason Moody calculated a draft Maximum Nexus by multiplying the total RTIF Project Cost (\$1.165M) by 52% to calculate a total eligible RTIF Cost of \$607M. By dividing that cost by the total projected 2030 dwelling-unit-equivalent (DUE) growth (66,766 DUEs), Mr. Moody calculated a draft maximum RTIF fee of \$9,094 per DUE. Mr. Moody will discuss his proposed Maximum Nexus Methodology with the RTIF Working Group and answer any questions.

Recommendation:

*Approve the use of the Maximum Nexus Methodology for the RTIF Nexus Study as shown in Attachment B.*

**Item IV. C. Revised RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Estimates** (Jason Moody, EPS)

At the April 2011 RTIF Working Group meeting, Jason Moody presented six different RTIF Implementation Options ranging from a regionally focused program (Option #1, STIA Allocated) to a locally focused program (Option #6, Return-to-Source) and four options in between including partial return to source programs, regional transit capital programs, and county roadway programs.

All options included revenue estimates based on a \$1,000 per DUE for illustrative purposes. These options were described in two tables, dividing estimated revenues by geographic district (Table 6a, Attachment C) and by individual jurisdiction (Table 6b, Attachment D). Jason Moody has not made substantive changes to these tables since the April RTIF Working Group meeting, where members asked to table the approval of these options until their next meeting. Mr. Moody will answer any additional questions about these tables during the meeting.

Recommendation:

*Forward to the RTIF Policy Committee the list of feasible RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Projections as shown in Attachments C and D.*

**Item V. Next Meeting Topics**

*Direction from RTIF Policy Committee on Program Development & Fee Schedule*

Given that the total project cost of the RTIF program is \$1.165M and the maximum allowable fee per DUE is \$9,094, the following table of fee ranges describes how much of the overall project cost an RTIF program would be able to address.

Depending on the Fee Level and foreseeable funding, a RTIF Program could start a few projects or help complete 87% of RTIF projects.

Fee Level	Total Collected Fees		Fee Share of Project Costs		Available Funding by 2030-2040 for RTIF projects, over % of funded RTIF Projects		
	By 2020	By 2030	Percent of Max Nexus (\$607M)	Percent of Total RTIF Project Cost (\$1,165M)	Low Local impact fees without RTP assumptions.	Med RTP Committed with STA 50/50 policy	High Expects new non-local funds, federal & state
<b>\$0</b>	\$0	\$0	0%	0%	\$130 M 11%	\$267 M 23%	\$402 M 35%
<b>\$1,000</b>	\$33 M	\$66 M	11%	6%	\$196 M 17%	\$333 M 29%	\$468 M 40%
<b>\$2,000</b>	\$66 M	\$132 M	22%	11%	\$262 M 22%	\$399 M 34%	\$534 M 46%
<b>\$4,000</b>	\$132 M	\$264 M	43%	23%	\$394 M 34%	\$531 M 46%	\$666 M 57%
<b>\$9,094 (Max)</b>	\$304 M	\$607 M	100%	52%	\$738 M 63%	\$875 M 75%	\$1,010 M 87%

### **\$0 Fee Level**

Without a fee, 11% to 35% of RTIF listed projects could be built, depending on the certainty of new funding from non-local sources.

### **\$1,000 Fee Level**

At this fee level, 17% to 40% of RTIF listed projects could be built, depending on the certainty of new funding from non-local sources. The RTIF pays for 6% of the total cost of the RTIF project list.

### **\$2,000 Fee Level**

At this fee level, 22% to 46% of RTIF listed projects could be built, depending on the certainty of new funding from non-local sources. The RTIF pays for 11% of the total cost of the RTIF project list.

### **\$4,000 Fee Level**

At this fee level, 34% to 57% of RTIF listed projects could be built, depending on the certainty of new funding from non-local sources. The RTIF pays for 23% of the total cost of the RTIF project list.

### **\$9,094 Max Fee Level**

At this fee level, 63% to 87% of RTIF listed projects could be built, depending on the certainty of new funding from non-local sources. The RTIF pays for 52% of the total cost of the RTIF project list.

