

Subject	Release of Updated Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (RTMP) Status Report
Summary of Issues	Staff has prepared an update to the Regional Mitigation Program Status Report for circulation to local jurisdictions and the RTPCs. The report was last updated in December 2006. During 2007, TRANSPAC reviewed the report and transmitted comments, requesting the inclusion of additional information regarding Central County’s regional mitigation program and transportation fee information for all local jurisdictions.
Recommendations	That the Authority review and comment on the updated RTMP status report prior to distribution.
Financial Implications	As of the close of FY 2006-07, the Measure C Regional Transportation Mitigation Program has collected \$243 million in new revenues for multi-modal projects countywide (including the Alameda County portion of the Tri-Valley). Of that, the lion’s share – \$193 million – has been collected as part of the combined East County fee programs. Tri-Valley and south county have collected \$44.7 million, West County \$4.2 million, Central County \$417,384, and Lamorinda \$380,000.
Options	N/A
Attachments <i>(A - separate attachment, incorporating the revisions approved by PC; see PC packet dated 2/6/08 for B & C)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Measure C Regional Transportation Mitigation Program: Summary Status Report (Draft–Final: November 2007 February 2008 Update); B. Comment letter from TRANSPAC, January 7, 2008; C. Authority staff’s proposed responses to TRANSPAC comments;
Changes from Committee	<i>The Planning Committee accepted the proposed revisions to the RTMP Summary Status Report. Following the PC meeting, staff initiated further discussions with the Authority Chair, and proposes to include additional text suggested by TRANSPAC containing additional descriptive information regarding infill and redevelopment projects in Central County. The attached draft final report reflects those proposed additions.</i>

Background

Measure C requires the Authority to “...develop a program of regional traffic mitigation fees, assessments or other mitigations, as appropriate, to fund regional and subregional transportation projects, as determined in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan of the Authority.”¹ From 1993 through 1998, the

¹ Measure C Expenditure Plan, Growth Management Program, 1988, p. 11.

Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) developed programs suited to each subarea's project needs and growth expectations.

The adopted fee programs have collected \$243 million in new revenues for multi-modal projects countywide (including the Alameda County portion of the Tri-Valley). Of that, the lion's share – \$193 million – has been collected as part of the combined East County fee programs. Tri-Valley and South County have collected \$44.7 million, West County \$4.2 million, Central County \$417,384, and Lamorinda \$380,000. Regional fees for single family home range broadly. In East County, the fee is now set at \$16,667 per single family dwelling unit (SFDU). Fees in other subareas range from \$2,595 per SFDU for West County to \$5,941 per SFDU in South County for the Windermere development. Fees levied on commercial, office, and industrial developments also vary widely, from \$.53/sq. ft. in West County, to \$5.89 per sq. ft. in South County.

Since 2006, when the last update to this report was published, the fee schedules have increased based upon a variety of considerations that influence the fee calculation. These include increases in project cost estimates, changes in the annual inflation index in the Engineering News Record Construction Index, revisions to the project lists, and changes in forecasted demographic growth.

Proposed Update to the RTMP Report

The RTMP Report is updated from time-to-time to reflect changes in regional fees and fee revenues. The next proposed update will be published in March 2008. This update will include the latest "snap-shot" information on fee amounts and revenues. In addition, at the request of TRANSPAC, extensive information has been added on local fee programs.

The report is ready for release; however, as described below, TRANSPAC has some additional comments. Staff seeks the Planning Committee's review of TRANSPAC's comments before releasing the final report.

Comments from TRANSPAC

During 2007, TRANSPAC reviewed the last release of the RTMP Report (December 2006) extensively. In the course of this review, TRANSPAC voiced concern that the report did not accurately convey the status of the Central County mitigation program.

As noted in the report, instead of applying a uniform fee to all new development, the Central County program requires jurisdictions to execute a "developer sponsored mitigation agreement" with affected Central County jurisdictions when a proposed development would generate more than 100 peak hour trips of which 50 or more are interregional trips on Routes of Regional Significance.

TRANSPAC's comment letter is shown in Attachment B, followed by Authority staff's proposed responses (Attachment C). As noted in the letter, TRANSPAC's primary concern is that the report does not adequately reflect TRANSPAC's perceived advantages of the "Oakhurst model," compared to the uniform-fee approach adopted by the other regional committees. TRANSPAC further points out that the Concord Naval Weapons Station development will pay "more than its fair share of the cost of development impact using the Oakhurst model and that this is the appropriate method to generate funds."

In response to TRANSPAC's comments made during spring 2007, extensive information on local development mitigation fees was added to the report.

~~Staff recommends that~~ has prepared a draft-Final Report for realease and publication (revised Attachment A) incorporating the following:-1) the Planning Committee's review, 2)- incorporation of TRANSPAC's comments as shown in Attachment C, 3), approve or modify the proposed responses, and then authorize publication of the final report incorporation of additional text proposed by TRANSPAC based upon staff's discussions with the Authority Chair (underlined text shown on page 11 of Attachment A).