
SCOPE OF WORK

In this section we describe our proposed scope of work in detail by task. We explain how we will accomplish each task and identify associated meetings and deliverables. Following the task plan is a schedule of tasks, meetings, and deliverables.

TASK 1 PREPARE AND PRESENT INTERIM IMPACT FEE PROGRAM

TASK 1.1 DEVELOP PLAN AND SCHEDULE FOR INTERIM I-5 TRAFFIC IMPACT FEE

Objective: To generate funding from near-term development projects while a comprehensive fee program is developed and adopted.

Description: We will use the updated Shasta County travel demand model to develop year 2030 daily traffic forecasts for Interstate 5 (I-5) within the Shasta County portion of the study area. The model will be used “off-the-shelf” for this task; no adjustments will be made to the model’s roadway network or land use. The forecasts will be developed using the difference method which determines the incremental increase in the year 2030 travel demand model over the base year travel demand model and adds this increase to existing traffic counts.

We will calculate mainline freeway level of service (LOS) on all segments of I-5 within the Shasta County portion of the study area for existing and year 2030 conditions. The LOS calculations will be based on volume-to-capacity thresholds that will be submitted to Caltrans for approval. The LOS calculations will be based on available average daily traffic volumes for the existing condition and the forecasts developed as described above for year 2030 conditions.

We will document all locations where there are existing deficiencies in I-5 operations throughout the 61-mile study corridor. In addition, we will identify all I-5 segments that will operate below LOS D under year 2030 conditions throughout the study corridor. For each segment operating below LOS D, we will determine the number of additional mainline travel lanes needed to improve the segment to LOS D or better.

Fehr & Peers will identify the growth in inter-regional traffic on I-5 based on the external gateway trip table of the updated Shasta County travel demand model. We will determine the existing amount of inter-regional traffic on I-5 based on the origin-destination study conducted by Caltrans in 2006. Based on this information we will document the portion of future traffic growth attributable to inter-regional traffic.

Fehr & Peers will document the results of this task in a technical memorandum for use by MuniFinancial in developing the Interim I-5 Traffic Impact Fee program.

Meetings: One meeting to kick off the project.

Deliverables: Work plan and implementation schedule for interim fee program.

TASK 1.2 PRESENT INTERIM FEE PROGRAM TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Objective: To get input from Executive Committee regarding the interim fee program.

Description: We will present the draft interim fee program report to the Executive Committee to receive comments and determine the feasibility of moving the program forward to adoption by local city councils and boards of supervisors.

Meetings: Included in Task 2.1.

Deliverables: Executive Committee meeting agenda.

TASK 1.3 PREPARE INTERIM FEE FINAL PLAN AND ORDINANCES/ RESOLUTIONS

Objective: To provide final documents regarding the interim fee program to local agencies for their consideration and adoption.

Description: We will integrate comments from the Executive Committee into a final report for presentation to local agencies. The report will assist in both the adoption of an interim area-wide fee program as well as integration into development agreements for specific projects.

Meetings: Included in Task 2.4.

Deliverables: Interim fee program final report (20 copies) including sample ordinance and resolution.

TASK 2 FIX 5 PARTNERSHIP MEETINGS

TASK 2.1 FACILITATE FIX 5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Objective: To ensure that the project benefits from the input of, and that final deliverables are acceptable to, the Executive Committee.

Description: The Muni Team will facilitate up to five meetings of the Executive Committee to present updates at major project milestones, and, more importantly, to support decision making and consensus building efforts among Committee members with expert facilitators. MIG will provide facilitation services at each meeting and other Muni Team members will present technical data on an as-needed basis.

Meetings: Five Executive Committee meetings.

Deliverables: Agendas and presentation materials for each meeting.

TASK 2.2 FACILITATE FIX 5 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Objective: To ensure that the project benefits from the input of, and that final deliverables are acceptable to, the Technical Advisory Committee.

