



Elk Grove Active Transportation Fee Program

Nexus Report

SEPTEMBER 2022



This page is intentionally left blank.



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Relationship of 2022 Active Transportation Fee to Existing City Fee Programs	1
Study Purpose and Approach.....	2
Nexus Findings.....	4
2022 Active Transportation Fee	9
Multimodal Service Standard Development.....	9
Year 2022 (Existing) Multimodal Deficiencies	12
Buildout (Future) Multimodal Improvement Needs.....	13
Calculation of Maximum Allowable Fee.....	15
Active Transportation Costs for New Development.....	15
Credits and Reimbursements.....	16
ATF Administration Charge.....	16
Exemptions and City Discretion	18
Proposed ATF Fees	18
Implementation.....	20
Inflation Adjustment.....	20
Implementing Ordinances/Resolutions.....	20
Fee Administration	21
Fee Exemptions, Reductions and Waivers	21
Fee Credit and Reimbursement to Developers	23
Impact Fee Program Adoption Process.....	24
Programming Revenues and Projects with the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Other Studies ...	25
Funds Needed to Complement Impact Fee Program	25
Compliance Requirements.....	25



Table of Tables

Table 1: Employee to Resident Equivalency Factor Assumption 10

Table 2: Employee Service Population Factor Based on Resident to Employee Equivalency 11

Table 3: Service Population (2022 to Buildout) 12

Table 4: Service Standard – Multimodal Facilities by Facility Type 12

Table 5: Year 2022 (Existing) Multimodal Deficiencies and Multimodal Service Standard 13

Table 6: Multimodal Improvement Cost Estimates by Facility Type 13

Table 7: 2022 ATF – Active Transportation Improvement Cost Attributable to Growth 14

Table 8: Total DUE Growth by General Land Use Category 15

Table 9: Total 2022 ATF Update Attributable to Growth 15

Table 10: Proposed Maximum Allowable Fee by Detailed Land Use Category 19



Introduction

This report presents the analysis, findings, nexus methodology, and defensible fee amounts for multimodal transportation facilities in the City of Elk Grove. While it is a separate fee program, it has been coordinated with the Elk Grove Roadway Fee Program 2022 Update (EGRFP) and uses analysis conducted as part of that update as a basis for the Active Transportation Fee Program (ATFP). The ATFP effort presented herein is designed to align with the development of the 2021 Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan Update (BPTMP). The program will direct active transportation-related fees into a dedicated fund separate from fees collected to fund other types of transportation improvements.¹ The fees collected under this program will be used for items in the BPTMP related to bike and trail infrastructure and fair share of existing deficiencies for pedestrian infrastructure.

This report is focused on the ATFP 2022. The report documents data and technical analyses utilized in the calculations required to determine maximum allowable impact fees, and where required, makes the nexus findings required under state law.

The methodological approach for this update has been identified to ensure that fair, adequate, and timely funding will be available for necessary improvements and that the calculated impact fees are consistent with the nexus requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act and AB 602, as set forth in Sections 66000 et seq. of the California Government Code. As required by Government Code Section 66000 et seq. and subsequent court rulings, it is required that this fee illustrate that a reasonable relationship exists between the calculated fee amounts and development land uses on which they are imposed. Additionally, this fee demonstrates that a rough proportionality exists between the impact of a land use on a facility and the amount of fee imposed on it. The methodology also identifies the existing level of service and proposed level of service for each public facility type. The fees presented in this report represent the highest level of fees utilizing the methodology outlined in this document for multimodal transportation improvements that could be legally adopted based upon State law mandated nexus requirements.

Relationship of 2022 Active Transportation Fee to Existing City Fee Programs

The 2014 Elk Grove Roadway Fee Program collects transportation impact fees for both roadway and multimodal improvements using one program and fund. The new fee structure that will result from the 2022 update will collect these two fee types into separate fund accounts. The 2022 update to the existing EGRFP and the development of the City's new ATFP are being concurrently generated and each fee program uses the same demographic and land use data. However, the two programs were developed using different methodological approaches tailored to the relevant mode.

¹ The terms active transportation and multimodal transportation are used to encompass walking, bicycling, use of other "small-wheeled" modes such as scooters and skateboards, and transportation by those utilizing wheelchairs and other mobility devices in the public right of way, such as on sidewalks.



To support the growth associated with a development and infrastructure improvements needed to serve that development, developers pay impact fees such as those described in this report, or those required by specific plans or other agreements. In Elk Grove, there are several area-specific capital improvement financing programs that collect funds to contribute to trails costs through development or property tax assessments. Improvements located in those areas were identified by the City to have the potential to overlap with the improvements included in the active transportation fee program calculation described herein. To ensure that proposed multimodal improvements and the associated fees were not funded more than 100 percent between all the Citywide and area-specific fee programs, improvements located within the boundaries of relevant development areas were identified and vetted by the City. These areas include the following communities: Southeast Policy Area, East Franklin, Laguna Ridge, and Poppy Ridge.

Study Purpose and Approach

The primary goal of this active transportation fee (ATF) process is to establish a new fee program specifically dedicated to multimodal improvements. An asset-based service standard was developed to identify the active transportation improvements needed to accommodate future growth and calculate proportional allocation of cost of the new facilities to future development. Consistent with the City's concurrent Roadway Fee Program Update, trip length was incorporated into the cost allocation, by land use, in combination with trip generation. The inclusion of trip length along with trip generation establishes a fee program relationship with vehicle miles travelled (VMT). This relationship between VMT and fee aligns the fee program with the City's updated 2019 General Plan and SB 743, which changed the primary transportation impact criterion under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) from LOS to VMT. Although the VMT generated by a land use does not directly correlate to their impact on existing active transportation facilities, it does directly align with a land use's potential to benefit from the facility being funded, as the quantity of potential active transportation trips is a proportion of overall VMT.

Socioeconomic Data and Projections

As stated previously, the 2022 EGRFP is being updated concurrently with the development of this ATRFP. To ensure consistency between the cost allocation assumptions upon which the two fee programs are based, and to ensure consistency between the fee schedules, the Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) rates and fee schedule land use categories were sourced from the 2022 EGRFP². This data was used to calculate the multimodal fees by land use category presented in this 2022 Elk Grove Active Transportation Fee Program.

Service Population Calculation

The service population calculation is specific to a given fee program. The calculation is generated based on the metric that is most appropriate for the particular fee program type and context. Multimodal transportation facilities benefit both residential and nonresidential uses, so both must be accounted for. The service population calculation metric allows the benefit of facilities to be proportionally allocated across residential and nonresidential land uses. This ensures that residential development is paying only its fair share for transportation facilities that will also benefit non-residential development, and vice versa. The approach for generating the service population calculation utilized in this study leverages regional commute pattern data for the City of Elk Grove reported by Longitudinal Employer- Household Dynamics (LEHD) OnTheMap and U.S. Census population data. The estimated number of hours that residents and employees spend in the City, either

² Elk Grove Roadway Fee Program Update, Michael Baker International, 2022.



working or not working, is used as a proxy for their proportional access to the facilities being funded. This approach is described in additional detail in the service population calculations section.

Distribution of Costs

Using a unit-cost generated for each asset type multiplied by the net new miles for each facility attributable to future development, a cost attributable to the growth for each facility type is estimated. The cost for each facility type is summed to estimate the total cost of all active transportation improvements attributable to future development. Future development is quantified in units called Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE), which is used to compare the relative travel characteristics associated with different land use categories to that of a single-family residential dwelling unit. The DUE rate allows for the proportional allocation of the cost of transportation improvements funded by the fee program to the various land use categories, relative to the amount of travel generated by the land use. Additional information about unit cost development is provided in Appendix A.

A cost per DUE that can be levied on future development to maintain the asset standard is calculated by subtracting the existing roadway fee balance associated with active transportation improvements from the total active transportation costs attributable to growth, then dividing that number by the quantity of DUEs at buildout.

Trips and daily VMT is used as the basis for distributing cost in the fee program. This approach uses trip length by land use type to proportionally allocate impact fees based on the length of anticipated project trips in addition to the quantity of anticipated trips. This approach toward cost allocation in the ATFP brings the fee program in line with a statewide shift towards using VMT as a primary transportation impact criterion. As noted above, the DUE rates utilized in this analysis were sourced from the EGRFP, which was updated concurrently with the ATF presented herein. The 2022 Elk Grove Roadway Fee Program is **available on the City website**.

Asset-Based Methodology

During the development of the 2021 Update to the City of Elk Grove Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan (BPTMP), a comprehensive inventory of the City's existing multimodal "assets" was identified. This new ATF will consider bicycle, pedestrian, and trail improvements proposed in the 2021 BPTMP, which includes both network facilities and other important amenities that support bicycling, walking, and trail use in Elk Grove.

Using this asset-based methodology, the following facility quantities were calculated for existing and proposed facilities:

- ◆ Total facility miles, including:
 - Class I Shared-Use Paths (off-street/separated shared-use paths, for bicyclists and pedestrians)
 - Class II Bicycle Lanes (on-street striped bicycle lanes), including buffered Class II Bicycle Lanes
 - Class III Bicycle Routes (on-street routes with signage, pavement markings, and/or related supports)
 - Class IV Bikeways (bikeways adjacent to the roadway, separated from vehicle travel lanes by parking, curbs or bollards)

As explained in detail below, the existing and future facility lane miles are summed, and a future service standard is established by dividing the total future facility lane miles (multiplied by 5,280 to reflect the conversion from lane miles to linear feet) by the projected service population. The existing "deficiency" in miles is calculated by



multiplying the 2022 service population by the program-area buildout standard (divided by 5,280 to reflect the conversion from linear feet to lane miles) minus the existing lane miles.

Using this approach, the “gap” (existing deficiency) between service standard established in the BPTMP and the existing baseline condition (facility mileage per service population) cannot be funded by the fee program. The quantity of net new lane miles attributable to future development is then identified by subtracting the existing “deficiency” from the future lane miles needed to achieve the program-area buildout service standard.

Nexus Findings

Authority

In California, cities and counties rely on their authority to levy public facilities fees under the police powers granted by the California Constitution pursuant to the procedures of the Mitigation Fee Act, contained in Government Code Section 66000 et seq. This Nexus Study provides the necessary documentation for the City to adopt the updated Roadway Fee Program.

Mitigation Fee Act and Required Findings

Because of the growing use of impact fees after the passage of Proposition 13 and concern over inconsistencies in their application, the California State legislature passed the Mitigation Fee Act, with AB 1600 in 1987. The act, currently contained in California Government Code Section 66000 et seq., establishes ground rules for the imposition and ongoing administration of development fee programs. The act became effective in January 1989.

Assembly Bill 602 Requirements

AB 602 added Government Code Section, 66016.5(a) pertaining to impact fees, which requires that on and after January 1, 2022, a local agency that conducts an impact fee nexus study shall follow all the following specific standards and practices:

1. *"Before the adoption of an associated development fee, an impact fee nexus study shall be adopted."*

Adoption of this Nexus Study will satisfy this requirement.

2. *"When applicable, the nexus study shall identify the existing level of service for each public facility, identify the proposed new level of service, and include an explanation of why the new level of service is appropriate."*

The existing level of service for bikeways is expressed in lane mileage of bikeways, by facility type, per existing service population. The level of service standard for bikeways is established by the BPTMP, which proposes the necessary lane mileage of bikeways, by facility type, needed to serve the buildout service population of the City. The difference between the existing level of service and the BPTMP level of service standard indicates the current “deficiency” relative to that standard.

The level of service standard established in the BPTMP support the City's General Plan goals to provide a safe and accessible multimodal transportation network that promotes active transportation. The BPTMP level of service standard supports the City's General Plan policies to prioritize a network of low-stress bikeways, ensure safe routes to schools, reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and associated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and require new development to pay their fair share towards implementation of the City's Transportation Network Diagram, which includes the BPTMP network.



