Solano Transportation Authority

. . . working for you!

SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

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

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

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE (RTIF) TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

March 12, 2012
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

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

I. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS — Sam Shelton, STA
(3 minutes)

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
(3 minutes)

III. CONSENT CALENDAR
(3 minutes)

A. RTIF Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes of September 12, 2011. — Sam Shelton, STA
Recommendation:
Approve the RTIF Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes of September 12, 2011.

IV. RTIF STATUS UPDATE / MEETING PURPOSE — Daryl Halls, STA

V. ACTION ITEMS

A. Phasing in a RTIF Program Using Economic Recovery Indices — Jason Moody, EPS
Recommendation:
Forward to the RTIF Policy Committee potential RTIF economic recovery indices as shown in Attachment A.
(15 minutes)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

City of Benicia	City of Dixon	City of Fairfield	City of Rio Vista	City of Suisun City	City of Vacaville	City of Vallejo	County of Solano
Charlie Knox	Morrie Barr	George Hicks	David Melilli	Dan Kasperson	Rod Moresco	David Kleinschmidt	Bill Emlen
Melissa Morton	Dave Dowswell	Erin Beavers		April Wooden	Maureen Carson	Michelle Hightower	Matt Tuggle

RTIF Committee packet information is available on STA's website: www.solanolinks.com

B. Revised RTIF Implementation & Revenue Estimate Packages — Sam Shelton, STA; Jason Moody, EPS

Recommendation:
Forward to the RTIF Policy Committee feasible RTIF Implementation & Revenue Projection Packages as shown in Attachments C, D, E, F, and G.
(45 minutes)

Attachments C, D, E, F, and G will be provided under separate cover.

VI. NEXT MEETING TOPICS — Daryl Halls, STA

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

VII. CLOSING COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS — Committee Members
(10 minutes)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
The next Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Technical Working Group Meeting will be scheduled following input from the RTIF Policy Committee to be held in April or May 2012.

SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)
Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes of
Monday, September 12, 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:

Matt Tuggle	Solano County
April Wooden	City of Suisun City
Dan Kasperson	City of Suisun City
Janet Koster	City of Dixon
Erin Beavers	City of Fairfield
Jeff Knowles	City of Vacaville
Janet Koster	City of Dixon

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Charlie Knox	City of Benicia
Dave Doswell	City of Dixon
Morrie Barr	City of Rio Vista
Gary Leach	City of Vallejo
Michelle Hightower	City of Vallejo
Jim Fiack	County of Solano
George Hicks	City of Fairfield

STAFF PRESENT:

Robert Macaulay	STA
Jessica McCabe	STA
Sam Shelton	STA
Daryl Halls	STA
Jason Moody	Economic Planning Systems
Julie Morgan	Fehr & Peers
Adrian Engel	Mark Thomas & Company

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With a motion from Erin Beavers and a second from Matt Tuggle, the STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously approved the agenda.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

With a motion from Janet Koster and a second from Matt Tuggle, the STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously approved the meeting minutes of June 13, 201.

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

Recommendation:
Approve the RTIF Committee Meeting Minutes of June 13, 2011.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Preliminary Project Cost Estimates

Adrian Engel described how he and Sasha Dansky had worked on establishing cost estimates, based on feedback from the RTIF Working Group. Mr. Engel explained that they started with a broad approach for the cost estimates, but once the projects are refined with the process, they plan to come up with detailed cost estimates for all the projects that are included. Mr. Engel explained that since the last meeting, they determined that some of the estimates were too broad/generic, and so they have been adjusted. Mr. Engel reviewed the list of projects and described where the changes were made. Mr. Engel explained that the I-80 and SR 37 Fairgrounds project was changed to reflect the cost from the PSR, rather than the $65M, and that the Suisun Railroad Avenue project was split, with separate costs shown for the east and west segments. Mr. Engel added that changes was also made to the SR12 East Improvements (from I-80 to Rio Vista & Rio Vista Bridge), where the bridge was removed from the fee estimate and to the Jepson Parkway project, where it was now split into two projects (Fairfield portion and non-Fairfield portion).