Description: The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will be a key resource and “sounding board” on data collection efforts and methodology, findings, and coordination with other local planning efforts. The Muni Team will attend TAC meetings to provide technical information needed to support TAC deliberations

Meetings: Ten TAC meetings

Deliverables: Agendas, presentation materials, and minutes for each meeting

TASK 2.3 PRESENT INTERIM FEE TO LOCAL AGENCIES

Objective: To provide clarity and gain support from local agencies and elected officials for the interim fee, and to present the interim fee program for adoption.

Description: Muni Team project leaders will attend two public meetings with each of the nine public agencies. The first meeting will occur at the onset of the interim fee development in order to communicate the purpose and methodology of the program as well as respond to any questions or concerns. The second meeting will be to present the interim fee program to each agency and recommend adoption.

Meetings: Up to seventeen public meetings. First round of meetings to include one RTPA board, two county boards, and five city councils. Second round of presentations to include the two RTPA Boards, two county boards, and five city councils.

Deliverables: Presentation materials.

TASK 2.4 PRESENT FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Objective: To ensure that the leadership of local agencies benefit from an effective briefing on the final report to support their decision making process.

Description: Muni Team project leaders will partner with local agency staff to jointly present the final project report and recommendations to city, county, and agency boards across a total of eighteen meetings, one for initial presentation of the report and one for adoption. The Muni Team will develop one accompanying slideshow presentation for use at all of the meetings.

Meetings: Eighteen public meetings (two RTPA boards, two County Boards, and five city councils).

Deliverables: Stakeholder invitations and public notices for each meeting.

TASK 3 PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INFORMATION

TASK 3.1 CONDUCT STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Objective: To provide direct input regarding the program from key decision makers and community opinion leaders.

Description: The Muni Team will conduct up to ten interviews, primarily by phone. Initial interviews will likely be conducted with policymakers to probe their interests, issues and obstacles related to the interim impact fee program (see Task 1),

but also to obtain recommendations for interviews with other stakeholders such as key opinion leaders, members of the development community, and other community leaders. A portion of interviews will be conducted later in the project to seek input on draft results.

Meetings: Ten interviews.

Deliverables: Memorandum summarizing key findings

TASK 3.2 DEVELOP AND SHARE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM MATERIALS

Objective: To educate stakeholders regarding anticipated I-5 corridor congestion and alternative funding approaches for improvements.

Description: **Task 3.2.1: Develop Educational Program Materials**

The Muni Team will provide a range of materials to be used during meetings and available for policymakers, stakeholders and communities of interest:

- ♦ FAQ for posting on the website; updated at milestones
- ♦ 1 brochure about Interim TIF for stakeholders containing photo images provided by the client (1,000 copies, designed and printed)
- ♦ 1 round of postcard invitations to public workshops that also send people to the website (design only, does not include printing or postage)
- ♦ 2 geographically based overview brochures about service levels and solutions (to be printed and posted on the website)
- ♦ 2 different fact sheets, oriented to different stakeholder groups
- ♦ Presentation Boards (12 total for TAC, public workshops, presentations to community/business groups, and/or leadership summit)
- ♦ A 30-slide PowerPoint show updated throughout the process (for public workshops, summit; client to provide images)
- ♦ Final “executive summary” brochure (1,000 copies, designed and printed)
- ♦ Redesign of website (up to 18 hours of design time).

For those materials requiring printing and mailing, we are assuming that the RTPA will arrange for printing, posting and mailing

Task 3.2.2: Provide Media Relations

The Muni Team will produce a media kit to be reproduced and printed by the RTPA as needed.

Task 3.2.3: Conduct Outreach To Local Stakeholders

The Muni Team will conduct presentations to local organizations that have an interest in the Interstate 5 Fee Program at a regularly scheduled board meeting or other agreed upon time to build on results from the other outreach efforts and further refine the educational approach, issues, and

obstacles. The purpose of the presentations is to (a) gauge understanding and beliefs about I-5 service levels, (b) educate participants about I-5 service levels, growth projections (and about potential solutions, and (c) to record their feedback. The Muni Team will conduct up to six of these presentations and will provide a summary of key findings. RTPA staff, with input from the Executive Committee, TAC, and stakeholder interviewees (Task 3.1), will identify potential local organizations. We will rely on RTPA staff to schedule meeting times.