*Draft Nexus Study & Economic Analysis*

Regardless of the political outcome of RTIF Policy Committee meeting, the STA intends to complete the RTIF Nexus Study, should an opportunity for a RTIF Program present itself in the future. As part of the EPS scope of work, they will include an economic study to discuss the most appropriate fee schedule.

#	CTP ID	Agency	Location/ Title	Description	Very Preliminary Order of Matnitude Cost	Assumptions and Notes
3	09CTP001	Benicia	I-680/Lake Herman Road Interchange	Install traffic signals and construct interchange improvements at I-680/Lake Herman Road. This project will link a rail station to an intermodal transportation station.	\$20,000,000	Flat Cost of Interchange Modifications Assumed
7	09CTP010	Benicia	Columbus Parkway Reliever Route (I-780 to City Limits)	Widen Columbus Parkway from 2 to 4 lanes from I-780 to the City Limits with Vallejo.	\$35,000,000	Project Length of 10,800 LF assumed. 2 New lanes assumed
14	09CTP215	Dixon	I-80/West A St. Interchange	Construct overcrossing and ramp improvements.	\$20,000,000	Flat cost of Interchange Modifications Assumed
30	09CTP121	Fairfield	SR 12 and Red Top Road/Business Center Drive Interchange	Construct a new interchange linking the North Connector, Red Top Road and SR 12.	\$50,000,000	Flat Cost of New Interchange Assumed
34	09CTP182	Fairfield	SR 12 and Pennsylvania Avenue Interchange	Replace the existing SR 12/Pennsylvania at-grade intersection with a new grade-separated interchange.	\$50,000,000	Flat Cost of New Interchange Assumed
39	09CTP199	Rio Vista	SR 12/Church Road and Amerada Intersections	Improve the SR 12 and Church Road intersection. Construct 40 Space Park and Ride Lot at Church Road @ SR 12. The park-and-ride lot may be installed with development of a shopping center at this intersection. A PSR is being prepared for the project.	\$2,000,000	Flat Cost of Intersection Modifications Assumed
44	09CTP034	Solano County	I-80 and SR 37 - Fairgrounds	Improve interchanges at SR 37/Fairgrounds Dr and at I-80/Redwood Pkwy. Also widen Fairgrounds Dr to 4 lanes between SR 37 and Redwood Pkwy.	\$65,000,000	Project Length of 7100 LF Assumed. No New Lanes. Cost per side of the street assumed at \$6,000,000/mile
46	09CTP035	Solano County	Widen Peabody Road from 2 to 4 lanes	Widen Peabody Road to 2 lanes in each direction on the segment located in unincorporated County.	\$20,000,000	Project Length of 6900 LF Assumed. 2 new lanes assumed
49	09CTP061	Suisun City	Main Street Improvements (Phase 2)	Pavement, curb, sidewalk and utility enhancements along Main Street from Morgan Street to Highway 12.	\$6,000,000	Project Length of 2400 LF Assumed. No New Lanes. Cost per side of the street assumed at \$6,000,000/mile
51	09CTP075	Suisun City	Railroad Avenue Widening and Realignment (Middle and East Segment)	Widen and reconstruct Railroad Avenue from Sunset Avenue to Humphrey Drive to a 3-lane arterial with class 2 bike lanes. Realign and widen Railroad Avenue from Humphrey Drive to East Tabor Avenue with new intersection at East Tabor Avenue and Olive Stree		
52	09CTP076	Suisun City	Railroad Avenue Extension (West Segment)	Extend Railroad Avenue from Marina Boulevard to Main Street/Highway 12 On-Ramp and make a signalized intersection at Main St/Hwy 12 On-Ramp.	\$35,000,000	Project Length of 7230 LF Assumed. A brand new 3 lane facility is assumed for the entire length.
61	09CTP083	Vacaville	I-80/California Drive Extension and Overcrossing	Extend California Drive as 4-lane arterial from Marshall Road to Pena Adobe Road. Construct new 4-lane overcrossing @ I-80 with no freeway connections.	\$60,000,000	Flat cost of New Overcrossing Assumed. Project Lenth (w/o overcrossing) of 6640 LF assumed. 4 Lanes total assumed

