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Policies,

- **People**: Improve Quality of Life and Accessibility to All Modes, Create Livable Public Spaces

- **Planet**: Reduce GHGs to 80% of 1990 Levels by 2050

- **Prosperity**: A Resilient and Integrated System That Supports California’s Global Competitiveness

“Sea-Change”: “Were Not Where We Were 5 Years Ago or Where We Will BE 5 Years From Now”
Challenges Toward Implementation

• Broadening the Scope of Our Objectives & Definition of Our Needs

• Integrating Asset Management & System Planning

• Developing New Guidance on Community Impact Assessment to Include Public Health Targets & Measures

• Applying Transparent & Accountable Performance Measures to Prioritize Our Projects
Challenges Toward Implementation

• “Breaking Down The Silos”

• Balancing Co-Equal Objectives (Environment & Economy)

If Successful =

• The “Aggregate Affect” of Policy & Structural Changes in How We Make Investment Decisions

• New Planning/Impact Analysis Tools & Techniques That Will Ultimately Influence the Selection & Design of State, Regional, and Locally-Sponsored Transportation Projects
Plans

• CTP/ITSP

• Statewide Bike/Ped Plan

• Statewide Sustainability Initiatives

• District-Level Climate Change Vulnerability Assessments

• Comprehensive Corridor Studies

• Innovative Research Projects & Partnerships With Industry & Academia
  • Livability, Accessibility, & Prosperity “Scoring”
  • Transportation Analysis Guide/Transportation Impact Study Guide (TAG/TISG)
Plans

- System Planning “Re-Boot”
  - Project Scoping
  - New Guidelines
  - “Complete Transportation Framework”
    - Scott Sauer: (916) 653-4680 - scott.sauer@dot.ca.gov

- RTP Guidelines Update:
  - News Sections on Promoting Public Health & RTPA/MPO Best Practices
    - Erin Thompson (916) 654-2596 - Erin.Thompson@dot.ca.gov

- Smart Mobility Learning Network:
  - Ann Mahaney: (916) 653-4097 - ann.mahaney@dot.ca.gov

- SB 743 Implementation
  - Alyssa Begley: (916) 651-6882 - alyssa.begley@dot.ca.gov
Programs, & Project Level Decision-Making

- ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
- SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM
- ASSET MANAGEMENT & CALTRANS’ SHOPP
Active Transportation Program

• Consolidates Existing Federal & State Programs; Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), etc.

• **Purpose:** To Increase Mode-Shift, Non-Motorized Safety, GHG Reduction, Public Health (Obesity), Disadvantaged Community Benefits

• Eligible Projects:
  • Safe Routes To School
  • Safe Routes to Transit
  • Bikeways & Walkways
  • Traffic Control Devices
  • Rec. Trails/Trailheads, Park linkages, rails-to-trails
  • Educational Programs
Active Transportation Program

• Cycle 3 Call for Projects = June 15, 2016

• $240M - Includes 19/20 & 20/21 funding

• For questions, contact your District Local Assistance Engineer or ATP Coordinator
  
  or

• teresa.mcwilliam@dot.ca.gov or 916-653-0328

• ted.davini@dot.ca.gov or 916-653-4335
ATP Scoring Rubrics = 23 Pages!

• **QUESTION #1**: DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (0-10 POINTS)

• **QUESTION #2**: INCREASED WALKING & BICYCLING, (0-35 POINTS)

• **QUESTION #3**: REDUCED FATALITIES, INJURIES, & HAZARDS FOR PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLISTS (0-25 POINTS)

• **QUESTION #4**: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & PLANNING (0-10 POINTS)

• **QUESTION #5**: IMPROVED PUBLIC HEALTH (0-10 POINTS)

• **QUESTION #6**: COST EFFECTIVENESS (0-5 POINTS)

• **QUESTION #7**: LEVERAGING OF NON-ATP FUNDS (0-5 POINTS)
ATP – What Does it Mean to You?

• Target Disadvantaged Communities

• Demonstrate Anticipated Benefits/Outcomes

• Identify & Address Safety Needs

• Community-Based Planning

• Nexus to Public Health

• Articulate Return-on-Investment

• Incorporate Other Funds
ATP – What Does it Mean to You?