Task 3.2.4: Conduct Leadership Summit

The Muni Team will facilitate one leadership summit meeting with policymakers and participants the roundtable discussions to (a) provide a project update with the latest technical data, (b) review the input generated from all public outreach activities, (c) introduce and generate input regarding a range of funding strategy options/packages and (d) determine next steps. Additionally, the Muni Team recommends inviting a panel of executive staff and policy makers from California counties that have experienced similar issues (rural-to-urban transformations, increasing congestion that is caused by a combination of interregional and local traffic and questions of how to pay for needed improvements). These could include, for example, Kern, El Dorado and Riverside Counties. The Muni Team will work with RTPA staff to develop the summit agenda, provide electronic voting “clicker” technology at the summit for up to 150 attendees, and document meeting outcomes with a summary report. Shasta RTPA staff will coordinate meeting facilities and conduct outreach to policy makers and previous outreach participants.

Meetings: Six roundtable groups and one leadership summit

Deliverables: Educational program materials and media press kit

TASK 3.3 CONDUCT PROJECT AWARENESS AND OPINION ASSESSMENTS

Objective: To assess general public opinion regarding I-5 congestion and funding alternatives, and to provide an opportunity for general public education.

Description: Given that the Fix Five Partnership is considering a regional impact fee prior to a sales tax measure we advise that the project include a single awareness/opinion assessment. There are no specific improvement projects to vote on that would be funded by a sales tax, and the project does not have sufficient resources for mass communication efforts to affect opinion.

The Muni Team will conduct one awareness/opinion assessment via telephone. The assessment will measure the general public’s baseline understandings and opinions about I-5 service levels and the causes of congestion. We will also evaluate support for alternative funding sources for improvements including impact fees and sales taxes. The assessment will include an educational component, e.g. “If you knew that... would you be more or less likely to support...?” The results will provide valuable data for

developing refined options for regional funding strategy packages, which will be presented and discussed at the leadership summit.

Meetings: None

Deliverables: None (survey results to be integrated into Task 3.4 deliverable).

TASK 3.4 CONDUCT PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

Objective: To provide an opportunity to general public input to the study.

Description: The Muni Team will facilitate four public workshops, two in Shasta County and two in Tehama County, which will be designed to (a) educate the general public about I-5 service level and growth projections, (b) educate about potential funding solution packages, and (c) facilitate their input in an interactive and meaningful way. The Muni Team will provide all workshop presentation materials and handouts. RTPA staff will coordinate meeting facilities and conduct outreach to the general public.

Meetings: Four public workshops.

Deliverables: Memorandum summarizing results of roundtable focus groups, leadership summit, and public workshops.

TASK 4 SITUATION ANALYSIS

The Muni Team will create integrated travel demand forecasting and traffic operations tools to facilitate Tasks 1, 4, 5, 6, and 9. These tools are not discreetly identified in the work element contained in the RFP; therefore, their development is described below.

TRAVEL DEMAND FORECASTING MODEL

We will utilize the updated Shasta County Travel Demand Model as the forecasting tool for the fee study. We will extend the updated model to include the Tehama County portion of the study corridor. This effort will rely upon existing data sources such as the recent Tehama County General Plan Update and the Red Bluff Travel Demand Model.

The roadway network will be extended to include I-5 from the county-line to south of Corning and each interchange; local roadways will not be included. Base year and year 2030 land use for Tehama County will be obtained from the County based on their recent General Plan update. A coarse Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) structure will be defined that is detailed enough to reflect I-5 interchange traffic levels.

To enhance program defensibility and provide a high level of confidence in the traffic forecasts and benefit district assessment, we will perform a validation of the extended Shasta-Tehama model's performance related to I-5 mainline travel. Base year model volumes will be compared to existing traffic counts on up to 30 locations within the study corridor. We will document the model's performance relative to the *Travel Forecasting Guidelines* published by Caltrans in 1992.

We will augment the "static" validation described above with a "dynamic" validation of the model's ability to respond appropriately to roadway network changes such as will be the subject of the fee study. To accomplish this, we will test the model's response to individual changes in roadway network and link attributes and model assignment settings. The

magnitude and direction of changes in forecasted traffic volumes will be evaluated to document the model's performance. If necessary, we will recommend and execute refinements to the model; we have included up to 40 professional hours for this effort.