#	CTP ID	Agency	Location/ Title	Description	Very Preliminary Order of Matnitude Cost	Assumptions and Notes
62	09CTP085	Vacaville	I-505/Vaca Valley Pkwy Interchange	Widen the existing overcrossing to 2 lanes in each direction with protected turn pockets. Modify existing spread diamond to provide partial cloverleaf design.	\$20,000,000	Flat Cost of Interchange Modifications Assumed
84	09CTP029	STA	SR 12 East improvements from I-80 to Rio Vista, including the Rio Vista Bridge	Widen SR 12 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes from I-80 through Suisun City. Widen SR 12 from 2 lanes to 4 lanes from Walters Road to Rio Vista. This includes replacing the Rio Vista Bridge over the Sacramento River.	\$400,000,000	Excludes Rio Vista bridge Replacement Costs. Project Length of 129,500 LF (w/o Bridge) Assumed
91	09CTP033	STA	#91 - Jepson Parkway - Fairfield	Construct a 4-lane continuous expressway from SR 12, along Walters Road, Cement Hill Road, Vanden Road and Leisure Town Road to I-80. The project includes transit pull-outs and shelters, and Class I bike/ped facilities.	\$61,000,000	From STA Jepson Parway Technical Study
92	09CTP033	STA	#92 - Jepson Parkway - Non-Fairfield		\$124,000,000	From STA Jepson Parway Technical Study
87	09CTP166	STA	McCormack Road	Improve McCormack Road, Canright Road and Azevedo Road from SR 113 to SR 12 to provide a parallel alternate to SR 12. Improve the roadways to County standard travel lanes and shoulders.	\$75,000,000	Project Length of 23,750 LF Assumed. A brand new 2 lane facility is assumed
88	09CTP032	STA	North Connector	Construct a 4-lane roadway parallel to I-80, from Abernathy Road across the lower Suisun Valley, along Business Center Drive, connecting to SR 12. The East & Central segments are complete. The West Segment will be a 2-lane roadway connecting Business Ce	\$12,500,000	Project Length of 4100 LF Assumed. 2 lane facility
13	09CTP214	Dixon	I-80/Pitt School Rd. Interchange	Construct overcrossing and ramp improvements.	\$20,000,000	Flat Cost of Interchange Modifications Assumed
17	09CTP218	Dixon	Vaughn Road Railroad Bypass Project	Construct a four-lane bypass route of Vaughn Road to connect to Pedrick Road without crossing the UPRR tracks.	\$20,000,000	Flat Cost of Grade Separation Assumed
89	09CTP036	Solano County	Midway Road	Improve Midway Rd from I-80 to SR 113 to County standards.	\$50,000,000	Project Length of 21200 LF Assumed. No New Lanes. Cost per side of the street assumed at \$6,000,000/mile
90	09CTP036	Solano County	Pedrick Road	Improve Pedrick Rd from Dixon Avenue East to UPRR to County standards.	\$20,000,000	Project Length of 8660 LF Assumed. No New Lanes. Cost per side of the street assumed at \$6,000,000/mile
<b>Total / Weighted Avg.</b>					<b>\$1,165,500,000</b>	