• Develop Technical Capabilities – Model Sensitivity, Safety Hot-Spot Mapping, Updated B/C Tool, etc.

• Coordinate With Your Partners **WELL** In Advance

• You Decide – Stand Alone Project **VS.** Integrated Design Features & Finance Plan (i.e. Complete Street Corridor, Phasing & Funding Strategy)

• Screen Your Projects For Competitiveness & Readiness

• Use Your **PROCESS** and Your **PLAN** to Prepare Your **PROJECT**
SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM

Our New Policy Paradigm:
• California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Vision
• State Smart Transportation Initiative Assessment
• Caltrans’ Strategic Management Plan: Mission, Vision and Goals
• California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2040 & State Planning Priorities
• New Legislation, Executive Orders, Etc.

All =

Prioritize Sustainability (GHG & VMT Reduction) & Develop Context-Sensitive Solutions to Address Land Use/Community Design Issues and Regional Accessibility Challenges and to Achieve Smart Mobility Outcomes (See Caltrans’ 2010 Smart Mobility Framework)

Use Multi-Modal Performance Measures to Prioritize Planned Improvements
SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM

• Planning Grant Programs Consolidated, but Environmental Justice, Community-Based Transportation Planning, and Transit Planning still eligible

• Outcomes = Lead to the Planning & Implementation of Multi-Modal System Investments
  • Multimodal Mobility and Accessibility
  • Livable and Healthy Communities
  • Social Equity
  • Environmental Stewardship
  • Greenhouse Gas Reductions
  • Sustainable Communities Strategies
SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM

• Eligible Activities:
  • Data & Analysis
  • Planning
  • Visualization & Conceptual Renderings
  • Preliminary Designs, Costs, & Constraints
  • Community Engagement & Bilingual Services

• Ineligible Activities:
  • Actual Delivery (PID, PA&ED, PS&E, Construction)
  • RTP/General Plan Updates
  • Etc. (See Guidelines)

• Award List Shows the Results (Plans & Studies):
  • River Walks, Community Connectivity & Accessibility, Complete Street/Main Street Corridor Enhancements, Bike Parking Management, Active Transportation, Transit Centers, Safe Routes, Community and Performance Measure Based Improvement Prioritization

• FY 2016-2017 Deadline = December, 2015 (Over Proscribed by 30%)
SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM

What Does it Mean to You?

1. “Read the Waters” & Follow the Money!
   • Is Your Plan & Are Your Projects Aligned With the New Policy Direction on Sustainability & Public Health?
   • Drill-Down – What are Your Planning & Project Development Needs as Related to Sustainability Concerns?
   • If Needed, Discuss “Changing Times” & Community/Environmental Concerns with Your Leadership; “Tell the Story” ("All Planning is Political!")
   • If Not – If you Have Community/Organizational Support...

2. Focus on the “Building Blocks” Needed to Update Your Plans & Advance Your Projects (“Development” Vs. “Delivery”)
   • Constraints Analysis & Preliminary Alternative Screening
   • Cost Estimates & Financial Strategies
   • Public & Political Acceptance
   • Etc.

For questions, contact:
Andrew Knapp
(916) 651-8202
andrew.knapp@dot.ca.gov
Assent Management & Caltrans SHOPP

• SHOPP “Pilot Program”: January Awards for 2016 Cycle
  • Quality Information & Clear Objectives/Desired Outcomes

• “SHOPP Tool”:
  • Early Outcome Indicators
  • Life Cycle Considerations
  • Detailed Project Features & Defined Activities = Better Prioritization
    • 25 – 30 Complete Streets Features

• What is “In-Complete” About Our Streets?
  • Gap Analysis & System Completion
Assent Management & Caltrans SHOPP

• Tie Sustainability, System Performance, and Economic Goals To Project Selection

• Multi-Objective Decision Analysis

• Transportation Asset Management Advisory Committee

• Project Nominations = No Restriction on Which Assets or Objectives are Included

• Projects with a Total Cost of Between $2 - $20 million
Assent Management & Caltrans SHOPP