The BPTMP, which was adopted by the City Council, is the foundation for the improvements and level of service standard utilized in this Nexus Study. This Nexus Study proposes no changes to the BPTMP improvements, nor any changes to the level of service standard established through it.

3. *"A nexus study shall include information that supports the local agency's actions, as required by subdivision (a) of Section 66001."*

Section 66001 (a) states that: "In any action establishing, increasing, or imposing a fee as a condition of approval of a development project by a local agency, the local agency shall do all of the following:"

1) Identify the purpose of the fee.

The purpose of the ATF is to provide a funding mechanism to support new multimodal improvements necessary to serve new development throughout the City and provide new development sufficient access to the infrastructure necessary to increase active transportation mode share.

2) Identify the use of fee revenues.

The fees charged to new development will be used to fund needed additions and improvements identified in the BPTMP to accommodate future users and increase active transportation mode share.

3) Determine a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development paying the fee.

New development in the City will generate additional travel demand that can be satisfied through a variety of travel modes, including active transportation. Completion of the BPTMP's multimodal improvements will ensure that the increased travel demand caused by new development can be satisfied safely and conveniently through active transportation.

4) Determine a reasonable relationship between the need for the fee and the type of development paying the fee.

Each new residential and nonresidential development project in the City will add to the incremental need for active transportation facilities, and each new development will benefit from the new active transportation facilities. For new development to occur during the planning horizon of the City's General Plan, active transportation improvements identified in the City's BPTMP will be necessary to satisfy General Plan policies for VMT and GHG reduction, increased active transportation mode share, safe routes to school, and reduced level of traffic stress, in addition to achieving the level of service standard established by the BPTMP.

5) Relationship between Amount of Fees and Cost of or Portion of Facility Attributed to Development on Which Fee is Imposed.

The City's BPTMP identified active transportation improvements are necessary to serve the buildout service population of the City's General Plan. This Nexus Study calculates the improvements attributable to new development, expressed in lane mileage by active transportation facility type, needed to maintain the BPTMP level of service standard for future service population. This Nexus Study excludes the cost of improvements needed to increase the level of service for the City's existing service population, where the current level of service falls short of the BPTMP level of service standard.

The costs attributable to the service population of new development was estimated. The costs were allocated to new development using a plan-based allocation that factored in travel demand generation under the General Plan. The result are maximum justifiable multimodal fees by land use category that reflect the relative benefit of and impact on the City BPTMP network.



4. "If a nexus study supports the increase of an existing fee, the local agency shall review the assumptions of the nexus study supporting the original fee and evaluate the amount of fees collected under the original fee."

This Nexus Study supports the development of a new fee, not the increase of an existing fee. Therefore, further analysis of this point is not required.

5. "A nexus study adopted after July 1, 2022, shall calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development. A local agency that imposes a fee proportionately to the square footage of the proposed units of the development shall be deemed to have used a valid method to establish a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development." A nexus study is not required to comply with this requirement if the local agency makes certain findings, which are described in Government Code Section 660165(5) (B).

This Nexus Study complies with the requirement that the fee for residential development projects be calculated on the basis of square footage of the units by creating a fee schedule consisting of 8 floor area categories. The proposed fee schedule applies different fee rates according to the range of the home sizes, as well as the average length of trips for each home size category. Studies conducted in the Sacramento region by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (e.g., the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and accompanying SACSIM 19 Traffic Model) and an analysis by the City's traffic consultant Fehr & Peers, along with data from US Census Bureau's American Community Survey were used to make correlations between trip rates and income, then between income and home size. The final correlation between trip rates and home size is the basis for residential ATRF fees.

This Nexus Study provides the technical documentation to support the above findings and determinations that establish the basis for imposing the increased fees as recommended.

This Nexus Study and the recommended fee schedule also conforms to the fundamental premise of the Mitigation Fee Act that the burden of the impact fees cannot total more than the actual cost of the public facility needed to serve the development paying the fee. Also, fee revenues can only be used for their intended purposes. In addition, the Act has specific accounting and reporting requirements, both annually and after every five-year period, for the use of fee revenues. These requirements are covered in more detail in the Compliance Requirements section of this report.

In addition, the impact fee revenues may not be used for staffing, operations, and maintenance of either existing or new facilities.

Supportive General Plan Policies

The following *Urban and Rural Development* policies are cited as ATRF Nexus criteria:

Policy LU-2-4: Require new infill development projects to be compatible with the character of surrounding areas and neighborhoods, support increased transit use, promote pedestrian and bicycle mobility, and increase housing diversity.

Policy LU-5-8: Require developers to provide pedestrian amenities, such as trees, lighting, recycling and refuse containers, seating, awnings, and/or art, in pedestrian areas along project frontages. Where appropriate, install pedestrian amenities in public rights-of-way.

The following *Mobility* policies are cited as ATF Nexus criteria:



Policy MOB-1-2: Consider all transportation modes and the overall mobility of these modes when evaluating transportation design and potential impacts during circulation planning.

Policy MOB-1-3: Strive to implement the roadway performance targets (RPT) for operations of roadway segments and intersections, while balancing the effectiveness of design requirements to achieve the targets with the character of the surrounding area as well as the cost to complete the improvement and ongoing maintenance obligations. The Transportation Network Diagram reflects the implementation of the RPT policy at a macro level; the City will consider the specific design of individual segments and intersections in light of this policy and the guidance in the Transportation Network Diagram. To facilitate this analysis, the City shall use the following guidelines or targets. Deviations from these metrics may be approved by the approving authority (e.g., Zoning Administrator, Planning Commission, City Council).

- (a) Vehicular Design Considerations – The following targets apply to vehicular mobility:
 - (iii) Pedestrian and Bicycle Performance – The City will seek the lowest stress scores possible for pedestrian and bicycle performance after considering factors including design limitations and financial implications.

Policy MOB-3-1: Implement a balanced transportation system using a layered network approach to building complete streets that ensure the safety and mobility of all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, children, seniors, and people with disabilities.

Policy MOB-3-2: Support strategies that reduce reliance on single-occupancy private vehicles and promote the viability of alternative modes of transport.

Policy MOB-3-3: Whenever capital improvements that alter street design are being performed within the public right-of-way, retrofit the right-of-way to enhance multimodal access to the most practical extent possible.

Policy MOB-3-4: As new roads are constructed, assess how the needs of all users can be integrated into the street design based on the local context and functional classification.

Policy MOB-3-7: Develop a complete and connected network of sidewalks, crossings, paths, and bike lanes that are convenient and attractive, with a variety of routes in pedestrian-oriented areas.

Policy MOB-3-9: As funds become available, provide for the operation and maintenance of facilities for bicycle and pedestrian networks proportionate to the travel percentage milestone goals for each mode of transportation in the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan.

Policy MOB-3-11: Consider the safety of schoolchildren as a priority over vehicular movement on all streets within the context of the surrounding area, regardless of street classifications. Efforts shall specifically include tightening corner-turning radii to reduce vehicle speeds at intersections, reducing pedestrian crossing distances, calming motorist traffic speeds near pedestrian crossings, and installing at-grade pedestrian crossings to increase pedestrian visibility.

Policy MOB-4-1: Ensure that community and area plans, specific plans, and development projects promote context-sensitive pedestrian and bicycle movement via direct, safe, and pleasant routes that connect destinations inside and outside the plan or project area. This may include convenient pedestrian and bicycle connections to public transportation.

Policy MOB-4-3: Prioritize infrastructure improvements that benefit bicycle and pedestrian safety and convenience over vehicle efficiency improvements within and near community facilities, activity centers, and other pedestrian-oriented areas.



Policy MOB-4-4: Employ the recommendations and guidelines in the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan when planning and designing bicycle, pedestrian, and trail facilities and infrastructure, including updates to the Capital Improvement Program.

Policy MOB-7-1: Prioritize roadway improvements that result in appropriate capacity and multiuser facilities on major arterials consistent with the Transportation Network Diagram.

- *Standard MOB-7-1.a.* Generally, new roadway construction or road widening shall be completed to the ultimate width as provided in this General Plan and shall also provide required bicycle and pedestrian improvements and paths. However, phased improvements may be allowed based upon the timing of development and facility demand as determined by the City Engineer or as otherwise provided in this General Plan or an applicable specific plan or other area plan. Regardless, all roadways, pedestrian facilities, and bike routes or bikeways shall be constructed in logical and complete segments, connected from intersection to intersection, to provide safe and adequate access.

Policy MOB-7-4: Require new development projects to provide funding or to construct roadway/intersection improvements to implement the City's Transportation Network Diagram. The payment of adopted roadway development or similar fees, including the City Roadway Fee Program and the voluntary I-5 Subregional Fee, shall be considered compliant with the requirements of this policy with regard to those facilities included in the fee program, provided the City finds that the fee adequately funds required roadway and intersection improvements. If payment of adopted fees is used to achieve compliance with this policy, the City may also require the payment of additional fees if necessary to cover the fair share cost of facilities not included in the fee program.



2022 Active Transportation Fee

The 2022 Active Transportation Fee (ATF) calculates multimodal improvement needs separately from roadway improvement needs identified in the 2022 Roadway Fee Program. In order to establish the 2022 ATF multimodal improvement needs, the following analysis steps were completed.

- Establish Multimodal Service Standard
- Establish Existing Multimodal Deficiencies Relative to Service Standard
- Identify Future Improvement Needs and Develop Cost Estimates

Multimodal Service Standard Development

The 2022 ATF has been established using an “asset-based” methodology. A Citywide multimodal service standard, by multimodal asset type, has been calculated based on the proposed City of Elk Grove’s bikeway, pedestrian and trail improvements included in the City’s 2021 Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan Update (BPTMP). The calculation of a service standard requires calculation of City service population numbers based on the future residents and employees that the BPTMP improvements are designed to accommodate.

Service Population Calculations

The service population calculations associated with City multimodal transportation facilities, which are designed to serve both residential and nonresidential uses, are based on the results summarized in Table 1 and Table 2. The service population is presented in Table 3.

EMPLOYEE TO RESIDENT EQUIVALENCY

Table 1 presents the estimated total number of waking hours a typical employee and/or resident has in the City. Waking hours are used as a proxy for the proportional amount of access a resident or employee reasonably has to City Facilities. Proportional access to city facilities is used to estimate proportional benefit of the improvements being funded. This methodology is used to establish the proportional cost burden between residential and non-residential development, acknowledging that the proportional benefit of the improvements varies between residents and employees. The employee to resident equivalency assumptions reported in Table 1 reflect the first step in calculating the employee service population factor presented in Table 2, which is used in subsequent steps of the fee calculation.

The waking hours spent working are assumed to be eight hours per day on average, five days per week and 48 weeks per year (based on an assumption of the average number of days per week and number weeks per year worked, less holidays and assumed vacation/sick time), which equates to 1,920 waking hours spent working per year (8 hours/day x 5 days/week x 48 weeks/year = 1,920). The total waking hours is based on an assumption of the average waking hours per day multiplied by the number of days in a year (16 hours/day x 365 days/year).



Non-working resident waking hours were assumed to be the full 16 hours. Employee waking hours spent working were estimated at 5.3 hours per day, which accounts for the eight waking hours spent working over the five-day work week, averaged over the seven-day calendar week (1,920 waking hours spent working/365 days per year = 5.3 hours). Working resident waking hours were estimated at 10.7 by subtracting the waking hours spent working from the total waking hours (16 hours/day – 5.3 hours/day = 10.7 hours/day).

The individuals who both live and work in the City are listed under both the resident and employee categories. To avoid double counting these individuals, the resident category lists their time spent as a resident (10.7 hours/day), and the employees category list their time spent as an employee (5.3 hours/day).

