

AGENDA ITEM 2 A
Action Item

TIMED ITEM 1:15 PM

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 3, 2017

TO: El Dorado County Transit Authority

FROM: Mindy Jackson, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Draft 2017 El Dorado County Transit Authority Park-and-Ride Master Plan

REQUESTED ACTION:

BY MOTION,

- 1. Accept agency comments on the Draft 2017 El Dorado County Transit Authority Park-and-Ride Master Plan and staff response to comments**
- 2. Open the Public Workshop and receive any additional public comments**
- 3. Direct staff to return at the September 2017 meeting with a Final Draft document for the Board's consideration to approve**

BACKGROUND

In 2007 the El Dorado County Transit Authority (El Dorado Transit) approved the El Dorado County Transit Authority Park-and-Ride Master Plan (Plan). The Plan included improvements to and expansion of existing facilities and construction of new facilities along the State Route Highway 50 Corridor.

The Plan identified and prioritized twelve (12) improvements needed over a twenty-year horizon, but with capacity to serve beyond a span of twenty years. In 2014, the El Dorado Transit Board accepted the draft Western El Dorado County Park and Ride Facilities Study. At that time, the Board requested an update of the 2007 Park-and-Ride Master Plan with updated projects, priorities and policies.

At your February 2, 2017 meeting, staff presented the Draft 2017 El Dorado County Transit Authority Park-and-Ride Master Plan and the Board directed staff to circulate the document for comments.

DISCUSSION

On June 5, 2017, staff published a Public Notice soliciting comments on the draft 2017 El Dorado County Transit Authority Park-and-Ride Master Plan and sent notices to local agencies regarding the comment period which closed on July 20, 2017.

The draft 2017 El Dorado County Transit Authority Park-and-Ride Master Plan and the Notice of the Public Workshop are available at <http://eldoradotransit.com/news/draft-park-and-ride-master-plan-public-workshop/>.

Attached is a summary of the agency comments that were received, and proposed staff responses.

Staff recommends that the Board conduct a Public Workshop at the August meeting. Staff will return with a Final Draft document in September, for the Board's consideration and possible approval.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with this agenda item to receive public comment.

Should the Board approve the 2017 El Dorado County Transit Authority Park-and-Ride Master Plan that action would also not directly have a fiscal impact.

Future approval of the Plan would provide a policy framework for both future facility expansions, and operations/maintenance of existing facilities. Expenditures for any of these activities would be authorized in future Board actions related to approval of the annual agency Budget and approval of the five-year Capital Improvement Program.

Attachment

Draft 2017 El Dorado County Transit Authority Park-and-Ride Master Plan

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Commenting Agency: County of El Dorado

1. Inside Cover. Use consistent formatting for agency staff.

Agreed. Will modify in the Final Draft document.

2. Page 1. Regarding use of term “watershed times”, may want to use a different descriptor so readers aren't thinking about water instead of transit. The dictionary defines watershed times as a turning point - suggest using a form of "turning point".

Agreed. This is language from the 2007 document but could be misinterpreted. Will modify in the Final Draft document.

3. Page 2. Clarify the number of Park-and-Ride facilities.

Agreed. This existing language is confusing as it does not fully clarify the distinction between the number of facilities in the County, in the transit service area, and in the Highway 50 corridor. This language will be re-written to be clearer.

4. Page 2. The extension of the U.S. Highway 50 carpool lanes east of Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road are not included in El Dorado County's CIP or TIM Fee program.

Agreed. The language was referencing the previously-approved environmental documents for the eastern carpool lane extension, but the Draft Plan is not dependent on this eastern extension and this reference will be eliminated.

5. Page 2. Footnote should reference Appendix F, rather than Appendix A.

Agreed.

6. Page 5, Table 2. Update status of the El Dorado County Transportation Commission grant for the County Line Multi-Modal Transit Center to reflect that the grant has now been approved.

Agreed.