**Safety and Health** - Reduce injuries/fatalities & VMT

**Stewardship and Efficiency** – Current & Post-Project Conditions

**Sustainability, Livability and Economy** - How the project will improve sustainability

**System Performance** - Travel Time Reliability, User Information, Mode-Choice, Delay Reduction, Complete Streets, Etc.

**Organizational Excellence** – Leadership, Accountability, Collaboration, Innovation
Assent Management & Caltrans SHOPP

• Project Savings: Multi-Objective Solution Vs. Single Asset Delivery

• Example Projects:
  • Bike Lanes & Sidewalks
  • ADA Compliance
  • Improve Vegetation, Landscape, & Irrigation
  • Pedestrian Lighting & Signals
  • Solar Energy Generation

Michael Johnson
michael.b.johnson@dot.ca.gov
http://www.dot.ca.gov/assetmgmt/ampp.html
Assent Management & Caltrans SHOPP

What Does it Mean to You?

• Get to Know Your District SHOPP Managers

• Identify Your Multi-Objective Projects or Combine Project Lists/Features

• Articulate Your Anticipated Project Benefits

• Develop Multi-Source Funding & Delivery Partnerships
  • “Bring Something to the Table”
All Things Considered

What Does it Mean to You?

• The “Trickle Down Effect”: Policies, Plans, Programs, & Projects

• Know Your Caltrans Transportation/Environmental Planners & SHOPP Managers

• Merge Your Plans with Ours & Create Collaborative Delivery Strategies

• “Don’t Just Lead Them To Water, Make Them Thirsty”

• Explore Our Resources: http://dot.ca.gov/transplanning/
Projected Residential Growth

(By Traffic Analysis Zone)
City of Jackson - Circulation Improvement Program and Transportation Impact Fee Update

### Existing & Future Traffic

#### Level of Service
- **C or Better**: Green
- **D**: Yellow
- **E**: Orange
- **F**: Red

#### ADT
- **Existing Volume**
- **Future Forecast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Existing Traffic</th>
<th>Future Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Existing Traffic</th>
<th>Future Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended Improvements

Intersections
- New Traffic Control
- Intersection Upgrade

Existing Roadway
- Widening, Safety and/or Context Sensitive Solutions

Proposed Roadway
- New Roads
SR 49 / Sutter Street Intersection Improvement Alternatives

Sutter Street at Highway 49/88 Intersection

Alternative 1 (Traffic Signal)
- Pro
  - Previously vetted improvement
  - Meets current community expectation
- Con
  - Will increase signal delay on Highway
  - Will create traffic queues on Highway

Alternative 2 (Roundabout)
- Pro
  - Provides continuous, controlled traffic circulation
  - Acts as "Gateway" feature entering town
- Con
  - Higher construction costs than signal
  - Could require changes to parking lot

Legend:
- Existing Sidewalk
- Proposed Sidewalk
- Landscaped Area

2012 Capital Improvement Program Update
City of Jackson
Improvement Alternatives

Highway 49/88 Corridor - Main St. to Highway 88

Alternative 1

Pro
- No net loss of parking
- Maintains familiar traffic flow on Main Street

Con
- May require acquisition of private property
- Relocated on-street highway parking may be less convenient

Alternative 2

Pro
- Adds 14 on-street parking spaces.
- Improves traffic circulation through the downtown area.

Con
- Change to one-way traffic may confuse drivers
- May require acquisition of private property

2012 Capital Improvement Program Update
City of Jackson
Recommended Improvement

Highway 49/88 Corridor - Main St. to Highway 88

Parking Loss/Gain Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Loss/Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 49/88 Only</td>
<td>Net Loss 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Angled Parking Alley</td>
<td>No Net Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Angled Parking on Main St.</td>
<td>Net Gain 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Existing Sidewalk
- Proposed Sidewalk
- Landscaped Area
- Bike Lane
- Pedestrian Undercrossing
- Net Loss of Parking Spaces
- Net Gain of Parking Spaces

2012 Capital Improvement Program Update
City of Jackson
“Cross Town Connection”

- Low Speed
- Local Collector
- Context Sensitive
- Pedestrian-friendly
- Incorporate park trail system
“Typical” Section – SR 49 from SR 88 to French Bar

- Pedestrian area
- Bike lane and two 12’ travel lanes
- Landscaped median / turn lane
- Native and drought tolerant plant materials
Pedestrian area