Mr. Engel explained that Sasha Dansky talked with Matt Tuggle about re-assessing the rural roads/rural road standards and amount of improvements associated with them. Mr. Engel explained that they came up with a new estimate for widening existing two-lane rural roads, using current standards of approximately $1M per mile. The new methodology for rural roads resulted in updating (reducing) the costs for McCormack Road, Midway Road, and Pedrick Road. Mr. Engel explained that the last project changed was the North Connector, which now shows a cost of $32M.

Jeff Knowles asked how critical the cost estimates were in terms of determining funding down the line, and asked if it was worth going to the level of detail for the estimates when the jurisdictions won't be held to those amounts in an agreement. Mr. Engel answered that, at this point, the estimates are high level and they don't want to spend too much time and energy trying to getting the numbers perfect, especially if they might not be included in the fee program. Mr. Engel explained that the list represents a first cut and provides a idea of what the maximum nexus could be given the list of projects provided. Once the list is reviewed by the RTIF policy committee, the cost estimates can be revised and become more detailed. Mr. Knowles noted that

the downside of aiming high with the estimates is that local developers will fight the fees, and will argue that though it's only 1/4 of the fee, it's 1/4 of an inflated figure. Sam Shelton asked why the estimate for the I-80/California Drive overcrossing is $60M, while the other interchanges are estimated at $20M. Mr. Engel answered that $20M was a base cost, and new interchanges are assumed to be approximately $50M, but on the list they range from $20M to $70M depending on the complexity of the interchange project. Mr. Knowles noted that the I-80/California Drive overcrossing is not an interchange, and is just an overcrossing, and that projects #61 and #62 on the list have been estimated in Vacaville's transportation impact fees (TIF) at about $26M. Mr. Engel that the cost for projects #61 and #62 will be revised to be consistent with Vacaville's estimate, especially since it's been built into an existing fee. Mr. Engel added that other projects will be revised, if needed, to be consistent with other TIFs.

With a motion from Janet Koster, and a second from Dan Kasperson, the STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously approved the Preliminary Project Cost Estimates.

B. Maximum Nexus Methodology & Draft Calculations

Jason Moody briefly described what was reviewed at the last RTIF Working Group meeting and noted that, based on feedback at the last meeting, additional adjustments were made. Mr. Moody explained that one of the changes included the addition of Table A-2, which show the assumptions for the dwelling unit equivalent factors. Mr. Moody described the assumptions for each of the categories - single family residential, multifamily residential, retail, and commercial. Mr. Moody added the footnotes explain if there are pass-through/pass-by trips or new trips.

Jeff Knowles asked where the percentages came from and asked if they've been used elsewhere. Julie Morgan answered that it was similar to percentages used in other fee programs, and they came from San Bernardino Association of Governments (SANBAG) publication, and the numbers represent an average based on the numbers used by SANBAG. Mr. Moody reviewed Table 1 - Maximum RTIF Calculation, explaining that the percent of RTIF Costs attributed to new growth is the transportation model, the eligible RTIF costs is 50% times the total , the total DUE growth (over the timeframe 2010-2030) which is 66,902, and the maximum fee per DUE is the eligible RTIF costs divided by total DUE growth.

With a motion from April Wooden, and a second from Jeff Knowles, the STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously approved the Maximum Nexus Methodology & Draft Calculations.

C. Revised RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Estimates

Jason Moody reviewed Table 2a and 2b, describing the how the idea is to look at a per $1,000/unit Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) fee over the average annual and 10-year total. Mr. Moody explained how the estimates show the percent allocation of RTIF revenue, with six different scenarios that show all of the revenue going to STIA at one

extreme, and all revenue being return-to-source at the other.