7. Page 6, Table 3. Is there still a parking deficit at Cambridge even with the expansion? Maybe move the sentence after this statement to explain why there is a deficit.

There is still an existing deficit at Cambridge Road. However, the reference to an older study can be replaced with newer data that has been collected in 2007, 2014 and 2017.

8. Page 7, first bullet. What traffic delays from the MMTF occur in El Dorado Hills? This statement was prior to the opening of the Silva Valley Parkway interchange and the improvements to the El Dorado Hills Blvd. interchange. Maybe modify or add disclaimers.

Agreed. Opening of the Silva Valley Interchange has dramatically reduced vehicle delay. It remains true that adding an additional Park-and-Ride facility in El Dorado Hills is the operationally preferred and only feasible alternative (vs. replacing the existing Multimodal

Transfer Facility and overflow lot). The language will be updated to reflect the current circumstance.

9. Page 8, regarding the statement, “This plan needs to look beyond a traditional 20-25 year horizon. Is this wise given the rapidly changing technological advances as stated on pages 1 and 2? Some of the advances can significantly affect the transportation demand projections. If you do look beyond the 20-25 year horizon there should be multiple disclaimers attached to the projections.

The point is valid that there are many possible future scenarios, depending on how personal vehicle ownership, car-sharing services, autonomous vehicles and vehicle electrification evolve.

El Dorado Transit’s challenge in the Park-and-Ride Master Plan is to accommodate the widest variety of scenarios and to look far enough in the future to be able to project the largest reasonable need for Park-and-Ride facilities, and develop priorities and a funding strategy.

The best approach is to maintain the 20-25 horizon, but revisit the plan as the implications for impending possibilities become clearer. In that way, El Dorado Transit remains aware of the potential need but does not unnecessarily plan for overbuilding.

10. Page 9, regarding the statement, “El Dorado Transit will consider providing developers the option to pay a fee in lieu of constructing a transit facility.” Won't this require a nexus study, environmental document, etc.?

No. The in-lieu fee is based upon the valuation of a project-specific condition, not a fee schedule, and has been applied in cases where El Dorado Transit, the local land use authority, and the developer mutually agree to a condition of approval.

11. Page 11. “Financing Policies.” This should be updated to reflect Senate Bill 1 (SB 1).

Agreed. The recent passage of SB 1 will be noted. The specific revenue potentials for El Dorado Transit facilities are not yet fully known. El Dorado Transit will work with the El Dorado County Transportation Commission to provide a possible estimate of funding, if possible.

12. Page 11. Regarding, using standard hardware in facilities, minimal-maintenance landscaping, and installation of garbage cans. Should these be long-term maintenance? Not sure if you can use this type of financing for operations.

These can be added as maintenance policies also. The intent of listing these as a financing policy is the belief that the first revenue source for any project is cost avoidance and using standard hardware, etc. reduces inventories, staff time, and maintenance costs.

13. Page 11. Regarding including Park-and-Ride facilities in lighting and landscape, and similar districts. Should this be long-term maintenance? Not sure if you can use this type of financing for operations.

These costs are eligible, and ideally these costs would be included in districts. It is recognized that this has not been done previously, and may not be immediately feasible.

14. Facility and Administration Policies. Misc. edits.

The Final Draft will reflect the suggested wording.

15. Page 12. Suggest eliminating the statement “All new Park-and-Ride facilities should be constructed as locally-owned (City or County) facilities.”

Agreed. El Dorado Transit’s current policy is preferring to own the facilities.

16. Page 12, regarding “Where possible, Park-and-Ride capacity should first be used for public transportation users. Carpooling, vanpooling, and other forms of shared sides should be directed to secondary facilities, including joint-use parking facilities and designated parking spaces in large commercial parking lots.”

Comment noted. The intent of the policy is to make maximum use of Park-and-Ride facilities for transit patrons, to keep transit routes efficient. Examples of facilities that are currently at or near capacity include those at Missouri Flat Road, Cambridge Road, and the El Dorado Hills Multimodal Transit Facility.