Bike lane and 12’ travel lane

Landscaped median / turn lane

Native and drought tolerant plant materials

“Typical” Section – SR 49 from Broadway to French Bar
Pedestrian area buffered from traffic

Bike lane and 12’ travel lane

Landscaped median / turn lane

Native and drought tolerant plant materials

“Typical” Section – New Oro De Amador Parkway
Mid-block crossings increase pedestrian safety by creating a refuge in the center median, and through the use of pedestrian crossing signals.
City of Jackson - Circulation Improvement Program and Transportation Impact Fee Update
## Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection projects</th>
<th>Cost (rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SR-104 / SR-88</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SR-88 / Wicklow Way &amp; Portion of Sierra Pacific Drive South</td>
<td>$7,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sutter St. Extension</td>
<td>$8,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sutter St. / Hoffman: $1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SR-49/88 / Sutter Street: $1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sutter St. Ext. from Hoffman to SR-49/88: $6,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SR-49/88 / Argonaut Lane</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SR-88 / Martell Cutoff</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SR-49 / Martell Cutoff / Jackson Gate</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SR-49 / Industry Way / Trade Center</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SR-49 / SR-104 / Ridge Road</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SR-104 / Prospect Dr. / Bowers Dr.</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: Intersection projects $29,000,000

## Roadway projects (including sidewalk/landscaping projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost (rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. SR-88 west of SR-104 (project not defined yet)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SR-88 Widening from SR-104 to Wicklow Way</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stoney Creek Road from Wicklow to Argonaut</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Sutter St. Widening from Argonaut to Hoffman</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. SR-49/88 Widening from Argonaut Ln. to Sutter St.</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Kennedy Flat Road sidewalk</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. SR-88 Widening from Wicklow to SR-49</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. SR-49 sidewalks and landscaping (Martell Cutoff to Trade Center)</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. SR-49 sidewalks and landscaping (Trade Center to SR-104)</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. SR-104 Sidewalks and landscaping (SR-88 to Conductor)</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Sierra Pacific Drive North</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: Roadway projects $17,800,000

## Subtotal: All CMX Projects $46,800,000

## Program Administration Cost (10%) $2,280,000

## Subtotal CMX Program Costs $49,080,000
### Martell-area Traffic Sub-Regional Mitigation Fees: Recommended; Original

#### Sub-Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Unit Measurement</th>
<th>Total Forecast Units</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>Trips Per Unit</th>
<th>Cost Per Trip</th>
<th>Fair Share Fees</th>
<th>Total RTMF Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>10.0/DU</td>
<td>19,180</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>10,318,840</td>
<td>3,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>7.1/DU</td>
<td>4,923</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>2,433,340</td>
<td>2,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center, Retail</td>
<td>Per KSF</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>20.0/KSF</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>10,760</td>
<td>1,495,640</td>
<td>6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>Per KSF</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>13.0/KSF</td>
<td>5,343</td>
<td>6,994</td>
<td>2,874,534</td>
<td>3,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Per KSF</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>11.0/KSF</td>
<td>9,570</td>
<td>5,918</td>
<td>5,148,660</td>
<td>3,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Per KSF</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>6.0/KSF</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>2,714,748</td>
<td>1,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>Per KSF</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.5/KSF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>107,331</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 46,642 | $25,080,000 | $538 | $25,093,093 | $14,178,670

#### County-Wide Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Forecast Units</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>Trips Per Unit</th>
<th>Fee Per DU/KSF</th>
<th>Total Forecast Units</th>
<th>RTFM Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(By Land Use Class)</td>
<td>(By Land Use Class)</td>
<td>(By Land Use Class)</td>
<td>(By Land Use Class)</td>
<td>(By Land Use Class)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Unfunded Need: $25,093,093**

Cost Per Trip X Trip Rates = Fair Share Fees

| (By Land Use Class) | (By Land Use Class) |

**Fair Share Fees X Total Units Forecast = Total Fees**

#### CMX Area Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Single Family (DU)</th>
<th>Multi-Family (DU)</th>
<th>Shopping Center (KSF)</th>
<th>General Commercial (KSF)</th>
<th>Light Industrial (KSF)</th>
<th>Heavy Industrial (KSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martell Business Park</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Rush</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampine</td>
<td>Built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra West B.P.</td>
<td>Fees Locked In Agreement, Not Available to CMX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicklow</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossroads</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base growth model</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 1,918 | 637 | 139 | 411 | 870 | 841 | 133