#	CTP ID	Agency	Location/ Title	Description	Existing Trips				Growth in Trips 2010 to 2030				Total 2030 # of Trips				Trips from Regional Growth as % of Total Trips in 2030
					Local	Thru	Regional	Total	Local	Thru	Regional	Total	Local	Thru	Regional	Total	
3	09CTP001	Benicia	#3 - I-680/Lake Herman Road Interchange	Install traffic signals and construct interchange improvements at I-680/Lake Herman Road. This project will link a rail station to an intermodal transportation station. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	4	0	450	454	1	0	935	936	5	0	1385	1390	67.3%
7	09CTP010	Benicia	#7 - Columbus Parkway Reliever Route	Widen Columbus Parkway from 2 to 4 lanes from I-780 to the City Limits with Vallejo. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	0	61	316	377	1	170	502	673	1	232	818	1050	47.8%
13	09CTP214	Dixon	#13 - I-80/Pitt School Rd. Interchange	Construct overcrossing and ramp improvements. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	2	0	1182	1184	1	0	2140	2142	3	0	3323	3326	64.4%
14	09CTP215	Dixon	#14 - I-80/West A St. Interchange	Construct overcrossing and ramp improvements. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	0	228	642	871	1	654	1578	2233	1	883	2220	3103	50.8%
17	09CTP218	Dixon	#17 - Vaughn Road Railroad Bypass Project	Construct a four-lane bypass route of Vaughn Road to connect to Pedrick Road without crossing the UPRR tracks. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	0	0	7	7	0	0	6	6	0	0	13	13	45.2%
30	09CTP121	Fairfield	#30 - SR 12 and Red Top Road/Business Center Drive Interchange	Construct a new interchange linking the North Connector, Red Top Road and SR 12. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	419	161	1238	1818	630	236	1825	2692	1049	397	3063	4510	40.5%
34	09CTP182	Fairfield	#34 - SR 12 and Pennsylvania Avenue Interchange	Replace the existing SR 12/Pennsylvania at-grade intersection with a new grade-separated interchange. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	300	14	695	1009	367	17	1096	1481	667	32	1791	2490	44.0%
39	09CTP199	Rio Vista	#39 - SR 12/Church Road and Amerada Intersections	Improve the SR 12 and Church Road intersection. Construct 40 Space Park and Ride Lot at Church Road @ SR 12. The park-and-ride lot may be installed with development of a shopping center at this intersection. A PSR is being prepared for the project. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	65	198	154	417	113	421	808	1342	178	619	962	1759	45.9%
44	09CTP034	Solano County	#44 - I-80 and SR 37 - Fairgrounds	Improve Fairgrounds Drive and Redwood Parkway, including the Redwood Parkway - I-80 Interchange, from SR 37 to Redwood Parkway. A Project Study Report for the project is complete. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	147	28	232	406	128	37	396	561	274	64	628	967	41.0%
46	09CTP035	Solano County	#46 - Peabody Road Widening	See Projects 09CTP 148 and 09C Widen Peabody Road to 2 lanes in each direction, plus a Class 2 bike/ped facility. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	58	1	475	534	145	2	1172	1319	204	3	1647	1854	63.2%
49	09CTP061	Suisun City	#49 - Main Street Improvements (Phase 2)	Pavement, curb, sidewalk and utility enhancements along Main Street from Morgan Street to Highway 12. A portion of this project is funded by ARRA. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	22	91	193	305	26	89	311	426	48	180	504	732	42.5%
51	09CTP075	Suisun City	#51 - Railroad Avenue Widening (Middle/East)	Widen and reconstruct Railroad Avenue from Sunset Avenue to Humphrey Drive to a 3-lane arterial with class 2 bike lanes. Realign and widen Railroad Avenue from Humphrey Drive to East Tabor Avenue with new intersection at East Tabor Avenue and Olive Stree	28	98	133	260	61	89	346	496	90	187	479	756	45.8%
52	09CTP076	Suisun City	#52 - Railroad Avenue Extension (West)	Extend Railroad Avenue from Marina Boulevard to Main Street/Highway 12 On-Ramp and make a signalized intersection at Main St/Hwy 12 On-Ramp. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	15	92	219	325	38	86	422	546	52	178	641	872	48.5%
61	09CTP083	Vacaville	#61 - I-80/California Drive Extension and Overcrossing	Extend California Drive as 4-lane arterial from Marshall Road to Pena Adobe Road. Construct new 4-lane overcrossing @ I-80 with no freeway connections. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	12	33	284	330	39	73	475	587	51	106	759	917	51.8%