Ideally, all uses would be accommodated in a single facility. This language will be clarified.

17. Page 14, regarding Marble Valley Specific Plan and following paragraphs. Add a note explaining the status of the proposed project.

An update will be included in the Final Draft document.

18. Page 14, Placerville Multi-Modal Station. Clarify language. It appears that some words are missing from this sentence.

Agreed. Intent is that the facility is nearing final approval for construction on the permanent expansion. This will be clarified in the Final Draft document.

19. Page 15, regarding projected demands. Should the forecasts be updated to include additional ride share potential providers such as Uber, Lyft or even autonomous vehicles?

Comment noted. As above, the potential impacts of these trends are not yet clear, though undoubtedly each has the potential to tremendously impact demand. At this time, there are scenarios that will increase Park-and-Ride demand, and scenarios that will diminish demand.

Moreover, it is conceivable that the impact on demand could be inverse in different areas along the Highway 50 corridor.

The best approach appears to re-evaluate the projected demands as data begins shape how each of these are manifesting.

20. Page 15. Change “Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Connector” to “Capital SouthEast Connector.”

Agreed.

21. Page 16, update reference to the successful funding of the grant to study feasibility of the County Line Transit Center.

Agreed.

22. Page 16. Regarding reference to the Rodeo Drive Park-and-Ride facility/transit stop. Is there an existing Park-and-Ride here?

Comment noted. This facility was discontinued and this reference will be deleted.

23. Page 16, regarding opportunity areas for a new Cameron Park Drive Park-and-Ride facility. Area's identified in this study near the Cameron Park Drive Interchange may be problematic due to rare plants, and the location circled at the western end of Coach Lane feeds into the most congested area near the interchange where it would be difficult to provide good access to US 50.

Agreed. This is a challenging location. El Dorado Transit will continue to coordinate with any future efforts to study interchange and other transportation facility improvements to identify potential locations.

24. Page 17, third bullet. Extra characters after "El Dorado Hills Multimodal Transfer Facility."

Agreed.

25. Page 20, see comment 12 above.

See response to comment 12 above.

26. Page 20, first paragraph under "recommended financing program." Is there any new funding available with SB1?

Yes, but unknown in magnitude. The language will be updated to reflect the recent passage of SB 1. El Dorado Transit will work with the El Dorado County Transportation Commission to provide a possible estimate of funding, if possible.

27. Table 7, regarding "Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees (City and County)." You cannot use TIM fees for Maintenance.

Agreed. This will be removed in the Final Draft.

28. Page 22, regarding funding assumptions. Which revenue source?

The intended reference is to Table 8. This will be clarified in the Final Draft.

29. Page 24, regarding, "Alternatively, these projects could be funded through other mechanisms tied to new development, such as parcel taxes." This is a discussion that would have to be expanded and include all the steps needed to implement such a parcel tax. What would be the mechanism? The El Dorado County BOS would have to be the implementing authority.

Comment noted. Additional language will be added with the stated clarifications.

30. Table 10, regarding assumption that over the 10-year horizon El Dorado Transit will be successful in obtaining 25% of an approximately \$2.0 million annual apportionment of Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality funds. Is this a correct assumption?

Comment noted. It is reasonable, but intended only as an estimate to base a funding/phasing program for future Park-and-Ride facility expansions and as an indication of the level of need.

31. Page 26, regarding use of traffic impact fees for Park-and-Ride facilities. The EDC TIM fee program can only pay for the portion associated with the growth. Under the current program that is approximately 20%. Transit has a line item in the current TIM Fee program which is based on 20% of the cost of EDCTA's Capital Improvement Program. Previously indicated this is an exaction from development therefore, it would not be included in the TIM Fee program.

Comments noted and this language will be clarified in the Final Draft document.

32. Page 27. Please modify as noted: "The State of California will consider working cooperatively to relinquish other existing Park-and-Ride facilities that are served by El Dorado Transit to the County of El Dorado."

Agreed.