We will develop year 2015, 2020, 2025, and 2030 travel demand forecasts with the expanded model. The land use for each of the intermediate forecast years will be determined based on a straight-line interpolation between the base year and year 2030 land use data. These forecasts will be used in Task 6.

TRAFFIC OPERATIONS ANALYSIS TOOL

We will create a Microsoft Excel based traffic operations analysis tool that integrates with the travel demand model to enable a system-level analysis that identifies the benefits and consequences of widening I-5 and/or improving parallel facilities. The integrated tool will directly import travel demand forecasts from the model, calculate volume-to-capacity based LOS, identify bottlenecks, and determine generalized vehicle queue information. Capacity constraints will be identified along with their implications on downstream traffic flow and congestion. The overall result will be the ability to test individual infrastructure improvements to identify their system-wide implications. Further, the traffic operations results will enable a feedback loop into the travel demand model provide more realistic travel demand forecasts based on capacity constraints. This will provide a very efficient analysis tool for infrastructure planning projects.

TASK 4.1 SUMMARIZE EXISTING SYSTEM ANALYSES AND PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS

Objective: To make efficient use of existing traffic analysis information.

Description: We will compile, review, and summarize the Regional Transportation Plans, General Plans, Special Studies, and Interchange Studies identified on pages 10-12 of the RFP. A database of relevant information will be developed containing the following elements pertaining to I-5 throughout the 61-mile study segment: existing and future LOS; recommended I-5 mainline and interchange improvements; estimated improvement costs; and project-specific traffic growth proportions. The end result will be a summary of relevant information and graphics showing existing and future traffic operation deficiencies on I-5 along with identified mainline, interchange, and parallel facilities improvements. In addition, a corridor-wide map will be developed showing the location and a brief description of each improvement identified in past studies.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: Memorandum summarizing existing studies.

TASK 4.2 CONDUCT FEE PROGRAM COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS

Objective: To take advantage of lessons learned from other regional traffic impact fee programs in California.

Description: Having worked on most of the regional traffic impact fee programs in the State we already have substantial data on these programs and the lessons learned. We can provide a program comparison matrix of regional transportation programs through the state to Shasta RTPA staff developed as

part of our work for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority to initiate discussion on the items to be included in the matrix developed for this task. The matrix will identify the key components of the fee program that led to local agency support, and lessons learned from the adoption process.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: Fee program comparison matrix.

TASK 4.3 CONDUCT SUMMARY I-5 INTERCHANGE APPRAISAL

Objective: To consider integration of interchange improvements in the financing plan.

Description: We will perform a qualitative evaluation of each interchange on I-5 within the study corridor. This qualitative evaluation will be based on information assembled in Task 4.1 and no new technical analysis will be performed. This task will consist of the following items: 1) organize a reference list of existing studies for each interchange; 2) denote the type of each interchange using generalized categories from the Caltrans Highway Design Manual; and 3) weight the need for improvements at each interchange based on documented expected deficiencies and information from the project team regarding need for improvement to facilitate I-5 mainline widening. We will obtain the approximate capital investment cost to improve each interchange from the project team. We will determine recommended next steps at each interchange.

The results of this task will be summarized in an I-5 Interchange Appraisal memorandum including a summary evaluation matrix.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: I-5 interchange appraisal technical memorandum.

TASK 5 ASSESS ALTERNATE ROUTES AND DEVELOP IMPROVEMENTS

TASK 5.1 APPRAISE ALTERNATIVE ROUTES

Objective: To evaluate the effectiveness of improvements to alternative routes.

Description: Fehr & Peers will perform a macro-level analysis of potential improvements apart from the I-5 mainline to determine if they would provide cost-effective system-wide benefits. The following corridors will be considered: 1) Airport Road / Old Oregon Trail, 2) SR 273 / Lake Boulevard, 3) a new Cottonwood Creek crossing, 4) Road 99W, 5) McCoy/Hooker Creek Road, 6) Rawson Road, and 7) connection between Jellys Ferry Road and Lake California Drive.