Table 1: Employee to Resident Equivalency Factor Assumption

Waking Hours at Work/Not at Work	# of Waking Hours	% of total Waking Hours
Total Waking Hours/Day (Residents and Employees)	16	100.0%
Residents	16	100.0%
Not in Workforce	16	100.0%
Work in the City	10.7	67.1%
Work Outside of the City	10.7	67.1%
Employees	5.3	32.9%
Live in the City	5.3	32.9%
Live Outside the City	5.3	32.9%

Table 2 presents the employee service population factor calculation, which represents the employee to resident equivalency factor. The ratios of waking hours spent working shown in Table 1 were applied to population and employment estimated in this study, which is calculated using multiple sources including the following:

- ◆ 2020 U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year population and employment estimates
- ◆ 2019 Longitudinal Employment Household Dynamics (LEHD) On the Map employee origin-destination estimates
- ◆ EGRFP household and employment forecasts

The land use growth forecasts used to establish the DUE rates used in the EGRFP are used similarly to calculate the fee in this study. To ensure consistency between the land use land use assumptions used in the EGRFP with the Census ACS and LEHD estimates, the Census estimates are adjusted by balancing the Census data with the EGRFP land use assumptions. To calculate the weighted average of residents and employees in each category, the ratio of the total in each resident/employee subcategory is multiplied by the relative access to city facilities shown in Table 1. The weighted average of for each of the subcategories is summed for a weighted average for total residents and total employees. Finally, to normalize residents to 100% and calculate the employee service population factor, the weighted average of total residents is divided by the weighted average of employees, resulting in a factor of .389, meaning the employee equivalent of a resident is 38.9%.



Table 2: Employee Service Population Factor Based on Resident to Employee Equivalency

Employment Characteristics of Elk Grove Residents and Non-Residents	Existing Population/Employment		Relative Access to City Facilities (Hours/Day) ¹	Relative Access to City Facilities (% of Day) ¹	Weighted Average	Normalizing Residents to 100%
	Total #	% of Total				
Employment Status of Residents						
Not in Workforce	90,808	52.5%	16	100.0%	52.5%	
Work in City	12,305	7.1%	10.7	67.1%	4.8%	
Work outside City	69,795	40.4%	10.7	67.1%	27.1%	
Total Residents	172,908	100.0%			84.4%	100.0%
Residence Status of Employees						
Live in City	12,305	26.0%	5.3	32.9%	8.5%	
Live outside City	35,096	74.0%	5.3	32.9%	24.3%	
All Employees	47,401	100.0%			32.9%	38.9%

Employee Service Population Factor

(32.9%/84.4%) = 38.9%

Source: 2020 U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Population and Employment Estimates; 2019 Longitudinal Employment Household Dynamics (LEHD) On the Map; GHD, 2022; EGRFP Household and Employment Estimates

Note:¹ Relative Access to City Facilities represents the assumption of waking hours with access to the City facility. This is based on the assumption of the ratio of waking hours spent working/not working to the total number of waking hours shown in Table 1.

SERVICE POPULATION

The multimodal service standard is established based on the buildout population of the program geography, presented in Table 3. As shown in Table 3, applying the respective service population factor to Year 2022 and buildout population and jobs, a growth of 79,523 in service population is expected.



Table 3: Service Population (2022 to Buildout)

Demographic	Year		Growth
	2022	Buildout	2022 to Buildout
Population ¹	172,908	234,358	61,450
<i>100% Allocation to Service Population</i>	172,908	234,358	61,450
Jobs	47,401	93,790	46,389
<i>38.9% Allocation to Service Population</i>	18,467	36,539	18,072
Service Population	191,374	270,897	79,523
Employee Service Population Factor:			.389

Source: GHD, 2022; Population, Jobs: EGRFP, 2022.

¹ Household values used in the EGRFP were multiplied by a factor of 3.22 based on assumption of the average persons per household (U.S. Census 2016-2020 estimates 3.22 persons per household estimated for the City of Elk Grove.

MULTIMODAL SERVICE STANDARD

Table 4 presents the service standard by facility type. The service standards for each multimodal facility type are calculated based on the total future lane miles by facility (or asset type) shown in the 2021 BPTMP. This service standard reflects the standards needed to accommodate the buildout of the BPTMP and future land use growth assumptions. The Total Plan facility lane miles have been adjusted to reflect projects completed since the adoption of the BPTMP in 2021.

Table 4: Service Standard – Multimodal Facilities by Facility Type

Facility Type	Total Plan Lane Miles by Asset Type a	Buildout (Future) Service Population b	Service Standard (Linear Feet per Service Population) $c = a * 5280 / b$
Multi-Use Path (Class I)	83.5	270,897	1.63
Bike Lane (Class II)	111.9	270,897	2.18
Bike Lane (Buffered)	30.8	270,897	0.60
Bike Route (Class III)	28.4	270,897	0.55
Class IV Bikeway	13.3	270,897	0.26

Year 2022 (Existing) Multimodal Deficiencies

By establishing the existing service levels relative to the buildout service standard, a calculation of “existing deficiencies” can be made to ensure that the improvement costs allocated to new growth do not include costs necessary to bring the current multimodal network up to the service standard, and instead only include the costs necessary to maintain the service standard as future development occurs. Table 5 presents the existing deficiencies in the City’s multimodal network relative to the existing multimodal service standards established in Table 4.



Table 5: Year 2022 (Existing) Multimodal Deficiencies and Multimodal Service Standard

Facility Type	Existing Miles by Asset Type a	2022 Service Population b	Service Standard (Linear Feet per Service Population) ¹ c	Service Standard Level (in Miles) $d = b * c / 5280$	Existing "Deficiency" relative to Standard (in Miles) $e = d - a$
Class I Multi-Use Path	35.2	191,374	1.63	59.1	23.6
Class II Bicycle Lane	91.6	191,374	2.18	79.0	n/a ¹
Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	.69	191,374	0.60	22.1	21.5
Class III Bicycle Route	11.2	191,374	0.55	19.9	8.6
Class IV Bikeway	0.5	191,374	0.26	9.4	8.7

¹Existing service level exceeds service standard. No existing deficiency.

Buildout (Future) Multimodal Improvement Needs

The quantity of multimodal facilities, in miles, attributable to future development is calculated by subtracting the existing deficiencies identified in Table 5 from multimodal service standard established in Table 4. To assign a cost per mile of improvement and by facility type, the linear cost estimates included in the 2021 BPTMP were applied to the improvement quantities attributable to service population growth between 2022 and buildout. The cost estimates by improvement type are shown in Table 6. Additional information about unit cost development is provided in Appendix A.

Table 6: Multimodal Improvement Cost Estimates by Facility Type

Facility	Cost	Unit
Multi-Use Path (Class I Path)	\$ 2,615,000	per Mile
Class II Bicycle Lane	\$ 75,000	per Mile
Buffered Class II Bicycle Lane	\$ 175,000	per Mile
Class III Bike Route	\$ 10,000	per Mile
Class IV Separated Bike Lanes	\$ 750,000	per Mile

Using the cost estimates reported in Table 6, Table 7 presents the total multimodal improvement costs attributable to future development in the ATF.



Table 7: 2022 ATF – Active Transportation Improvement Cost Attributable to Growth

Facility Type	Existing Lane Miles	Total Plan Facility Lane Miles	Future Lane Miles Needed to Achieve Buildout Plan	Existing "Deficiency" in Miles	Net New Lane Miles Attributable to New Development	Costs Attributable to New Development
Multi-Use Path (Class I Path)	35.2	83.5	48.3	23.9	24.4	\$63,694,388
Class II Bicycle Lane	91.6	111.9	20.3	n/a ¹	20.3	\$1,519,300
Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	0.7	31.5	30.8	21.4	9.4	\$1,653,407
Class III Bicycle Route	11.2	28.4	17.2	8.7	8.5	\$84,625
Class IV Bikeway	0.5	13.3	12.8	8.9	3.9	\$2,925,000
Total Cost of Active Transportation Improvements (Attributable to Growth):						\$69,876,721

¹ Existing service level exceeds service standard. No existing deficiency.

Calculation of Maximum Allowable Fee

To determine the cost attributable to each unit of new growth, the first step of this portion of the analysis involved calculating a Cost per Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) based on the total amount to be collected by the ATF and the new service population expected at buildout. As noted earlier, the 2022 to buildout projected land uses and associated DUE factors were sourced from the concurrent update to the EGRFP. The DUE calculation is shown in Table 8 and further information about this calculation can be found in the EGRFP Update.

Table 8: Total DUE Growth by General Land Use Category

Land Use Category		Unit	Planned Growth	DUE Rate	Total DUEs
Residential	Single Family	Dwelling Unit	15,824	1.00	15,284
	Multi-Family		3,800	0.41	1,558
Retail		1,000 Square Feet	10,574	1.53	16,178
Office			4,913	2.37	11,644
Industrial			6,301	0.65	3,920
Total					48,584

Source: Elk Grove Roadway Fee Program, 2022.

Active Transportation Costs for New Development

Using the analyses presented in the previous section that establishes the cost attributable to the ATF, Table 9 presents the cost that can be collected by the ATF. As shown in Table 9, the balance of the existing fee program is excluded from the total cost attributable to growth. Using the total number of DUEs at buildout, and the total amount to be collected by the 2022 ATF, a Cost per Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) was calculated at \$1,429, as seen in Table 9.

Table 9: Total 2022 ATF Update Attributable to Growth

Description	Amount
Total Active Transportation Costs (Attributable to Growth)	\$69,876,721
Existing ATF Balance	\$455,693
Amount to be collected by ATF	\$69,421,028
Buildout DUEs	48,584
Cost per DUE	\$1,429



Credits and Reimbursements

Developers contribute to the infrastructure necessary to serve their developments by paying this impact fee, and by making other contributions that may be required through a Specific Plan or other agreement, such as dedicating right-of-way. Some of the capital improvement projects included in the BPTMP may be constructed directly by developers, in which case they may be eligible to receive fee credits per the terms described in the City's administrative practices.

ATF Administration Charge

Development impact fee programs may include the cost of administering the program that funds the construction of public facilities necessary to serve new development including these:

- The administrative costs of assessing, collecting, cost accounting, and public reporting of the ATFP pursuant to Government Code 66006.
- The cost of justification analysis, legal support, and other costs of annual, periodic, and five-year updates to the ATFP.
- Costs associated with the establishment and ongoing administration of an effective system of fee credits and cash reimbursements.
- Costs of capital planning and programming for the ATFP, which includes costs associated with a capital program manager, a civil engineer, and public works analyst.
- City-led project contingency.
- Fee formation and update costs.

As such, the Active Transportation Fee includes an administration fee that equals 5.5% of the total costs, consistent with the administration charge applied to the 2022 EGRFP Update proposed fee schedule. As the active transportation costs were previously included with the Roadway Fee Program, the City has historical data that can be reviewed to understand the administrative costs associated with the Active Transportation Fee Program. Consistent with the EGRFP, this data can be seen below in Table 10. The City should monitor its costs in the following years and adjust the rate, as necessary.