#### Total Martell-Area Traffic Mitigation Fees

- **Sub-Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee:** $25,093,093
- **Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee:** $14,178,670
- **Total:** $39,271,763
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Single-Family (KU)</th>
<th>Multi-Family (KU)</th>
<th>Shopping, Retail (KSF)</th>
<th>General Commercial (KSF)</th>
<th>Office (KSF)</th>
<th>Light Industrial (KSF)</th>
<th>Heavy Industry (KSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>3,436 ~ 12,430</td>
<td>2,096 ~ 7,582</td>
<td>5,601 ~ 20,261</td>
<td>3,951 ~ 14,295</td>
<td>3,127 ~ 11,311</td>
<td>1,440 ~ 1,990</td>
<td>730 ~ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>6,578 ~ 10,164</td>
<td>4,539 ~ 7,013</td>
<td>7,680 ~ 12,290</td>
<td>6,73 ~ 10,770</td>
<td>3,127 ~ 11,311</td>
<td>1,440 ~ 1,990</td>
<td>730 ~ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>772 ~ 6,677</td>
<td>772 ~ 5,065</td>
<td>1,000 ~ 11,530</td>
<td>1,000 ~ 11,530</td>
<td>1,000 ~ 6,220</td>
<td>1,000 ~ 6,220</td>
<td>1,000 ~ 6,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>6,699</td>
<td>4,689</td>
<td>40,050</td>
<td>10,060</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>4,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>8,774 ~ 18,649</td>
<td>5,858 ~ 12,451</td>
<td>8,240 ~ 13,840</td>
<td>7,980 ~ 10,630</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>7,400 ~ 13,433</td>
<td>5,526 ~ 9,306</td>
<td>8,830 ~ 17,640</td>
<td>8,380 ~ 9,380</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City</td>
<td>9,094</td>
<td>5,255</td>
<td>21,372</td>
<td>16,340</td>
<td>9,111</td>
<td>6,879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>5,831 ~ 13,868</td>
<td>3,580 ~ 8,513</td>
<td>7,300 ~ 17,300</td>
<td>7,300 ~ 17,300</td>
<td>5,070 ~ 12,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>15,430 ~ 41,700</td>
<td>9,990 ~ 27,180</td>
<td>19,030 ~ 26,030</td>
<td>8,860 ~ 12,170</td>
<td>2,280 ~ 3,110</td>
<td>1,440 ~ 1,990</td>
<td>730 ~ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin County</td>
<td>2,837</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,130 ~ 3,353</td>
<td>1,430 ~ 2,715</td>
<td>1,430 ~ 1,559</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850 ~ 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras County</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1600 ~ 8,600</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amador County RTMF ( Adopted)</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>3,952</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martell SRTMF (Proposed)</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>3,941</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>7,215</td>
<td>6,105</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amador County Traffic Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,099</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,180</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,167</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,449</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,154</strong></td>
<td><strong>1289</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amador County is comparable to: 7 of 11 (63%) 6 of 11 (55%) 5 of 11 (45%) 8 of 11 (72%) 6 of 11 (54%) 2 of 6 (33%) 4 of 6 (67%)

1) Many jurisdictions have multiple transportation improvement districts, each with unique infrastructure needs and project costs. Fees are calculated in relation to the total district-level improvement costs and projected units to be built within that improvement district.

2) Trip Rates used by Amador County are considered to be conservative estimates and already have a pass-by reduction factored in for commercial and retail units.

3) Each jurisdiction listed above uses varying methodologies to allocate program costs, calculate fees, and to adjust trip rates.

4) TPATF has recommended a policy that would allow projects to provide supplemental data from Traffic Impact Studies if they wish to challenge the adopted trip rates for their type of land use. However, in that Martell is a regional service center, it is assumed to be a destination that attracts regional traffic. Therefore, it is possible that data supplied by a TIS may demonstrate higher actual trip rates and less of a pass by reduction.