Each of the seven corridors will be reviewed under year 2030 conditions without improvement to determine the location and extent of potential improvement. The expanded Shasta County model will then be modified to reflect improvement of each corridor. The improvements to include for each

corridor will be approved by the TAC prior to proceeding with the analysis. The model will then be re-run to create Year 2030 traffic forecasts with each of the corridor improvements individually (i.e., this task includes seven model runs). These forecasts will be fed into the traffic operations tool to determine the system-wide implications of improving each corridor. Benefit to I-5 mainline will be identified in terms of the amount of traffic diverted from I-5 and the resulting elimination of I-5 mainline improvement needs, if any.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2

Deliverables: None.

TASK 5.2 DEVELOP SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Objective: To consider integration of alternative routes in the financing plan.

Description: The results of this Task 5.1 will be documented in an alternative route analysis technical memorandum that describes feasible improvement strategies to address forecasted mainline I-5 deficiencies apart from widening the freeway mainline.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2

Deliverables: Alternative route analysis technical memorandum.

TASK 6 DEVELOP IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

TASK 6.1 IDENTIFY IMPROVEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Objective: To identify improvement alternatives for that benefit I-5, including mainline, interchanges, and alternative routes.

Description: We will apply the integrated travel demand model and traffic operations tool to identify improvement alternatives that provide system-wide benefits. Improvement alternatives may include travel demand management strategies such as ramp metering which will be identified based upon overall corridor travel demand versus capacity; however, detailed operations analysis of ramp-specific metering is not included in this task. This task will be performed for year 2015, 2020, 2025, and 2030 conditions. For each future year, one or more improvement strategies will be identified to address mainline I-5 deficiencies. The improvement alternatives for each future year will consider structure widening needed to facilitate local roadway projects, which are identified by the Fix 5 Partnership and/or Task 4.1.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: Memorandum summarizing improvement alternatives.

TASK 6.2 DEVELOP PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

Objective: To develop a method for evaluating improvement alternatives.

Description: We will develop and present recommended project evaluation criteria for use in evaluating and prioritizing improvement alternatives. The evaluation

criteria will be presented to the TAC at one meeting. Based on TAC input, the evaluation criteria will be revised and submitted to the TAC for review and approval. Once approved by the TAC, the evaluation criteria will be presented to the Executive Committee for approval. We will perform one round of minor adjustments to the evaluation criteria based on feedback received from the Executive Committee. The evaluation criteria will be submitted to the Executive Committee for final approval.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: Memorandum describing project evaluation criteria and methodology.

TASK 6.3 PRIORITIZE IDENTIFIED IMPROVEMENTS

Objective: To determine the priority and phasing of improvements.

Description: We will develop a prioritized list of projects for years 2015, 2020, 2025, and 2030. The improvement strategies identified in Task 6.1 will be evaluated based upon the project evaluation criteria developed in Task 6.2. In addition, each improvement strategy will be evaluated using the Caltrans Life Cycle Benefit/Cost Analysis Model. We assume Caltrans will provide accident history information, as needed, to apply the benefit/cost model. The benefit/cost model will be applied using the underlying defaults related to accident cost, delay cost, etc. The prioritized list of projects will be fiscally constrained to total projected financing plan revenue (see Task 8). Therefore, the identified improvement programs for each future year will provide the best system-wide benefit for the infrastructure investment possible.

The results of the analysis will be a comprehensive list of improvements that are needed to mitigate planned growth in Shasta and Tehama Counties using a single, integrated system-wide travel demand forecasting and operations analysis tool.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: None.

TASK 6.4 PREPARE PROGRAM REPORT

Objective: To communicate results of the transportation planning analysis.

Description: The results of Tasks 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 will be summarized in a draft report. The report will include the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) recommended for implementation and inclusion in the Interstate 5 Fee Program in years 2015, 2020, 2025, and 2030. The report will provide an overview of improvement alternatives, a summary of relationship to the financial plan, documentation of the project evaluation criteria and methodology, and present a condensed project evaluation matrix for each future year.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: Projects Priorities Report.