Table 10: Historical Administrative Costs Compared to Fee Revenue

	Fiscal Year 2015	Fiscal Year 2016	Fiscal Year 2017	Fiscal Year 2018	Fiscal Year 2019	Fiscal Year 2020	Fiscal Year 2021	Fiscal Year 2022	8-year Average
Revenue									
Base Fee (excludes admin fee)	\$ 4,149,726	\$ 4,727,478	\$ 2,598,810	\$8,050,146	\$8,667,109	\$9,373,809	\$11,720,789	\$7,957,617	\$7,155.685.37
Expenses - Finance Administration									
Bank Fees	\$12,235	\$12,720	\$9,787	\$18,807	\$12,865.00	\$22,183.00	\$34,306.00	\$30,000.00	\$19,112.88
Salaries and Benefits (City Staff)	\$-	\$-	\$524	\$28,344	\$30,465	\$20,627	\$20,057	\$21,261	\$15,159.69
Administration (Consultant Charges)	\$-	\$8,040	\$6,374	\$16,734	\$23,490	\$24,865	\$12,127	\$83,120	\$21,843.87
Fee Program Updates	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$500,000	\$-	\$-	\$0	\$62,500.00
Total	\$12,235.02	\$20,760.02	\$16,683.77	\$63,885.95	\$566,820.67	\$67,674.73	\$66,490.37	\$134,381	\$118,616.44
As Percent of Base Fee	0.29%	0.44%	0.64%	0.79%	6.54%	0.72%	0.57%	1.69%	1.66%
Expenses - CIP Program Administration									
Salaries, Benefits, and Consultant Costs	\$189,440.02	\$251,049.00	\$300,905.00	\$442,938.45	\$839,135.00	\$565,405.85	\$587,438.00	\$325,160.00	\$437,683.92
As Percent of Base Fee	4.57%	5.31%	11.58%	5.50%	9.68%	6.03%	5.01%	4.09%	6.12%

Exemptions and City Discretion

All determinations regarding the exemptions provided in this section shall be made by the City Finance Director or his/her designee. The City shall make the final determination as to which land use category a particular development will be assigned. The Finance Director is authorized to determine the land use category that corresponds most directly to the land use. Alternatively, the Finance Director can determine that no land use category adequately corresponds to the development in question and may work in conjunction with the City Engineer to determine the applicable ad hoc fee.

The following public agencies and land shall be exempted from payment of the ATF: Public facilities (e.g., schools, parks, fire stations, federal and state agencies) are exempt from the ATF. The City will determine if other non-City public agencies and their facilities will be subject to payment of the Active Transportation Fee.”

Proposed ATF Fees

To develop the fee schedule by detailed land use category, the Cost per DUE shown in Table 9 and the DUE rates utilized in the 2022 EGRFP (shown in Table 11) were multiplied to calculate an active transportation fee per unit. The DUE rates are based on each land use category's PM peak hour trip rate and trip length (VMT) relative to that of a single-family dwelling unit (1SFDU = 1 DUE). Using this approach, the cost allocation of active transportation improvements described in the ATRFP is based on the proportional responsibility for reducing VMT associated with each of the land use categories considered in the fee schedule. The results of this calculation represent the maximum fee per land use category for the 2022 ATF and are shown in Table 11.



Table 11: Proposed Maximum Allowable Fee by Detailed Land Use Category

Land Use Category ¹	Unit Description	DUE Rate	Active Transportation Fee per Unit	Active Transportation Fee per Unit with 5.5% Admin Fee ¹
Residential (Traditional)²				
Up to 1,200 SF	Dwelling Size	0.41	\$586	\$618
> 1,200 SF to 1,400 SF	Dwelling Size	0.78	\$1,115	\$1,176
> 1,400 SF to 1,700 SF	Dwelling Size	0.86	\$1,229	\$1,297
> 1,700 SF to 2,000 SF	Dwelling Size	1.00	\$1,429	\$1,508
> 2,000 SF to 2,700 SF	Dwelling Size	1.10	\$1,572	\$1,658
>2,700 SF to 3,400 SF	Dwelling Size	1.17	\$1,672	\$1,764
> 3,400 SF	Dwelling Size	1.24	\$1,772	\$1,869
Senior Adult Residential				
Up to 1,000 SF	Dwelling Size	0.27	\$386	\$407
Greater than 1,000 SF	Dwelling Size	0.32	\$457	\$482
Shopping Center	1,000 SF	0.92	\$1,315	\$1,387
Auto Mall	Acres	2.45	\$3,501	\$3,694
Gas Station w/ Convenience Market	Fueling Positions	1.27	\$1,815	\$1,915
Theater/Cinema	Seats	0.01	\$14	\$15
Office	1,000 SF	0.97	\$1,386	\$1,462
Industrial	1,000 SF	0.36	\$514	\$542
Hotel/Motel	Rooms	0.15	\$214	\$226
Hospital	Beds	0.94	\$1,343	\$1,417
Assembly	1,000 SF	0.37	\$529	\$558
Day Care Center	1,000 SF	1.42	\$2,029	\$2,141
Congregate Care Facility	Dwelling Units	0.10	\$143	\$151
Assisted Living	Beds	0.13	\$186	\$196
School (K-12)	Students	0.14	\$200	\$211

Source: Land use categories and DUE rates were sourced from the Elk Grove Roadway Fee Program, 2022.

¹ Totals and calculations may not equal due to rounding.

² Multi-family units are those units less than 1,200 square feet



Implementation

This chapter identifies tasks that the City will complete when implementing the fee program.

The ATRP presented in this report is based on the best improvement cost estimates available (see Appendix A), funding source information, administrative cost estimates, and land use information available at this time. If costs change significantly, the type or amount of new development changes, other assumptions significantly change, or other funding becomes available (as a result of legislative action on State and local government finance, for example), the fee program should be updated accordingly.

After the fees presented in this report are established, the City will conduct periodic reviews of roadway improvement costs and other assumptions used as the basis of the 2022 ATRP. Based on these reviews, the City may make necessary adjustments to the fee program through subsequent fee program updates.

Inflation Adjustment

The planning-level improvement cost estimates discussed in this report are shown in 2020 dollars, as reported in the 2021 BPTMP and are based on the consultant's experience and developed based on recent local project costs bid in 2017 and 2018, as well as the City's Trail Project List and Detail Estimates. To ensure that the fee program stays current with the prevailing cost of construction, the proposed fee will be automatically adjusted by the City annually to account for the inflation (or deflation) of construction, right-of-way acquisition, environmental, and design costs. Elk Grove Municipal Code Section 16.95.060 (A), which pertains to the EGRFP, provides that fee adjustments shall occur automatically on January 1st of each calendar year. Adjustments in the amount of the estimated construction costs of providing the specified road fee program facilities will be adjusted automatically based upon the average three-year adjustment in the Caltrans Cost Index.

The adjustment will be based on a three (3) year moving average of the for the second (2nd) quarter of the year, or equivalent, as determined by the Finance Director. For example, the adjustment for January 2023 will be determined by calculating the average change for the previous three (3) prior year's indices, beginning with the second quarter of years June 30, 2019 to June 30, 2020, June 30, 2020 to June 30, 2021, and June 30, 2021 to June 30, 2022. The resulting value will be the adjustment factor that will be applied to the Roadway fee in January 2023.

Implementing Ordinances/Resolutions

The proposed fee would be adopted by the City through one or more ordinances authorizing collection of the fee and through one or more fee resolutions establishing the fee. The City has established Elk Grove Municipal Code Chapter 16.95 (Development Impact Fees), which establishes the City Roadway Impact Fee. That chapter will be updated to rename that fee the Elk Grove Roadway Fee Program, as that title is used in this report.

The fee will be effective 60 days following the City's final action on the ordinances authorizing collection of the fee and on the fee resolutions establishing the fee. The new ordinance and resolution should reference the automatic inflation adjustment factor discussed in this section.



Fee Administration

The ATF will be collected from new development in areas subject to the fee at the time of the building permit issuance; use of these funds may need to wait until a sufficient fund balance can be accrued. According to Government Code Section 66000, the City is required to deposit, invest, account for, and expend the fees in a prescribed manner.

Fee Exemptions, Reductions and Waivers

The ATFP may be reduced under certain circumstances. Any exemptions or reduction in fees will be based on the City's independent analysis and review of the subject property, and consistent with the provisions outline in the 2022 EGRFP.

The 2022 EGRFP Nexus Study carries forward the exemptions, reductions, and waivers as determined in the 2014 Nexus Study. Except as otherwise provided herein, all determinations regarding the application of the exemptions listed in this section, along with determining any special fee calculations as allowed under this section, shall be made by the City Finance Director or their designee. Specific reductions or waivers provided in this section shall be made by the City Council as provided.

Public Agencies

All federal and state agencies, public school districts, facilities of the Cosumnes Community Services District (including fire stations and park sites), and the City will be exempt from the ATF. Other non-City public agencies shall be subject to payment of the ATF; however, the City may choose to waive some or all the ATF in certain cases.

Replacement/Reconstruction

Any replacement or reconstruction (no change in use) of any residential unit or any nonresidential structure that is damaged or destroyed as a result of fire, flood, explosion, wind, earthquake, riot, or other calamity, or act of God shall be exempt from the ATF. However, if the replacement or reconstructed residential unit exceeds the documented total number of units or unit size of the damaged/destroyed residential structure, or the replacement or reconstructed nonresidential building exceeds the documented total floor area of the damaged/destroyed building, the excess units or building square footage is subject to the ATF.

If a residential or nonresidential structure is replaced with an alternative land use, such as replacing an office building with a retail building, then City staff will determine the appropriate fee adjustment to reflect the different trip characteristics of the original and new land uses.

Additions/Alterations/Modifications/Temporary Facilities

The following rules shall apply to additions, alterations, modifications, and temporary facilities.

1. Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units shall not be assessed a fee under the ATFP.
2. Additions to residential structures where the total square footage of the dwelling remains within a fee category range, provided no change in use occurs and a second full kitchen is not added, shall not be charged a fee. If the square footage of the dwelling increases into a new fee category range, the difference of the two fee category ranges shall be collected prior to building permit issuance.



3. Except as otherwise provided, when an existing residential dwelling is converted into two primary units, or a new primary dwelling is added to the property, that new unit shall be assessed a fee consistent with the provisions of this study.
4. Additions to multifamily residential structures that are not part of a mixed-use type project, provided no change in use occurs and no additional units result.
5. Supporting use square footage in multi-unit residential projects, such as the office and recreation areas required to directly serve the multifamily project, shall not be subject to a fee. The residential unit fee will provide the full mitigation required in multi-unit residential projects.
6. Non-habitable residential structures including, but not limited to, decks, pools and spas, pool cabanas, sheds, and detached garages shall not be assessed a fee. An attached garage shall not count towards the square footage of the dwelling.
7. Mobile or manufactured homes that are not the primary residents and have no permanent foundation shall not be assess a fee.

Reductions and Waivers

The City may reduce or waive the ATF for a development project if it can be determined that the proposed project will have reduced or no impact on any facility for which the ATF is collected. If a development project is found to have no impact such project may be exempted from the fees. If a project has characteristics that indicate its impacts on a public facility or infrastructure system will be significantly and permanently smaller than the average impact used to calculate impact fees in this Study, the fees may be reduced accordingly at the City's sole discretion.

The City may base its determination for fee reductions or waivers on evidence presented to the City by the project applicant that demonstrate one or more of the following conditions:

- The project will have substantially less residential occupancy or employment density than the assumptions indicated in this study for the proposed land use.
- Due to the nature of the project, such as location, anticipated use, expected market, and/or customer base, there is justifiable reason to expect less demand on transportation facilities. The applicant may provide evidence or cite authoritative sources which indicate that, for their specific project, one or more of the factors used in this study (e.g., occupancy, trip generation, vehicle miles traveled) are lower than given for the general categories of this study.

The City shall review the evidence and make a recommendation to City Council of its findings and whether the impact fee may be reduced or waived for the development project.

In some cases, the City may desire to voluntarily waive or reduce impact fees that would otherwise apply to a project to promote goals such as affordable housing, economic development, or the provision of benefits that apply to the public at large. Such a waiver or reduction may not result in increased costs to other development projects and is allowable only if the City offsets the lost revenue from other funding sources.

Required Fees

Below are examples of instances in which the Roadway Fee may be required for land uses that potentially could be classified as exempt from the fees:

1. Any project listed above that would otherwise be exempt from the fee (including both ministerial and discretionary projects), but which nonetheless, in the determination of the City Council, increases the



demand on City facilities funded by the ATF may be subject to the fee. In determining to impose such fee, the City Council may impose the entire fee or pro rate the amount of the fee based on the project's demonstrated impact on the subject facility or facilities. Unlawfully constructed facilities and buildings, constructed before the adoption of the ATF, which later obtain a building permit consistent with applicable law to legitimize the facility or building, may be subject to the applicable fee. For discretionary projects, this determination may be made as part of the project approvals or at a subsequent meeting. For ministerial projects, the determination shall be made prior to issuance of the building permit after review and recommendation by the Finance Director and Development Services Director.