#	CTP ID	Agency	Location/ Title	Description	Existing Trips				Growth in Trips 2010 to 2030				Total 2030 # of Trips				Trips from Regional Growth as % of Total Trips in 2030
					Local	Thru	Regional	Total	Local	Thru	Regional	Total	Local	Thru	Regional	Total	
62	09CTP085	Vacaville	#62 - I-505/Vaca Valley Pkwy Interchange	Widen the existing overcrossing to 2 lanes in each direction with protected turn pockets. Modify existing spread diamond to provide partial cloverleaf design. New bridge to accommodate pedestrian and Class 2 bicycle facilities. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b>	560	253	520	1332	311	1184	1537	3032	870	1437	2057	4364	35.2%
84	09CTP029	STA	#84 - SR 12 East improvements	Widen SR 12 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes from I-80 through Suisun City. Widen SR 12 from 2 lanes to 4 lanes from Walters Road to Rio Vista. This includes replacing the Rio Vista Bridge over the Sacramento River. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b> This	0	479	392	871	0	967	1573	2541	0	1447	1966	3412	46.1%
87	09CTP166	STA	#87 - McCormack Road	Improve McCormack Road, Canright Road and Azevedo Road from SR 113 to SR 12 to provide a parallel alternate to SR 12. Improve the roadway to County standard travel lanes and shoulders. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b> This project was also submitted by the City of Rio Vista.	0	0	163	163	0	0	630	630	0	0	793	793	79.4%
88	09CTP032	STA	#88 - North Connector	Construct a 4-lane roadway parallel to I-80, from Abernathy Road across the lower Suisun Valley, along Business Center Drive, connecting to SR 12. The East Segment (Suisun Parkway) is under construction. The central segment is under construction. The West Segment will be a 2-lane roadway connecting Business Center Drive to SR 12 Jameson Canyon. The west segment status is currently unfunded. <b>This is a Route of Regional Significance.</b> This project was also submitted by the City of Fairfield and the County of Solano.	19	79	315	414	10	195	352	557	29	274	668	971	36.3%
89	09CTP036	Solano County	#89 - Midway Road	Improve Midway Rd from I-80 to SR-113 to County Standards	0	15	91	106	0	29	200	229	0	45	291	335	59.6%
90	09CTP036	Solano County	#90 - Pedrick Road	Imrpove Pedrick Rd from Dixon Avenue East to UPRR to County Standards	1	11	38	50	8	51	251	310	8	62	290	360	69.9%
91	09CTP033	STA	#91 - Jepson Parkway - Fairfield	Jepson Parkway project: portion inside Fairfield	76	52	338	466	165	49	1314	1528	241	101	1652	1994	65.9%
92	09CTP033	STA	#92 - Jepson Parkway - Non-Fairfield	Jepson Parkway project: portion outside of Fairfield	78	17	259	353	155	45	798	998	233	62	1056	1351	59.0%

**Table 1**  
**Maximum RTIF Calculation (Preliminary)**

<b>RTIF Calculation Category</b>	<b>Formula</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Preliminary RTIF Program Costs Estimate <sup>1</sup>	a	\$1,165,500,000
% of RTIF Costs Attributable to New Growth <sup>2</sup>	b	52%
Eligible RTIF Costs	$c = a * b$	\$607,177,735
Total DUE Growth (2010 - 2030) <sup>3</sup>	d	66,766
Maximum Fee / DUE	$= c / d$	<b>\$9,094</b>

[1] See preliminary RTIF costs estimates provided by Mark Thomas & Company Inc.

[2] Equals RTIF facility trips that are new and regional divided by total RTIF facility trips, as calculated by Fehr & Peers.

[3] See Table 3 for Dwelling Unit Equivalent calculations.