TASK 7 DEVELOP COST ESTIMATES

TASK 7.1 COMPARE CURRENT YEAR PROJECT COSTS

Objective: To update project cost estimates to current year dollars.

Description: We will compile and present cost estimates for all CIP projects identified in Task 6 based on current year construction dollars, broken down by phases of project development and delivery (i.e. environmental review/mitigation, design, right of way, construction). This task will be based on preliminary work performed by Caltrans with Willdan refining and finalizing project cost estimates. We have budgeted 173 hours for the entire Task 7, anticipating little if any need to develop new cost estimates for projects that have not been specified.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: None

TASK 7.2 PROPOSE COST INDEXING APPROACH

Objective: To estimate project costs for the year in which construction will commence.

Description: We will adjust costs for all CIP projects identified in Task 6 based on proposed construction year, broken down by phases of project development and delivery (i.e. environmental review/mitigation, design, right of way, construction, etc). Appropriate cost index multiplication factors will be used to escalate the individual project costs to reflect the anticipated construction year. The results of this task will be integrated into the financial model in Task 8.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: Project cost estimates and indexing technical memorandum

TASK 8 DEVELOP FINANCIAL PLAN

TASK 8.1 FORECAST EXISTING FUNDING SOURCES

Objective: To determine anticipated levels of funding from existing sources

Description: We will gather historical data on funding levels for transportation improvements from the Fix Five Partnership agencies to use as a basis for projections through 2030 in current dollars. Revenue sources will include local gas tax (the share budgeted to capital expansion projects only), plus State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) federal and state funding sources directed through the Shasta and Tehama regional transportation agencies.

For revenue inflation indexes we will rely on credible secondary research sources. If not available or applicable to the Shasta/Tehama area we will develop an index based on primary research of historical correlations with significant economic factors that affect revenue generation, projected to 2030 based on the most current projections for the area.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: None.

TASK 8.2 IDENTIFY AND ESTIMATE POTENTIAL SOURCES

Objective: To estimate the type and amount of potential funding sources.

Description: We will identify a comprehensive list of potential funding sources based on our experience with regional transportation funding programs around the State, and the list of improvements developed in Task 6. All revenue estimates will be to 2030 in current dollars. We will estimate sales tax revenue based on recent regional retail market analysis available to the Muni Team. We will estimate regional impact fee revenues based on Task 9 results.

We will also evaluate the potential for other sources revenue, particularly new development exactions, redevelopment tax increment, and current and future state transportation bond funds. Revenue projection will be based on the funding potential for specific projects, e.g. Oasis Road interchange funding from local sales tax and redevelopment tax increment. We will also evaluate the region's ability to be awarded funds from the State's recently passed "I-Bonds."

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: None.

TASK 8.3 ANALYZE FUNDING OPTIONS

Objective: To develop a financial plan based on reasonably anticipated funding sources.

Description: We will evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of all funding sources identified in subtasks 8.1 and 8.2. The primary criterion will be the probability that a source would be available for the planned improvements based on implementation requirements (State action, Council action, Prop. 218 election, etc.). Based on this analysis we will develop a financial model to projected revenues and improvement costs through 2030 in current dollars. We will likely show several financial scenarios depending on whether or not certain potential sources such as a sales tax are adopted. The model will have the capacity to integrate debt financing should that be a reasonably anticipated approach. We may adjust the initial phasing of projects identified in the CIP to the extent that debt financing or sufficient revenues are unavailable to ensure a fiscally constrained plan on an annual basis.

We will also use the tools of real estate economics to develop information for the public outreach (Task 3) and public agency action (Task 10). In particular, we will develop comparison of the overall infrastructure funding burden placed on new development over time and across jurisdictions and types of development projects. We will place the proposed impact fee in the context of this burden to communicate the relative impact of the fee program on economic development.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: Financial plan model output (tables).