2. Shell buildings, meaning the construction of the exterior of the building with limited or no interior improvements (e.g., unfinished floors, limited electrical and plumbing) and with or without a heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system:
3. The full ATF can be made payable at the time the building permit for the shell building is obtained.
4. The incremental difference between the intended and actual use of any shell building may be collected on any building permit for tenant improvements.
5. Accessory residential structures that are converted to a Primary Residential Dwelling Unit and are not considered Accessory Dwelling Units or Junior Accessory Dwelling Units may be subject to the ATF as provided in this Study. A conversion shall be considered an Accessory Dwelling Unit or Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit if it conforms to EGMC Chapter. 23.90, and will not be subject to the ATF. A unit constructed pursuant to EGMC Chapter 23.30 shall be subject to the ATF.
6. That portion of the reconstruction of a building destroyed as a result of fire, flood, explosion, wind, earthquake, riot, or other calamity, or act of God, which is greater than the documented total number of units or square footage that was or would have been previously subject to the City's ATFP.

Other Land Uses

The ATFP identifies an Active Transportation Fee for the major land use categories identified by the City's traffic model. Specialized land uses may have unique trip generation rates, and in these cases, the City may require a project-specific traffic study and may calculate the applicable fee based on information derived from the traffic model. For specialized development projects, the City Finance Director or his/her designee, in conjunction with the Development Services Director and City Traffic Engineer, will review traffic generation rates applicable to the specialized development and decide on an applicable fee.

Credit for Replacement of Existing Buildings

Portions of the City are already developed. New development that replaces existing development is eligible for a fee credit to the extent that the facilities to be funded by the new development are already provided to the existing development. For example, a four-unit apartment complex that is replaced by an eight-unit apartment complex could receive up to a 50 percent credit in the fee ($4/8 = 50$ percent). The City's Finance Director, in consultation with the Development Services Director, will determine the amount of the fee credit at the time a site plan is submitted to the City.

Fee Credit and Reimbursement to Developers

As is typical with development impact fee programs, many of the public infrastructure facilities are needed up-front before adequate revenue from the fee collection would be available to fund such improvements. Consequently, some type of private funding may be necessary to pay for the public improvements when they are needed. This private financing may be in the form of land-secured bonds, developer equity, or other form of private financing.



In cases where a private party (e.g., developer) has advance-funded an eligible ATFP facility, the party will be due a reimbursement from the ATFP. Reimbursements will be provided under the following conditions:

- Developer-installed improvements shall be considered for reimbursement. Only funds collected from the ATF shall be used to reimburse a developer who installed eligible roadway facility improvements identified in this report.
- The value of any developer-installed improvement for fee credit or reimbursement purposes shall be based on the lesser of the actual cost of eligible facilities (as determined at the sole discretion of the City via a review of the construction contract and payments made, plus an allowance determined by the City for soft costs directly associated with the facility design and construction) *or* the total eligible facility costs based on the cost schedule and estimate set forth in the ATFP, subject to an automatic annual inflation adjustment described previously in this section.
- All construction contracts, construction work, and requests for reimbursement are performed in conformance with the most current City "Reimbursement Policies and Procedures for Privately Constructed Public Facilities," (Reimbursement Policies) available from the City.
- The reimbursement may be in the form of fee credits or cash reimbursements as described in more detail herein.

Credit and Reimbursement Implementation Process

Once all criteria are met, fee credits up to 60 percent of the base fee obligation may be used to offset fees when payable at building permit issuance. To obtain fee credits, the public facility project must meet all criteria and developers must apply to the City before payment of fees on the first unit associated with final development approval. The City maintains the flexibility to allocate fee credits in a manner it chooses. Fee credits granted shall be on a per unit or per square-foot basis for all development projects. In no event will a party be granted fee credits against the administrative portion of the fee.

Cash reimbursements will be due to developers who have advance-funded a facility (or facilities) in excess of their proportionate share for such a facility. In this instance, developers would first obtain fee credits, up to their allocation requirement for a facility, and then await reimbursement from fee revenue collections from other fee payers.

The use of accumulated fee revenues shall be used in the following priority order:

1. Critical projects as defined by the City.
2. Repayment of reimbursement to private developers for the construction of ATFP projects.

To obtain reimbursements, developers must enter into a reimbursement agreement with the City. Reimbursements will be paid and/or credit balances established only after the City accepts the subject public facility improvements and the developer has complied with the Reimbursement Policies or its equivalent replacement document. It is important to note that reimbursements are an obligation of the ATFP and not an obligation of the City General Fund or other operating funds.

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in California Government Code Section 66016–66019. Adoption of this impact fee program requires the City Council to follow certain procedures, including holding a public hearing with at least 30 days' notice for the hearing (Gov. Code § 66016.5(a)(7)). The City shall notify



any member of the public that requests notice of intent to begin an impact fee nexus study of the date of the hearing.

Mailed notice 14 days prior to the public hearing is required for those individuals who request such notification. Data, such as this impact fee report and referenced material, must be made available at least 10 days prior to the public hearing. Any new or increased fees would be effective 60 days after adoption.

Programming Revenues and Projects with the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Other Studies

The City will update its CIP to identify specific projects and program fee revenues to those projects. Use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues.

For the planning period of the CIP, the City shall allocate all existing fund balances and projected fee revenue to facilities projects. The City shall plan its CIP expenditures at least five years in advance and show where all collected development impact fee revenues will be spent. The City can hold funds in a project account for longer than five years, if necessary, to collect sufficient funds to complete a given project. See Compliance Requirements below for the specific CIP update requirements stated in Government Code Section 62000.

The City will also periodically update the BPTMP to identify additional active transportation projects necessary to the safety and vitality of the bicycle, pedestrian and trails system in Elk Grove.

Funds Needed to Complement Impact Fee Program

In adopting the fees presented in this report, additional funds will need to be identified to fund the share of costs not related to new development. Table 7 identifies the facilities studied in this report and the projected costs attributable to growth. The City needs to obtain additional funding for the facilities shown to cover, among other things, the City's share related to existing development, which equates to the cost attributable to new development (growth) and the total project costs provided in Appendix A.

Compliance Requirements

The California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Section 66000 et seq.) mandates procedures for administration of impact fee programs, including collection, accounting, refunds, updates, and reporting. The City must comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements. For facilities to be funded with a combination of impact fees and other revenues, the City must identify the source and amount of the other revenues. The City must also identify when the other revenues are anticipated to be available to fund the project. The City's compliance obligations vis-à-vis the act include but are not limited to the following specific requirements:

Collection of Fees.

Section 66007 provides that a local agency shall not require payment of fees by developers of residential projects prior to the date of final inspection or issuance of a certificate of occupancy, whichever comes first. In a residential development of more than one dwelling unit, the local agency may choose to collect fees either for individual units or for phases upon final inspection, or for the entire project upon final inspection of the first dwelling unit when it is completed. The local agency may require the payment of those fees or charges at an earlier time if:



- A. The local agency determines that the fees or charges will be collected for public improvements or facilities for which an account has been established and funds appropriated and for which the local agency has adopted a proposed construction schedule or plan prior to final inspection or issuance of the certificate of occupancy; or
- B. The fees are to reimburse the local agency for expenditures previously made. "Appropriated," as used in this section, means authorization by the governing body of the local agency for which the fee is collected to make expenditures and incur obligations for specific purposes.

Earmarking of Fee Revenues.

Section 66006 mandates that the City deposit fees for the improvements in a separate capital facilities account or fund in a manner to avoid any commingling of the fees with other revenues and funds of the City, except for temporary investments. Fees must be expended solely for the purpose for which they were collected. Interest earned on the fee revenues must also be placed in the capital account and used for the same purpose. The Mitigation Impact Fee Act is not clear as to whether depositing fees "for the improvements" refers to a specific capital improvement or a class of improvements (e.g., fire or police facilities). The City intends to place all fee revenue into a single, exclusive account fund.

Reporting.

Section 66006 requires that once each year, within 180 days of the close of the fiscal year, the City must make available to the public the following information for each account established to receive impact fee revenues:

1. The amount of the fee.
2. The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund.
3. The amount of the fees collected, and interest earned.
4. Identification of each public improvement on which fee revenues were expended and the amount of the expenditures on each improvement, including the percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fee revenues.
5. Identification of the approximate date by which the construction of a public improvement will commence, if the City determines sufficient funds have been collected for financing of an incomplete public improvement.
6. A description of each interfund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including interest rates, repayment dates, and a description of the improvements on which the transfer or loan will be expended.
7. The amount of any refunds or allocations made pursuant to Section 66001, paragraphs (e) and (f).

The above information must be reviewed by the City Council at its next regularly scheduled public meeting, but not less than 15 days after the statements are made public.



Findings and Refunds.

Section 66001 requires that, for the fifth fiscal year following the first deposit of any impact fee revenue into an account or fund as required by Section 66006, and every five years thereafter, the City must make all the following findings for any fee revenues that remain unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted:

1. Identify the purpose to which the fee will be put.
2. Demonstrate the reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged.
3. Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing of incomplete improvements for which the impact fees are to be used.
4. Designate the approximate dates on which the funding necessary to complete financing of those improvements will be deposited into the appropriate account of fund.

Updating of the Impact Fee Nexus Study.

Per California Government Code Section 66016.5(a)(8), impact fee nexus studies shall be updated at least every eight years, from the period beginning on January 1, 2022.

The City may use the impact fee nexus study template developed by the California Department of Housing and Community Development pursuant to Section 50466.5 of the Health and Safety Code to update the nexus study.

Annual Update of Capital Improvement Plan

Section 66002 provides that if the City adopts a CIP to identify the use of impact fees, that program must be adopted and annually updated by a resolution of the governing body at a noticed public hearing. The City maintains two CIPs: one includes the programming of all projects funded or partly funded by impact fee revenues (which is contained in this Study in Appendix A and the ATRP Cost Estimate by GHD, as published in the Elk Grove BPTMP 2022 Update and the other is the 5-year CIP that is adopted annually during the City budget process.





Active Transportation Fee Program: Appendix

SEPTEMBER 2022

Table of Contents

Appendix A: Active Transportation Improvements Cost Estimates..... 1



Appendix A: Active Transportation Improvements Cost Estimates



Cost Estimates

This appendix discusses the unit cost assumptions used to develop the active transportation cost estimates and the list of projects included in the proposed facility lane miles used in the ATF calculation. Proposed facilities were sourced from the 2022 Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan. Proposed project list. However, in order to ensure that projects are not being funded beyond 100% of their project cost, some projects were excluded completely, or partially. Excluded projects include the portions of a proposed project segment that was already included in previous fee program calculations such as SEPA and Laguna Ridge.

Unit Cost Assumptions

Table 1 presents planning level unit cost assumptions used to develop project construction cost estimates. For linear projects, the unit cost method uses a single functional unit (mile or linear foot) that serves as a multiplier. The appropriate unit cost is multiplied by the length of the improvement to develop a planning-level project cost estimate.

Unit cost estimates were developed based on recent local project costs bid in 2017 and 2018, as well as the City Trail Project List and Detail Estimates. Estimates include assumed costs for:

- ◆ Mobilization
- ◆ Traffic control
- ◆ Earthwork
- ◆ Signs
- ◆ Pavement delineation and markings
- ◆ Utility coordination, grading, and erosion control

In addition, estimates include 30 percent soft costs including engineering design (15 percent), administration (3 percent), and construction management (12 percent). There is also a 15 percent contingency. Cost estimates for projects in this plan are in 2020 dollars and do not include cost escalation. Project cost estimates have been rounded to the nearest \$100.

At the planning level, cost assumptions do not consider project-specific or location-specific factors that may affect actual costs, including acquisition of right-of-way or road widening. For some projects, actual costs may differ significantly from the planning-level estimates.