Dan Kasperson commented that it would have been helpful to have city lines indicated on the map. Mr. Moody noted that begs the question as to what the meaning of return-to-source means - district source or agency source. Sam Shelton noted that the two tables illustrate this point, showing implementation and funding option by RTIF district and jurisdiction, respectively. Mr. Kasperson asked if the Board would make the decision on whether it goes by district or jurisdiction. Daryl Halls answered that there will need to be further discussion about that and how to implement the fee. Mr. Halls noted that what will be critical is deciding which projects on the list are selected, by each jurisdiction, to be advanced. Mr. Halls also noted that most of the projects are multi-jurisdictional. Mr. Kasperson commented that he thought a regional fee makes more sense, however noting that politically it may not make the most sense. Mr. Halls commented that the RTIF working group should focus more on the technical aspects of the projects, rather than the political feasibility, whereas that would be handled by the elected officials.

Jeff Knowles noted that when he had worked on establishing/tailoring fees in the past, it took local staff buy-in, and then needed to be sold to the elected officials. Mr. Halls commented that, historically staff has had to handle the political side, but that has changed, and the political climate has changed because of the economy (i.e. - no one wants to impose more fees and/or raise fees).

Mr. Knowles highlighted the importance of having projects geared up and shelf-ready for when these sources of funds become available, and could be sold at various levels, but is less sellable to politicians and developers. Mr. Halls commented that, ultimately, it is the decision of the jurisdictions and their councils; it is STA that is offering the options for how to select the projects and accomplish the goal of establishing the RTIF. Mr. Halls added that it is important to select very strong projects, that are supported politically, which will help drive the RTIF.

Dan Kasperson asked if projects that don't cross all seven jurisdictions, like McCormack Rd., are selected then would the fee only be charged to development in the communities that are involved in those projects. Mr. Halls responded that that would be likely, unless it was a regional or countywide project, with a regional/countywide benefit. April Wooden noted that the methodology is confusing because it assumes a regional approach. Mr. Moody answered that it doesn't change the methodology, but it would change how the methodology would be applied (i.e. - the number of projects could be reduced, and it wouldn't affect the methodology), and there is still the decision about the implementation option. Erin Beavers commented that the list of projects is too long, and it should be reevaluated from a more regional standpoint.

Mr. Beavers added that he doesn't want to see a series of additive fees (a county fee, STA fee, city fees, etc.), but would rather see a regional fee, with the ideal option being Option #4. Mr. Halls agreed that the list should be a lot smaller, and further discussions should be had about the regional benefits. Mr. Kasperson commented that he thought it would be difficult to sell the fee to their council, especially with implementation being in the future, but agreed it was important to participate in something regional and highlighted the importance of the return-to-source. Mr. Halls commented that narrowing the list down to something more manageable is essential to making a recommendation and therefore the item would need more thought and discussion.

Sam Shelton referenced page 10 of the RTIF WG packet, and explained that it shows assumptions, based on fee level and foreseeable funding, what percentage of projects could actually be built. Mr. Kasperson asked how do deal with only 3 or 4 projects, and only return-to-source. Mr. Shelton answered that it would push the projects out to 2030-40. Mr. Moody explained that when each jurisdiction was asked to select projects for the RTIF that would entice the elected officials, they provided 3-4 projects each, which made the entire list of projects long. Mr. Kasperson noted that if you leave more projects on the list, then later on, there is more flexibility as to where to pick and choose to spend the money. Mr. Kasperson asked if the Board would take action on fee level/implementation before or after the nexus study. Mr. Halls answered that the nexus study will determine eligibility, and then the policy decision will follow. Jeff Knowles asked, given the political climate, should the RTIF be put on hold. Mr. Halls answered that it would be best to get the RTIF study ready to go, because the political climate could suddenly change.

Mr. Shelton commented that the groups feedback indicated that the information is still a bit vague and that narrowing down the project list is necessary. Mr. Moody asked the group if they thought another meeting was needed, or if they thought what is available now should be presented to the policy makers. Mr. Kasperson answered that he thought another meeting was needed and that the list needs to be refined. Mr. Moody suggested, for the next meeting, working on a presentation for policy makers that highlights the key RTIF choices/options. April Wooden, commented that, reconsidering the projects on the list is necessary and important.

The STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously agreed to table the revised RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Estimates item to the next RTIF Working Group meeting.

V. NEXT MEETING TOPICS

- **Revised RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Estimates**
- **Direction from RTIF Policy Committee on Program Development & Fee Schedule**
- **Draft Nexus Study & Economic Analysis**

VI. CLOSING COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

No closing comments from committee members.

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 October 2011.

DATE: March 8, 2012
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. Phasing in a RTIF Program Using Economic Recovery Indices (Jason Moody, EPS)
Jason Moody will discuss how an RTIF Program could be phased in and indexed to several different types of economic indices as shown in Attachment A, "Potential RTIF Economic Recovery Indices for Solano County".

Recommendation:
Forward to the RTIF Policy Committee potential RTIF economic recovery indices as shown in Attachment A.

Item IV. B. Revised RTIF Implementation & Revenue Estimate Packages (Sam Shelton, STA)
At the September 12, 2011 RTIF Working Group meeting, many different implementation options and their associated revenue estimates were presented to the RTIF Working Group. At the meeting, working group members recommended approval of preliminary project cost estimates and the maximum nexus methodology and draft calculations. During the topic of "Revised RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Estimates", working group members were generally supportive of the technical accuracy of the information, but requested additional time to discuss specific implementation options and projects in preparation for a presentation to a future RTIF Policy Committee meeting. STA staff organized meetings throughout the Fall of 2011 to discuss each of the potential elements of a RTIF implementation package (see email from Attachment B). Also attached is a summary of these discussions that helped inform draft RTIF implementation packages included in Attachments C, D, E, F, and G (see table from Attachment B).

Recommendation:
Forward to the RTIF Policy Committee feasible RTIF Implementation & Revenue Projection Packages as shown in Attachments C, D, E, F, and G.

Attachments:

A. Potential RTIF Economic Recovery Indices for Solano County (02-08-2012)
B. Invitation email and Summary of Informal RTIF Discussions with Agency Public Works & Planning staff (03-08-2012)

RTIF Implementation & Revenue Projection Packages as shown in Attachments C, D, E, F, and G will be provided under separate cover.

Potential RTIF Economic Recovery Indices for Solano County

Factor	Data Source	Amount in County By Year			Avg. Annual Growth	Data Availability
		2000	2005	2010		
Unemployment Rate	U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics or EDD	4.6%	5.4%	12.0%	10.1%	Monthly
Average Home Price	RAND California:	$267,976 [1]	$468,836	$220,289	-2.4%	Monthly
Building Permits	RAND California	2,346	2,553	441	-15.4%	Annual
Housing Foreclosures	RAND California	79 [1]	31	3,783	62.2%	Monthly
Residential Vacancy	California Department of Finance	3.06%	3.46%	4.03%	2.8%	Annual
New Housing Units Built	California Department of Finance	1,522	2,942	570	-9.4%	Annual
Population	California Department of Finance	394,930	419,004	413,344	0.5%	Annual
Jobs	U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics	121,402 [2]	129,185	122,105	0.1%	Monthly
Jobs / Housing Ratio	See above	0.31	0.31	0.30	-0.4%	Annual
Construction Cost Index	Engineering News Record	100 [3]	114	136	3.1%	Monthly
Traffic Level of Service	(check with F&P)	(check with F&P)				

[1] From 2002.
[2] From 2001.
[3] Based on the San Francisco index with year 2000 adjusted as the base year.