TASK 9 CONDUCT NEXUS ANALYSIS

TASK 9.1 DEVELOP ZONE OF BENEFIT MAP

Objective: To make the fee program more acceptable to local stakeholders by establishing zones of benefit

Description: We will design two alternative approaches to defining zones of benefit. Boundaries will be based on the results of the stakeholder interviews and the “reasonable relationship” requirements of the law. We anticipate the jurisdictional boundaries will be respected and not split between zones, though this is not a requirement of the fee program. We will use the geographical relationship between the location of new development and the location of CIP projects to initially define the zone boundaries.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: Zone of benefit map for two alternatives.

TASK 9.2 DETERMINE FAIR SHARE COSTS

Objective: Determine new development’s share of the total cost of planned improvements.

Description: We will determine the cost share allocations for each CIP project identified in Task 6. We will evaluate up to two independent zone-of-benefit scenarios as identified in Task 9.1. The proportion of traffic increase attributable to future land use growth in each zone will be identified using the expanded Shasta County model. A select-link procedure will be applied with the model to accomplish this task for each CIP project.

The impact fee will be calculated in a three-step process. First, total CIP costs will be allocated to each zone based on the percent of the growth in trips using each CIP project generated from within the zone. Impacts associated with the growth in external trips will not be allocated to the fee program. Second, we will divide the allocated cost to each zone by the number of trips generated by that zone to establish a cost per trip by zone. Third, we will multiply the cost per trip by zone by a schedule of trip generation rates by land use category to establish the fee schedule for each zone. Trip generation rates will include adjustments for pass-by trips and trip length. Consideration will also be given to the differential impacts of truck traffic.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2

Deliverables: None

TASK 9.3 DETERMINE NON-ELIGIBLE IMPROVEMENTS

Objective: To determine the share of CIP costs that must be funded by non-fee sources.

Description: We will identify the portion of improvement costs not attributable to new development within the benefit zones. First, we will determine the proportion of overall need attributable to existing deficiencies based on the results of Task 4. Second, we will determine the share of costs for each CIP

project associated external trips that neither starts nor end in any zone based on the results of the select-link analysis discussed in Task 9.2. The proportion of need caused by inter-regional traffic growth will be identified based on the internal-external trip interactions identified in the Shasta County Model as augmented by the origin-destination study conducted by Caltrans in 2006.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: Nexus analysis memorandum.

TASK 1.0 DEVELOP RECOMMENDED FUNDING STRATEGY

TASK 1.0.1 DEVELOP TRAFFIC IMPACT FEE PROGRAM

Objective: Prepare a final report that presents the results, assumptions, and methodologies used to support an I-5 corridor traffic impact fee program.

Description: We will bring together the memorandum and model results developed in prior tasks into a final report. The report will be sufficient to reference in an impact fee adoption resolution as the basis for the statutory findings required by the Mitigation Fee Act (*California Government Code* sections 66000 – 66025). The report will include a discussion of waivers, discounts, and exemptions, for projects such as low-income housing and transit-oriented development.

Meetings: See Tasks 2.1 and 2.2.

Deliverables: I-5 Corridor Traffic Impact Fee Program report.

TASK 1.0.2 PRESENT IMPACT FEE PROGRAM TO EACH AGENCY

Meetings: See Task 2.3.

TASK 1.0.3 PREPARE NOTICES, ORDINANCES, AND RESOLUTIONS

Objective: Facilitate adoption of the fee program by providing official documents.

Description: We will provide an ordinance and resolution for each agency that may adopt the impact fee program (five cities and two counties). The ordinances will be drafted to appropriately amend each agency's municipal code. We will provide a draft to each agency's legal counsel for review and comment.

Meetings: See Task 2.3.

Deliverables: Notices, ordinances, and resolutions for each agency.

Proposed Project Schedule

Task	2007												2008					
	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun		
Meetings & Major Deliverables																		
1. Prepare and Present Interim Impact Fee Program Work plan & implementation schedule Interim fee program report	☞		☞															
2. Fix 5 Partnership Meetings Interim Fee Council / Board meetings (17) Executive Committee meetings (5) TAC meetings (10) Final Fee Council / Board meetings (18)	◆ ◆	◆ ◆	◆ ◆	◆ 														

Key: ♦ = Meetings % = Deliverable