Table 1: Unit Cost Assumptions

Improvement	Unit	Estimated Unit Cost	Notes
Class I Shared Use Path	MI	\$2,615,000	Assumes 10' wide path and minor grading
Class I Shared Use Path with Equestrian Tread, Easement Only	MI	\$954,000	Assumes a 40 ft wide easement in infill areas and 24 ft in new development.
Class I Shared Use Path without Equestrian Tread, Easement Only	MI	\$515,000	Assumes a 30 ft wide easement in infill areas and 14 ft in new development.
Class II Bicycle Lanes	MI	\$75,000	Both sides of street
Class II Buffered Bicycle Lanes	MI	\$175,000	Both sides of street
Class III Bicycle Route	MI	\$10,000	Includes signage and pavement markings
Class IV Separated Bikeway	MI	\$750,000	Includes signing and striping for a one- or two-way facility with small curb separation, no roadway widening

Key - MI: Mile; LF: Lineal Foot

Estimates include assumed costs for mobilization, traffic control, earthwork, signs, pavement delineation and markings, utility coordination, grading, and erosion control. In addition, estimates include 30 percent soft costs including engineering design (15 percent), administration (3 percent), and construction management (12 percent). There is also a 15 percent contingency.

Source: Unit cost estimates were developed based on recent local project costs bid in 2017 and 2018, as well as the City Trail Project List and Detail Estimates

Table 2 presents the list of improvements included as part of the proposed facilities used to calculate the desired service levels, buildout service standard, and existing “deficiencies” by linear facility type that used to calculate the new lane miles to attributable to future development, and ultimately the active transportation fee per unit by each land use categories. While the list of projects was originally sourced from the projects recommended in the 2022 BPTMP, the list of projects presented in Table 2 have been adjusted to ensure that projects included in other fee programs are not double funded or funded beyond 100% of their associated improvement cost.



Table 2: Improvements Included in ATRP Proposed Facility Calculation

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATRP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
613	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Undeveloped area NE of Elefa Ave	Tuscan Park Proposed Park Site	Arbor Park Proposed Park Site	0.24		0.19	Portion of the segment beginning at NW corner of Proposed Arbor Park site included in LRSupp. Parks Fee parkways	0.05	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 141,149
304	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Laguna Ridge east of Bruceville Rd	Parada Ct/Existing Class I adjacent to Machado Ranch Dr	Proposed SEPA Park Site IDs D and O.	1.16		0.87	Segments included in LR Supp Parks Fee parkways: NE corner of Proposed Tuscan Park site to Bruceville Rd (.47 mi); Big Horn Blvd and P024 E on Exhibit 4 of Laguna Ridge Supp. Parks Fee Report (.4 mi)	0.29	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 748,944
258	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Existing trail at Creekside Christian Church	E Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove Creek	0.54				0.54	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,419,590
263	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed Trail	Nottoli Park	Elk Grove Blvd	1.66				1.66	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 4,329,304
266	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Railroad Tracks	Grant Line Rd	Austin Ct	0.97				0.97	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,537,991
272	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed	Whitehouse Creek Trail	Unnamed	0.38				0.38	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,001,870
274	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Grant Line Rd	Bradshaw Rd	North of Calvine Rd	5.69				5.69	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 14,892,334
276	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed	Waterman Rd	Bond Rd	0.45				0.45	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,163,750
282	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Kilconnell Dr/West of St Elizabeth Ann Seton School	Racquet Ct	Elk Grove Blvd	0.39				0.39	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,025,563
284	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Whitehouse Creek Trail	Springhurst Dr	Elk Grove Florin Rd	0.29				0.29	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 749,586
291	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Cruz Ct	Waterman Rd	Black Swan Trail	0.05				0.05	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 120,300
293	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Creek Trail	Elk Grove Blvd	Florence Markofer Elementary School	0.87				0.87	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,282,338
294	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Laguna Creek Trail	Bond Rd	Waterman Rd	0.13				0.13	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 348,136
298	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed (Crosses LC Tributary 4)	Willow Falls Cir	Rising Creek Way	0.04				0.04	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 97,096
302	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Between Scheurebe Pl and Trebbiano Circle Bike Trail	Trebbiano Circle Bike Trail	Scheurebe Pl	0.03				0.03	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 76,476
305	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Bradshaw Rd	Sheldon Rd	Bond Rd	0.81				0.81	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,108,639
307	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Bond Rd	Waterman Rd	Crowell Dr	0.14				0.14	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 359,892
308	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Strawberry Creek Trail	Calvine Rd	Brown Rd	0.37				0.37	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 979,576
314	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Calvine Rd	Bader Rd	LC Tributary 1	2.62				2.62	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 6,857,640
315	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Blvd	Franklin Blvd	Stonelake Apartments	0.94				0.94	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,460,140
318	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	I-5	Beach Lake	Elk Grove Blvd	2.92				2.92	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 7,630,510

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATFP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
319	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Bradshaw Rd	LC Tributary 4	Bond Rd	0.05				0.05	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 135,247
320	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed	Tegan Rd	Howard Wackman Park	0.17				0.17	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 439,405
333	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Laguna Creek Trail	Proposed Laguna Creek Trail/Powerline Trail segment east of Waterman, north of Bond	Bond Rd/Sierra River Dr	0.22				0.22	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 568,162
342	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed	Bilby Rd	Kammerer Rd	0.33				0.33	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 866,815
343	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Kammerer Rd	Bruceville Rd/Kammerer Rd/SEPA Trail ID 5	Hood Franklin Rd	2.89				2.89	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 7,550,651
568	Class I Multi-Use Path	Trail Improvement	Laguna Creek Trail (East of Waterman Rd)	Waterman Rd/Sheldon Rd	East of Jordan Ranch Rd (Existing/Proposed Class I)	1.07				1.07	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,788,796
570	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Connector Path (between Park Dr and Rancho Dr)	Park Dr	Waterman Rd/Rancho Dr	0.17				0.17	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 449,719
259	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Whitehouse Creek	Elk Grove Florin Rd	Proposed Powerline Trail	1.18	.79 mi of segment is Easement and Equestrian Tread cost only. Remainder of segment, .39 mi, is calculated using regular Class I Path unit cost.	0.79	Exclude the easement + equestrian trail portion from ATFP facility segment and cost calculation	0.39	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,024,207
565	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Path Connector NE of Guttridge Park	Lewis Stein Rd	Guttridge Park	0.09	Class I Path connecting existing path at Guttridge and low stress local streets to SE.			0.09	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 231,267
506	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Quail Run Ln/Poppy Ridge Rd	Quali Run Ln east of Kuhn Ranch Way	Poppy Ridge Rd/Whitelock Pkway	0.98	Class I shared-use path along south side (eastbound) of roadway. May require ROW acquisition. Class II bicycle lane exists along small segment, which is frequently blocked by parked cars.	0.51	Between Proposed Poppy West and Poppy East Park sites included in LR Spp. Parks Fee parkways	0.47	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,235,962
295	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Laguna Creek Trail	Waterman Rd	East EG - Rainbow Creek (Trib Point Development) Laguna Creek Trail	0.07	Close a small gap between two existing Laguna Creek Class I paths			0.07	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 170,336
300	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Between Waterman Rd and Trebbiano Circle	Trabbiano Circle Bike Trail	Waterman Rd	0.19	Connect the existing Class I path to Waterman Rd to the west			0.19	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 495,402

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATFP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
269	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Creek	Grant Line Rd/Bradshaw	EG Creek near Sedgefield	0.80	Connect the proposed Class I facilities along Elk Grove Creek to Bradshaw and Grant Line Rds.			0.80	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,079,106
322	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Creek Trail	Waterman Rd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	0.60	Connect the proposed Class I facility along Elk Grove Creek over the railroad tracks to the west. Complete connectivity for new and proposed residential areas to Florence Markofer Elementary School, Elk Grove High School, and other locations			0.60	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,566,808
301	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed	Waterman Rd	North of Scheurebe Pl	0.14	Connect the proposed Elk Grove Creek Trail to Waterman Rd			0.14	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 360,520
547	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Excelsior Rd	Calvine Rd	Sheldon Rd	1.00	Construct Class I Shared Use Path			1.00	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,626,840
264	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Laguna Creek	Camden Park	Proposed Whitehouse Creek Trail (Adjacent to Creekside Christian Church)	0.59	Construct Class I Trail that connects from Camden Park to Proposed Class I that extends to Stockton Blvd			0.59	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,553,550
546	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Florin Rd/Mineral King Ct	Elk Grove Florin Rd	Mineral King Ct	0.02	Create bicycle/pedestrian connection at E end of Mineral King Ct cul de sac to connect to Elk Grove Florin Rd, providing connectivity between residential uses to the east and destinations on Elk Grove Florin Rd.			0.02	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 58,289
501	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Auberry Rd	Geneva Pointe Dr	Power Inn Rd	0.31	Create Class I path on east side of road along school frontage			0.31	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 809,767
493	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Extension of McConnell Park Trail	Trail terminus NE of Falcon Hill Ct	Iron Rock Way	0.35	Create Class I shared use path along existing desire lines			0.35	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 906,775
299	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Waterman Rd	Brinkman Ct	Elk Grove Creek Trail	0.05	Create connectivity between proposed Class I paths with this shorter segment			0.05	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 118,318
283	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Creek Trail	Waterman Rd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	0.82	Create trail connectivity for the residential area near Florence Markofer Elementary School and connect to the proposed Class I network near Elk Grove Creek			0.82	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,136,490
409	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	East side of Rhone River Dr	Rhone River Dr	Scheurebe Pl	0.01	East side of Rhone River Dr			0.01	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 38,757
326	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Big Horn Blvd	Whitelock Pkwy	Poppy Ridge Rd	0.26	Enhance 2014 BPTMP Rec to Class I Shared-Use Path (GHD Rec). May require ROW acquisition.			0.26	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 670,269
265	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed	Roan Ranch Cir	Waterman Rd Spur	0.46	Extend existing Class I path to Grant Line Rd near the Waterman Rd intersection			0.46	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,203,913
323	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	North of Strong Park-Est Park Dr north toward Wright Park Trail	Hambley Cir	Misty Springs Ct	0.45	Extend the existing Class I path to the north and south of this proposed route to improve connectivity of trail network			0.45	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,169,458
324	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Power Line Trail	Charolais Way	Scheurebe Pl	0.08	Extend the existing Power Line Trail south to connect to the existing Class I that starts adjacent to Scheurebe Pl			0.08	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 197,242