**Table 3  
DUE Growth (2010 - 2030)  
STA RTIF Nexus Study**

<b>Category</b>	<b>City of Benicia</b>	<b>City of Dixon</b>	<b>City of Fairfield</b>	<b>City of Rio Vista</b>	<b>City of Vacaville</b>	<b>City of Vallejo</b>	<b>Solano County</b>	<b>County-wide</b>
<b>Single Family</b>	793	2,720	9,512	5,866	7,404	9,151	993	36,439
<b>Multi Family</b>	162	557	1,946	1,200	802	991	203	5,862
<b>Retail</b>	0	147	3,223	351	2,107	2,658	87	8,575
<b>Other Employment</b>	1,651	370	5,846	268	2,565	4,848	343	15,890
<b>Total</b>	2,606	3,794	20,528	7,686	12,877	17,648	1,626	66,766

**Table 2a**  
**Illustrative RTIF Implementation and Funding Options**  
**Average Annual and 10-year Total Fee Revenue by District for every \$1,000 per Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) Fee Amount<sup>1</sup>**

Entity / District	Funding Allocation by Illustrative Return-to-Source Option <sup>2</sup>					
	Option #1: STIA Allocated	Option #2: 50% Return- to-Source	Option #3: Partial Return- to-Source and Transit	Option #4: Partial Return-to- Source and County	Option #5: 2/3 <sup>rd</sup> s Return- to-Source	Option #6: 100% Return-to-Source
<b>% Allocation of RTIF Revenue</b>	▪ STIA: 100% ▪ Districts: 0%	▪ STIA: 50% ▪ Districts: 50%	▪ STIA: 47.5% ▪ Districts: 47.5% ▪ Transit: 5%	▪ STIA: 40% ▪ Districts: 40% ▪ County: 20%	▪ STIA: 33% ▪ Districts: 67%	▪ STIA: 0% ▪ Districts: 100%
<b>STIA</b>						
10-year total	\$33,386,000	\$16,693,000	\$15,858,000	\$13,354,000	\$11,129,000	\$0
Avg. Annual	\$3,338,600	\$1,669,300	\$1,585,800	\$1,335,400	\$1,112,900	\$0
% of Total	100%	50%	47%	40%	33%	0%
<b>District 1: Central County</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$3,330,000	\$3,163,000	\$2,664,000	\$4,439,000	\$6,659,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$333,000	\$316,300	\$266,400	\$443,900	\$665,900
% of Total	0%	10%	9%	8%	13%	20%
<b>District 2: Jepson Parkway Corridor</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$3,306,000	\$3,141,000	\$2,645,000	\$4,408,000	\$6,612,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$330,600	\$314,100	\$264,500	\$440,800	\$661,200
% of Total	0%	10%	9%	8%	13%	20%
<b>District 3: SR 12 Corridor</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$1,717,000	\$1,631,000	\$1,373,000	\$2,289,000	\$3,433,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$171,700	\$163,100	\$137,300	\$228,900	\$343,300
% of Total	0%	5%	5%	4%	7%	10%
<b>District 4: Dixon and NE County</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$1,182,000	\$1,123,000	\$946,000	\$1,576,000	\$2,364,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$118,200	\$112,300	\$94,600	\$157,600	\$236,400
% of Total	0%	4%	3%	3%	5%	7%
<b>District 5: Rio Vista and SE County</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$2,085,000	\$1,981,000	\$1,668,000	\$2,780,000	\$4,170,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$208,500	\$198,100	\$166,800	\$278,000	\$417,000
% of Total	0%	6%	6%	5%	8%	12%
<b>District 6: Vallejo / Benicia</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$5,074,000	\$4,820,000	\$4,059,000	\$6,765,000	\$10,148,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$507,400	\$482,000	\$405,900	\$676,500	\$1,014,800
% of Total	0%	15%	14%	12%	20%	30%
<b>County or Transit</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$0	\$1,669,000	\$6,677,000	\$0	\$0
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$0	\$166,900	\$667,700	\$0	\$0
% of Total	0%	0%	5%	20%	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>						
10-year total	\$33,386,000	\$33,387,000	\$33,386,000	\$33,386,000	\$33,386,000	\$33,386,000
Avg. Annual	\$3,338,600	\$3,338,700	\$3,338,600	\$3,338,600	\$3,338,600	\$3,338,600
% of total RTIF Facility Costs	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%

(1) The \$1,000 DUE fee equates to a fee of \$1,000 per single family unit, \$614 per multi-family unit, \$1.85 per retail square foot, and \$.85 per square foot for office / industrial.