Source: Economic and Planning Systems, Inc

From: sam shelton
To: April Wooden ; Bill Emlen; Charlie Knox; Dan Kasperson; "Dave Dowswell"; David Kleinschmidt; dmelilli@ci.rio-vista.ca.us; Erin Beavers; "George Hicks"; jkoster@ci.dixon.ca.us; Matt Tuggle; Maureen Carson; Melissa Morton; Michelle Hightower; Rod Moresco ; mbarr@ci.dixon.ca.us
Cc: dkhalls@sta-snci.com; jadams@sta-snci.com; rguerrero@sta-snci.com; Bob Macaulay; kkoelling@sta-snci.com; Jessica McCabe; jmasiclat@sta-snci.com; Jeff Knowles ; Adrian Engel; Mike Roberts ; "MJ Lanni"; Shawn Cunningham; Wayne Lewis; Jason Moody; Sasha Dansky; J.Morgan@fehrandpeers.com
Subject: Sept-Oct Individual agency RTIF meetings
Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2011 3:01:00 PM

Dear RTIF Working Group,

Thank you for attending Monday's Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Working Group meeting. At the meeting, working group members recommended approval of preliminary project cost estimates and the maximum nexus methodology and draft calculations. During the topic of "Revised RTIF Implementation Options & Revenue Estimates", working group members were generally supportive of the technical accuracy of the information, but requested additional time to discuss specific implementation options and projects in preparation for a presentation to a future RTIF Policy Committee meeting..

Listed below are several suggestions ideas discussed during Monday's meeting that could become part of these implementation options:

- Focus RTIF fees on the highest priority projects by narrowing the project list further.
- Maintain a balance of regional and local fee levels as part of project delivery funding strategies.
- Reshape districts or corridor area working groups around specific priority projects and/or near-term development areas.
- Include only the cost of project development phases (e.g., environmental, design and right-of-way) of high-cost projects to lower the max nexus.
- Create additional county road funding resources by shifting some of the current County Facilities fees to potential RTIF transportation projects.
- Provide elected officials with informational materials about the role of fees and fee-funded projects in economic development.
- Connect STA transportation funding strategies and leveraging other funding concepts to RTIF projects (e.g., reality of available funding and policies, shelf-ready RTIF projects, etc.).
- Explain multiple methods of Indexing, triggering, or phasing the introduction of a RTIF program based on construction cost indexes, numbers of permits processed, etc.

It's clear that these ideas need additional refinement and discussion with individual agencies before they are developed further or incorporated into any draft implementation options. RTIF working group members requested an additional meeting to discuss these topics further to package these ideas prior to a future RTIF Policy Committee meeting in December. To help guide this discussion, STA staff and EPS staff would like to create draft implementation options based on individual discussions with working group members over the next month.

To help STA staff schedule these meetings with individual RTIF working group members in each agency, please send me a <u>single agency contact</u> that can work with STA administrative staff to

schedule these meetings.

Below is a draft agenda for these individual agency meetings between STA Staff and local agency staff regarding RTIF Interests.

Local Agency RTIF Interests Discussions (draft agenda)
Sept/Oct TBD, 1 hour max, held at local agency offices

Purpose:
Clarify each agency's interests and options regarding potential RTIF Implementation packages in preparation for the next RTIF Working Group meeting and eventual presentation to RTIF Policy Committee members.

Attendees:
Robert Macaulay, STA
Sam Shelton, STA
Local Agency RTIF Working Group members
(as seen on agenda covers)

Draft Agenda Items:
- Review of RTIF Nexus Study development (STA Staff, 10 mins)
- Update on Local Fees & AB1600 projects (Local staff, 20 mins)
- Discussion of Local Agency Interests in RTIF implementation option ideas (ALL, 30 mins)

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Sam

Sam Shelton
Project Manager
Solano Transportation Authority
1 Harbor Center, # 130
Suisun City, CA 94585
(707) 399-3211 DIRECT
(707) 424-6074 FAX
sshelton@sta-snci.com

www.sta.ca.gov and
solanosr2s.ca.gov

Summary of Informal RTIF Discussions with Agency Public Works & Planning staff (03-08-2012)