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATFP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
331	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Laguna Creek Trail	Calvine Rd	Vista Creek Trail	0.15	Extend this trail to Calvine Rd to connect to adjacent existing and proposed low stress trail facilities			0.15	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 397,371
477	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Laguna Creek Trail	Boulder Falls Ct	Rocky Falls Ct/Winding Brook Way	0.04	Extend/connect Class I Path north across stream to connect to Boulder Falls Ct			0.04	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 93,181
275	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Powerline Trail/Laguna Creek Trail (east of Waterman Rd, between Sheldon Rd and Bond Rd)	Sheldon Rd	Bond Rd	1.03	Install Class I Path to avoid use of stressful Waterman Rd			1.03	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,685,237
260	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	South of Daniels Ct (Laguna Creek/Powerline Trail connections)	Jordan Ranch Rd	Brown Rd/Waterman Rd	0.32	Install Class I Path to connect proposed trail at Jordan Ranch Rd at the east and Powerline Trail and Waterman Rd to the west.			0.32	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 848,542
497	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Sheldon Rd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	Waterman Rd	1.27	Install Class I Shared-Use Path. May require some ROW acquisition, and narrowing of lanes from 11' to 10'. Segment west of Elk Grove Florin Rd has existing sidewalk/path, which could be widened and realigned to Class I standards.			1.27	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 3,324,693
489	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Black Swan Trail/South of Elk Grove Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	Trail terminus	0.14	Pave existing trail if not already paved (public comment stated it was not).			0.14	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 364,346
492	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Power Line Trail	Mainline Dr	Black Swan Dr/Viridian Way	0.21	Pave this side of the trail			0.21	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 553,768
488	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Black Swan Trail West of Lockford Way	Trail terminus SE of East Park Dr/Lockford Way	Elk Grove Blvd	0.24	Pave Trail			0.24	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 627,274
210	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Power Line Trail	Calvine Rd	Sheldon Rd	0.97	Power Line Trail - Sheldon to Calvine			0.97	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,548,215
296	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed (Crosses LC Tributary 4)	LC Tributary 4	Clear Springs Cir	0.03	Small bikeway to connect LC Tributary to residential area			0.03	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 87,618
297	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed (Crosses LC Tributary 4)	LC Tributary 4	Willow Pond Cir	0.06	Small bikeway to connect LC Tributary to residential area			0.06	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 162,083
379	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	South side of Elk Grove Blvd	Bradshaw Rd	East of Mainline Dr	0.12	South side of Elk Grove Blvd. BPTMP recommended sidewalk, but upgrading this improvement to a two-way Class I facility would be ideal (GHD Rec), to accommodate more connected, low stress travel along EG Blvd.			0.12	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 303,048
209	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Strawberry Creek Trail/Trail Extension	Monterey Trail High School	Jones Family Park	1.72	Strawberry Creek Trail from Jones Park north along UPRR to Calvine Rd and along Strawberry Creek west to Monterey Trail High School. Also includes a bridge over Strawberry Creek at Union Pacific Railroad.			1.72	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 4,492,928
222	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Creek	Laguna Springs Drive	Oneto Park	0.24	This project will construct a new Class I Bikeway.			0.24	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 628,318

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATFP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
239	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Blvd	Bradshaw Rd	Grant Line Rd	0.55	Upgrade Class II Bike Lanes recommendation to Class I Shared-Use Path			0.55	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,440,798
540	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Bruceville Rd	Soaring Oaks Dr	Elk Grove Blvd	0.83	Widen existing sidewalk path to accommodate Class I Bikeway (SSAR Rec). Extend this further South to Whitelock Pkwy (GHD Rec).			0.83	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,168,050
541	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Bruceville Rd	Soaring Oaks Dr	Elk Grove Blvd	1.18	Widen existing sidewalk paths to accommodate Class I Bikeway (SSAR Rec). Extend this further South to Whitelock Pkwy (GHD Rec).			1.18	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 3,089,223
515	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Blvd	Waterman Rd	Grant Line Rd	0.88	Widen existing sidewalk to Class 1 shared-use path standards.			0.88	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 2,292,603
511	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Elk Grove Blvd	Laguna Springs Dr	SB 99 On-Ramp	0.33	Widen existing sidewalk to Class I Shared-Use Path			0.33	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 853,191
306	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Bond Rd	Bradshaw Rd	Shire Oaks Way	0.63	Would require ROW acquisition of parcel to the south			0.63	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,645,471
312	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Bond Rd	Van Ruiten Ln	Grant Line Rd	0.33	Would require ROW acquisition of parcel to the south.			0.33	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 861,934
592	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Kammerer Rd	SEPA Trail ID 5	Waterman Rd	3.70				3.70	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 9,664,078
595	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Bilby Rd (SEPA Trail ID 1)	Treasure Homes Park	SEPA Trail ID 2/Bilby Rd	0.16				0.16	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 421,687
615	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Laguna Blvd	Dwight Rd	Franklin Blvd	0.65				0.65	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,689,299
636	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Connector Path Between Proposed Park Sites	Tusacan Park	Tuscan/Treasure Homes Park	0.13				0.13	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 335,996
642	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Unnamed	Waterman Rd Spur	Grant Line Road	0.13				0.13	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 350,969
644	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	Existing trail at Creekside Christian Church	Existing trail to the west	Sheldon Rd	0.41				0.41	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 1,065,142
646	Class I Multi-Use Path	-	New development South of Kammerer Family Park	Kammerer Family Park existing trail segment (North of Upbeat Way/Allegra Dr)	Bilby Rd/Allegra Dr	0.16				0.16	\$ 2,615,000.00	\$ 414,929
224	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Machado Ranch Dr	Franklin High Rd	Bruceville Rd	0.25	Install Class II Bicycle Lanes			0.25	\$ 18,797.10	\$ 4,711
225	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Stonebrook Dr	Lyndley Plaza Way	Winding River Way	0.20	Install Class II Bicycle Lanes to fill lane gap between two existing segments.			0.20	\$ 14,742.93	\$ 2,898
226	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Adobe Spring Way	Amber Creek Dr	Bambridge Way	0.37	Install Class II Bicycle Lanes			0.37	\$ 27,880.98	\$ 10,365
227	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Bambridge Way	Adobe Spring Way	Old Creek Dr	0.10	Install Class II Bicycle Lanes			0.10	\$ 7,582.08	\$ 767
228	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Grant Line Rd	Bradshaw Rd	North of Calvine Rd	5.66	Install Class II Bicycle Lanes			5.66	\$ 424,449.29	\$ 2,402,096
231	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Excelsior Rd	Sheldon Park Way	Sheldon Rd	0.35	Connect the existing Class II facility along Excelsior Rd to Sheldon Rd			0.35	\$ 25,935.33	\$ 8,969
232	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Excelsior Rd	Calvine Rd	Halfway Rd	0.38	Connect the existing Class II facility along Excelsior up to Calvine Rd			0.38	\$ 28,175.57	\$ 10,585

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATFP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
233	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Sheldon Rd	Waterman Rd	Grant Line Rd	3.22	Class II facility not recommended because of high speeds and moderate ADT along this segment of Sheldon Rd. Class I equestrian trail to north is the preferred segment alternative (ObjectID 120).			3.22	\$ 241,391.46	\$ 776,931
234	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Waterman Rd	Calvine Rd	Rubia Dr	0.58				0.58	\$ 43,682.19	\$ 25,442
235	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Bradshaw Rd	Buna Ct	Bond Rd	0.16				0.16	\$ 12,361.79	\$ 2,038
237	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Bruceville Rd	Bilby Rd	Kammerer Rd	0.50	Recommend installing bike lanes for more experienced riders			0.50	\$ 37,470.07	\$ 18,720
241	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Elk Grove Blvd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	Gage St	0.20				0.20	\$ 14,944.03	\$ 2,978
252	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Laguna Springs Dr	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Creek Trail	0.63	Upgrade recommendation to buffered class 2 for lowest-stress experience. Would be LTS 2 due to speeds, even with buffer.			0.63	\$ 47,494.73	\$ 30,077
277	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Frye Creek Dr	Big Horn Blvd	Francesca St	0.56	Leverage low volume/speed residential streets for low stress Class II experience.			0.56	\$ 41,703.11	\$ 23,189
278	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Laguna Park Dr	Allbritton Way	Franklin Blvd	0.20				0.20	\$ 14,944.47	\$ 2,978
279	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	E Stockton Blvd	Geneva Pointe Dr	North of Rick Chapman Way	0.39				0.39	\$ 29,357.36	\$ 11,491
280	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	E Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	Elkmont Way	0.48				0.48	\$ 35,642.21	\$ 16,938
289	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Spring Flower Dr	Summer Glen Way	Harvest Park Dr	0.11				0.11	\$ 8,614.23	\$ 989
332	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Springhurst Dr	W Camden Dr	Sheldon Rd	0.46	Install Class II Bicycle Lane			0.46	\$ 34,164.93	\$ 15,563
339	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Elfa Ave	Bruceville Rd	Promenade Pkwy	2.31				2.31	\$ 173,573.51	\$ 401,704
480	Class II Bicycle Lane	Green Paint	Laguna Blvd	Franklin Blvd	Laguna Oaks Dr	0.19	Missing bike lane between Franklin Blvd and Laguna Oaks Blvd. Close bike lane gap and add green paint to increase driver awareness.			0.19	\$ 60,446.50	\$ 11,481
503	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Blue Maiden Way	Power Inn Rd	Shasta Lily Dr	0.31	Install Class II Bicycle Lane			0.31	\$ 23,404.44	\$ 7,304
507	Class II Bicycle Lane	Green Paint	Laguna Blvd/UPRR Crossing	Laguna Pointe	Franklin Blvd	0.13	Support green bike lane installation, and extend bike lane past Santorini Drive to Franklin Blvd, where bike lane is dropped at intersection approach. Add buffer if feasible.			0.13	\$ 9,612.20	\$ 1,232
530	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	East of Willard Pkwy	Bilby Rd/Gilliam Dr	Proposed Class I Path S/O Bilby/Willard	0.62	Install Class II that will go along Willard Pkwy from Bilby Rd to Kammerer Rd.			0.62	\$ 46,437.05	\$ 28,752
550	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Criswell Dr	Bradshaw Rd	Stonebrook Dr	0.52	Class II Bicycle Lanes only present along portion of roadway, and parking on both sides of the street/11 foot parking + bike lane results in LTS 3. Remove parking on one side, to provide additional bike lane width.			0.52	\$ 39,158.74	\$ 20,445
571	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	E Park Dr	Stinebrook Dr	End of E Park Dr	0.18				0.18	\$ 13,226.64	\$ 2,333
579	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Heritage Hill Dr	Four Seasons Dr	Elk Grove Florin Rd	0.24				0.24	\$ 18,222.51	\$ 4,427

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATFP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
585	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Ridgerock Dr	Mainline Dr	Mainline Dr	0.26	Install Class II bicycle lanes			0.26	\$ 19,178.83	\$ 4,904
586	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Clarke Frams Dr	Elk Grove Blvd	Criswell Dr	0.37	Install Class II bicycle lanes			0.37	\$ 27,385.73	\$ 10,000
587	Class II Bicycle Lane	-	Brown Rd	heritage Hill Dr	Waterman Rd	0.34	Install Class II bicycle lanes			0.34	\$ 25,520.81	\$ 8,684
218	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Emerald Oak Dr	Elk Grove Blvd	Valley Oak Ln	0.51	Remove parking lane and re-stripe existing Class II bike lanes to include an ample buffer.			0.51	\$ 88,720.65	\$ 44,979
236	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Dwight Rd	Bramblewood Way	Railroad Tracks	0.35	Enhance from BPTMP 2014 Class II Bicycle Lane recommendation to Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane to reduce traffic stress.			0.35	\$ 61,266.90	\$ 21,449
238	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Kammerer Rd	I-5	Lent Ranch Parkway	2.49				2.49	\$ 435,056.46	\$ 1,081,566
327	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Waterman Rd	Laguna Creek	Rancho Dr	0.72	Close the gap between existing facilities on the north and south end of Waterman Rd between Elk Grove Blvd and Bond Rd			0.72	\$ 125,629.98	\$ 90,188
328	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Waterman Rd	Sheldon Rd	Bond Rd	0.91	Enhance Class II Rec to Buffered Class II for improvement to LTS 2.			0.91	\$ 158,422.63	\$ 143,416
334	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Elk Grove Blvd	School Street	Waterman Rd	0.50	Install Buffered Class II Bicycle Lane			0.50	\$ 87,353.47	\$ 43,604
337	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Bilby Rd	Bruceville Rd	Promenade Pkwy	2.25	Install Class II Buffered Bike Lane. ~36 ft existing. Reduce lanes to 11 feet, with 6 foot bike lane, 1 foot buffer. Also ensure more frequent sweeping of the EB side of Bilby, as public stated there is buildup of debris.			2.25	\$ 394,132.73	\$ 887,661
473	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Taron Dr	Riparian Dr	Riparian Dr	1.67				1.67	\$ 291,976.39	\$ 487,144
486	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Brucville Road	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	0.99	Upgrade improvement from existing Class III route and Class II bike lane recommended in the 2019 CIP to Class II Buffered Bike Lane, if feasible. Road diet assessment needed to investigate feasibility of Class II Buffered facility.			0.99	\$ 172,883.17	\$ 170,792
491	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Bilby Rd	Willard Pkwy	Bruceville Rd	1.60	Install Class II Buffered Bike Lane. ~36 ft existing. Reduce lanes to 11 feet, with 6 foot bike lane, 1 foot buffer. Also ensure more frequent sweeping of the EB side of Bilby, as public stated there is buildup of debris.			1.60	\$ 279,593.05	\$ 446,699
494	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Elk Grove Florin Rd	E Stockton Blvd	Bond Rd	2.54	Add buffer to existing Class II bike lane.			2.54	\$ 445,173.49	\$ 1,132,454
513	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Elk Grove Blvd	Emerald Vista Dr/E Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	0.69	Upgrade existing Class II in both directions with 2 foot buffer.			0.69	\$ 121,448.91	\$ 84,285
516	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Laguna Blvd	Laguna Oaks Dr	Bruceville Rd	1.46	Upgrade existing Class II facilities to buffered bicycle lane. Additional road diet assessment needed but could be accomplished by reducing travel lanes.			1.46	\$ 255,831.38	\$ 373,998