(2) Growth assumptions based on 2010 - 2030 year STA travel demand model and ABAG projection (the 10 year projections are equal to one-half of this growth).

**Table 2b**  
**Illustrative RTIF Implementation and Funding Options**  
**Average Annual and 10-year Total Fee Revenue by District for every \$1,000 per Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) Fee Amount<sup>1</sup>**

Entity / District	Funding Allocation by Illustrative Return-to-Source Option <sup>2</sup>					
	Option #1: STIA Allocated	Option #2: 50% Return-to-Source	Option #3: Partial Return-to-Source and Transit	Option #4: Partial Return-to-Source and County	Option #5: 2/3 <sup>rds</sup> Return-to-Source	Option #6: 100% Return-to-Source
<b>% Allocation of RTIF Revenue</b>	▪ STIA: 100% ▪ Jurisdictions: 0%	▪ STIA: 50% ▪ Jurisdictions: 50%	▪ STIA: 47.5% ▪ Jurisdictions: 47.5% ▪ Transit: 5%	▪ STIA: 40% ▪ Jurisdictions: 40% ▪ County: 20%	▪ STIA: 33% ▪ Jurisdictions: 67%	▪ STIA: 0% ▪ Jurisdictions: 100%
<b>STIA</b>						
10-year total	\$33,383,000	\$16,691,000	\$15,857,000	\$13,353,000	\$11,016,000	\$0
Avg. Annual	\$3,338,300	\$1,669,100	\$1,585,700	\$1,335,300	\$1,101,600	\$0
% of Total	100%	50%	48%	40%	33%	0%
<b>City of Benicia</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$651,000	\$619,000	\$521,000	\$873,000	\$1,303,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$65,100	\$61,900	\$52,100	\$87,300	\$130,300
% of Total	0%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%
<b>City of Dixon</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$948,000	\$901,000	\$759,000	\$1,271,000	\$1,897,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$94,800	\$90,100	\$75,900	\$127,100	\$189,700
% of Total	0%	3%	3%	2%	4%	6%
<b>City of Fairfield</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$5,132,000	\$4,875,000	\$4,106,000	\$6,877,000	\$10,264,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$513,200	\$487,500	\$410,600	\$687,700	\$1,026,400
% of Total	0%	15%	15%	12%	21%	31%
<b>City of Rio Vista</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$1,921,000	\$1,825,000	\$1,537,000	\$2,575,000	\$3,843,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$192,100	\$182,500	\$153,700	\$257,500	\$384,300
% of Total	0%	6%	5%	5%	8%	12%
<b>City of Vacaville</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$3,219,000	\$3,058,000	\$2,575,000	\$4,314,000	\$6,439,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$321,900	\$305,800	\$257,500	\$431,400	\$643,900
% of Total	0%	10%	9%	8%	13%	19%
<b>City of Vallejo</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$4,412,000	\$4,191,000	\$3,530,000	\$5,912,000	\$8,824,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$441,200	\$419,100	\$353,000	\$591,200	\$882,400
% of Total	0%	13%	13%	11%	18%	26%
<b>Solano County</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$407,000	\$386,000	\$7,002,000	\$545,000	\$813,000
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$40,700	\$38,600	\$700,200	\$54,500	\$81,300
% of Total	0%	1%	1%	21%	2%	2%
<b>Transit</b>						
10-year total	\$0	\$0	\$1,669,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Avg. Annual	\$0	\$0	\$166,900	\$0	\$0	\$0
% of Total	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>						
10-year total	\$33,383,000	\$33,381,000	\$33,381,000	\$33,383,000	\$33,383,000	\$33,383,000
Avg. Annual	\$3,338,300	\$3,338,100	\$3,338,100	\$3,338,300	\$3,338,300	\$3,338,300
% of total RTIF Facility Costs	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%

(1) The \$1,000 DUE fee equates to a fee of \$1,000 per single family unit, \$614 per multi-family unit, \$1.85 per retail square foot, and \$.85 per square foot for office / industrial.

(2) Growth assumptions based on 2010 - 2030 year STA travel demand model and ABAG projection (the 10 year projections are equal to one-half of this growth).