Topics	Benicia	Dixon	Fairfield	Rio Vista	Suisun City	Vacaville	Vallejo	County	Topic Summary
Local AB 1600 status	2008 updated AB1600	RFP for AB1600 update Fall 2011	Current AB1600 update + East Area fees, Parks vs. other	Need to update & review DAs	After GP update (update unfunded, no redev $)	GP update +2yrs, AB1600 after	Update in 2012, fees now subsidized from 50% to 80%	Public Facility Fee (PFF) RFQ	Various stages, under pressure to update & lower
Development Near-term locations	Bordoni Ranch	Southwest Dev Area & NE Industrial	Train Station Area	Del Rio Hills	Main St. West, Gentry (no FEIR)	Southtown	Mare Island, Bordoni Ranch, Cook, SR29, 360	(not discussed)	FF Train Station Area, Del Rio Hills, Southtown, 360
Projects Focus on highest priorities with a shorter project list	Columbus Pkwy WB, 780 to Rose ramps, add transit element/SolTRANS	West A St. I/C, Pitt School I/C, Vaughn Rd RxR, Pedrick maybe	North Connector West	Church Rd, McCormick, SR12 Widening	SR12/Pennsylvania, RxR Ave w/ FF?, staff support on transit element	Jepson, Peabody (Midway I/C +20yrs)	Fairgrounds/SR37 + 360 Transit project phases	Jepson, Peabody, McCormick, Midway, Pedrick	Isolated localized priorities that are less regional
Balance Regional & Local Fees as part of delivery strategy	AB1600 recently updated	No comment w/o AB1600 update	Okay with RTIF alternative of DAs & MOUs for Jepson	Yes	NA	Yes, use fee comparison memo from EPS	Leverage local TIF for Regional projects	Potential PFF shifting to roads	Support to balance with PFF, not local AB1600 fees
RTIF working groups Define around priority projects or development areas	Columbus Pkwy connections with Vallejo	Geographic isolation of Dixon makes the County the only partner	No, focus on clear regional benefit	Yes, for SR12 Corridor	SR12	Jepson Corridor	Problem with north county project nexus	Can become a member of many working groups	Jepson Corridor & Transit have clearest nexus & partners
PE Cost Only for Lower Max Nexus	No	Yes, if it can help deliver phases of projects	Not an issue	No, too limiting during nexus stage	No, too limiting during nexus stage	Not a deal breaker	Keep total cost in nexus	No	No
County PFF to Roads Shift part of County Public Facility Fee to RTIF	Maybe	Clarify Fee benefits	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Potentially after study	Yes, consider after study
Role of fees memo for elected officials	Yes	No	Econ Dev, Fee comparison info, possible sales tax?	Are Fees Adequate for Needs?	Yes, Econ Dev	Econ Dev, Fee comparison info, info for chambers	Yes, Econ Dev for Jobs!	Not important	Yes, for councils and chambers
Clear funding strategies with RTIF and STA funds.	Yes	Yes	Yes, focus on leveraging more money with RTIF	Yes	Keep regional benefits clear for developers	Maintain clear strategies, show $	Yes	Phased delivery	Clarify project (phases) funding strategies
Index, trigger, phase introduction of RTIF program	Not important	Maybe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Use for flexible introduction of fees,	Debt Ratio trigger for financing new projects	Yes
Other issues mostly administrative	Keep admin & collection simple	Avoid double charging	Local control, clear regional benefits; not local projects	Avoid double charging	Planning TOD vs. sales tax generators debate for cities	Piecemeal project MOU process difficult for all	pilot RTIF with few projects and willing partners to get started, Napa/AC?	Need PFF study before acting on RTIF	Governance & local control, pilot RTIF areas first
Agency Summary Willingness, projects, and partners	Support transit, lack partners	County Partnerships	North Connector West with STA & County?	Church Rd with SR12 Group/ County	SR12/Penn with FF (but no support from FF)	Jepson & Peabody with County	Support for Regional projects with willing partners	Need PFF study before acting on RTIF/Jepson/Peabody	See RTIF packages staff report attachments