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATFP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
517	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Emerald Crest Dr/Emerald Vista Dr	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	1.03	Upgrade existing Class II facility to buffered Class II.			1.03	\$ 180,129.18	\$ 185,409
519	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Foulks Ranch Dr	Laguna Park Dr	Elk Grove Blvd	0.66	Upgrade existing Class II facility to buffered class II with ample buffer for lowest stress experience by removing parking on one side of roadway.			0.66	\$ 116,124.68	\$ 77,057
522	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Big Horn Blvd	Franklin Blvd	Laguna Blvd	2.93	Install Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane			2.93	\$ 512,245.78	\$ 1,499,404
523	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Bruceville Rd	Big Horn Blvd	Laguna Blvd	0.48	Upgrade existing Class II facility to buffered class II for lower stress experience.			0.48	\$ 84,452.26	\$ 40,755
524	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Power Inn Rd	Geneva Pointe Dr	Sheldon Rd	1.47	Upgrade existing Class II bike lanes to buffered Class II			1.47	\$ 257,251.16	\$ 378,161
525	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Elk Grove Blvd	Harbour Point Dr/W Taron Dr	Four Winds Dr	1.15	Upgrade existing Class II bicycle lane with buffered class II.			1.15	\$ 201,224.25	\$ 231,378
526	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Taron Dr	Riparian Dr	Riparian Dr	0.15				0.15	\$ 27,087.94	\$ 4,193
531	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Coop Dr	Franklin High Rd	Bilby Rd	0.62	Upgrading existing Class II with additional width or buffered bike lane would require removal of parking. Would result in lowered LTS (2 instead of 3).			0.62	\$ 108,538.26	\$ 67,317
536	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	Green Paint	Sheldon Rd	Bruceville Rd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	2.50	Upgrade existing Class II facility to Class II Buffered and Green Painted Bicycle Lane through conflict areas to lower traffic stress.			2.50	\$ 436,681.53	\$ 1,089,661
538	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Laguna Blvd	Bruceville Rd	Laguna Springs Dr	1.00	Upgrade existing class II to buffered Class II. Road diet assessment needed, but could be accomplished by reducing width of travel lanes.			1.00	\$ 174,215.19	\$ 173,434
539	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Laguna Blvd	Harbour Point Dr	Dwight Rd/Babson Dr	1.18	Upgrade existing Class II to I Buffered Bike Lane. Reducing travel lanes from 11' to 10' would allow for 3 additional feet on either side of roadway to reduce LTS slightly.			1.18	\$ 206,491.06	\$ 243,649
542	Class II Buffered Bicycle Lane	-	Bond Rd	E Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	1.01	Upgrade existing Class II to buffered Class II. Road diet assessment needed, but could be accomplished by reducing lane width.			1.01	\$ 176,476.84	\$ 177,966
242	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Corfu Dr	Atlantis Dr	Excelsior Rd	0.74	Install signage to designate Class III Bicycle Route			0.74	\$ 7,425.53	\$ 5,514
243	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Sleepy Hollow Ln	Corfu Dr	Sheldon Rd	0.84				0.84	\$ 8,354.98	\$ 6,981
244	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Bader Rd	Sheldon Rd	Bond Rd	0.99				0.99	\$ 9,893.10	\$ 9,787
245	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Bader Rd	Calvine Rd	Sheldon Rd	1.00				1.00	\$ 10,038.51	\$ 10,077
246	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Stathos Dr	Franklin High Rd	Franklin High Rd	1.03	Leverage low stress residential streets for Class III Route. Additional signage and traffic calming in front of park and school to lower entire segment to LTS 1.			1.03	\$ 10,322.03	\$ 10,654

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATFP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
247	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Boa Noa Dr	Bilby Rd	Bruceville Rd	0.52	Leverage low volume and speeds for low stress bicycling experience connecting to major roadways with additional bicycle facilities, near parks and schools.			0.52	\$ 5,211.97	\$ 2,716
248	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Harvest Park Dr	Cresleigh Pkwy	Cresleigh Pkwy	0.62	Leverage low volume/speed residential roadway for low stress bicycling experience.			0.62	\$ 6,160.94	\$ 3,796
249	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Castleview Dr	Franklin Blvd	Franklin Blvd	0.47				0.47	\$ 4,715.83	\$ 2,224
250	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Santorini Dr	Thira Way	Laguna Blvd	0.31				0.31	\$ 3,116.34	\$ 971
251	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Laguna Main St	Laguna Blvd	Renwick Ave	0.16				0.16	\$ 1,553.22	\$ 241
253	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Soaring Oaks Dr	Harrogate Way	Trenholm Dr	0.90	Install Class III Route			0.90	\$ 9,020.12	\$ 8,136
290	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Elk Spring Way	Amber Creek Dr	Murrell St	0.07	Add segment of Class III bicycle route connecting proposed Class II on Amber Creek Dr to the west and proposed Class I east of Murrell St			0.07	\$ 707.16	\$ 50
292	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Laguna Oaks Dr	Laguna Woods Dr	Laguna Blvd	0.20				0.20	\$ 1,975.88	\$ 390
330	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Laguna Crest Way	Laguna Crest Way	Laguna Blvd	0.08				0.08	\$ 803.21	\$ 65
338	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Lotz Pkwy	Porto Bay Dr	Whitelock Pkwy	0.77		0		0.77	\$ 7,748.56	\$ 6,004
502	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Caldicot Dr	Brush Way	Power Inn Rd	0.18	Install Class III Bicycle Route, leveraging lower speeds and volume for low stress experience.			0.18	\$ 1,771.21	\$ 314
521	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Auto Center Dr; Laguna Grove Dr; Auto City Dr; Auto Passage Dr	Elk Grove Blvd	Lotz Pkwy	0.82	Leverage low speeds/residential classification of these roadways to create a low-stress bicycling route.			0.82	\$ 8,230.59	\$ 6,774
532	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Multiple Segments: Sping Flower Dr, Orchard View Dr, Radmere Dr, McKenna Dr, Toscano Dr, Baker Ranch Road, Civic Center Dr	Laguna Springs Dr	Summer Glen Way/Spring Flower Dr	0.88	Sign Civic Center to Backer Ranch to Toscano to McKenna to Radmere to Spring Flower to Erhardt bike trail for lower stress alternative to Elk Grove Blvd. Traffic calming needed along Civic Center Drive, as speeds are currently 35 mph.			0.88	\$ 8,750.26	\$ 7,657
572	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Wymark Dr	Soaring Oaks Dr	Civic Center Dr	0.66	Install Class III Route			0.66	\$ 6,581.55	\$ 4,332
576	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Gilliam Drive	McLean Dr	Franklin Elementary School	0.21		0		0.21	\$ 2,071.39	\$ 429
577	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Porto Rosa Dr	Hill Park	Elk Grove Blvd	0.50	Class III bicycle route leveraging low stress local street to connect to EG Blvd.			0.50	\$ 4,980.86	\$ 2,481
578	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Laguna Creek Dr/School Street	Laguna Creek Trail	Elk Grove Blvd	0.62				0.62	\$ 6,187.35	\$ 3,828

ID	Facility	Additional Facility Description	Location Description	Start	End	BPTMP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Recommendation Description	Approximate Excluded Length	Note	ATFP Proposed Segment Length (mi)	Unit Cost	Improvement Cost
580	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Fieldale Dr	Laguna Creek Trail North of North Laguna Creek Wildlife Area	Trail South of North Laguna Creek Wildlife Area	0.20				0.20	\$ 1,956.55	\$ 383
582	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Weeping Fig Way	Amber Creek Dr	Laguna Park Dr	0.11	Install Class III Route			0.11	\$ 1,109.24	\$ 123
583	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Kilconnell Dr	Foulks Ranch DR	Bruceville Rd	0.72	Install Class III Route			0.72	\$ 7,189.36	\$ 5,169
584	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Adobe Springs Way	Big Horn Blvd	Bambridge Way	0.28	Install Class III Route			0.28	\$ 2,763.65	\$ 764
588	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Renwick Ave/Hausman St/Vaux Ave/Gropius St	Harbour Pointe Dr	Dwight Rd	1.29				1.29	\$ 12,913.25	\$ 16,675
589	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Babson Dr	Four Winds Dr	Harbour Pointe Dr	1.17				1.17	\$ 11,669.08	\$ 13,617
638	Class III Bicycle Route	-	Windwood Wy	Elk Grove Creek Trail West of Windwood Way	Laguna Springs Dr/Laguna Palms Way	0.13	Install class III to connect the class II on Laguna Springs Dr to the Elk Grove Creek Trail.			0.13	\$ 1,284.07	\$ 165
645	Class III Bicycle Route	-	W Lake Dr	Babson Dr	Mumford Ct/Town Square Park	0.71				0.71	\$ 7,119.29	\$ 5,068
223	Class IV Bikeway	-	Franklin Blvd	Big Horn Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	1.78	Extend Franklin Cycle Track Phase 1 segment further south along Big Horn Blvd to Laguna Blvd. Road diet assessment needed, which may result in adjustment to Class IV bikeway.			1.78	\$ 1,331,952.50	\$ 2,365,463
504	Class IV Bikeway	-	Whitelock Pkwy	Bruceville Rd	W Stockton Blvd	2.08	Install two-way Class IV Bikeway adjacent to EB travel lane. Would require road diet and/or ROW acquisition. Road diet assessment needed.			2.08	\$ 1,561,778.84	\$ 3,252,204
509	Class IV Bikeway	-	Elk Grove Blvd	Franklin Blvd	Bruceville Rd	1.74	Remove Class II facility and install one way Class IV Bikeways adjacent to EB travel lanes. Road diet assessment needed.			1.74	\$ 1,307,669.65	\$ 2,280,000
527	Class IV Bikeway	-	Harbour Point Dr	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	1.39	Install Class IV bikeway adjacent to each side of roadway. 74' roadway width, 4 travel lanes with median. 11,406 ADT			1.39	\$ 1,039,923.85	\$ 1,441,922
537	Class IV Bikeway	-	Calvine Rd	Cliffcrest Dr	Bader Rd	3.82	Class IV bikeway on each side of roadway, if feasible. Road diet assessment needed.			3.82	\$ 2,862,209.83	\$ 10,922,994
543	Class IV Bikeway	-	Bond Rd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	Bradshaw Rd	0.61	Install Class IV Bikeway on either side of roadway. Road diet assessment needed. May be candidate for travel lane reduction, and/or lane width reduction.			0.61	\$ 455,504.17	\$ 276,645
544	Class IV Bikeway	-	Bond Rd	Elk Grove Florin Rd	Bradshaw Rd	1.39	Install Class IV Bikeway on either side of roadway. Road diet assessment needed. May be candidate for travel lane reduction, and/or lane width reduction. Roadway also needs maintenance due to debris, which causes safety hazards.			1.39	\$ 1,040,480.25	\$ 1,443,466