



RESOLUTION 196-2020

OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO

Adopting the El Dorado County General Plan Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program, previously named the Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program, 2020 TIF Program Schedule

WHEREAS, the County Board of Supervisors has long recognized the need for new development to help fund the roadway, bridge and transit improvements necessary to serve that new development; and

WHEREAS, starting in 1984 and continuing until the present time, the Board of Supervisors has adopted and updated various fee resolutions to ensure that new development on the western slope pay to fund its fair share of the costs of improving the County and state roadways necessary to serve that new development; and

WHEREAS, the County prepared a General Plan entitled “2004 El Dorado County General Plan: A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief,” and in July of 2004 adopted that plan; and

WHEREAS, on December 6, 2016, the Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 5045 which codified the 2016 TIM Fee Program; and

WHEREAS, General Plan Policy TC-Xb requires the County to “at least every five years, prepare a TIM Fee Program specifying roadway improvements to be completed within the next 20 years to ensure compliance with all applicable level of service and other standards in this plan;” and

WHEREAS, on July 1, 2020, the State of California has determined that delay, as defined by level of service (LOS), is not an impact for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the word “mitigation” is a CEQA term; and

WHEREAS, the County’s TIM fee program is in place to address LOS deficiencies consistent with the requirements of the County’s General Plan, and

WHEREAS, the County’s TIM Fee program will now be identified as the Traffic Impact Fee Program or TIF; and

WHEREAS, studies were conducted to analyze the impacts of contemplated future development on existing public transportation facilities in the County, and to determine the need for new public transportation facilities and improvements required by the new development; and

WHEREAS, the updated analysis identified one project that required limit adjustments, the addition of two projects that had previously been included in the program, and the removal of eight projects in the 2020 TIF Fee program; and

WHEREAS, said studies set forth the relationship between new development, the needed transportation facilities, and the estimated costs of these improvements; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the analysis of the traffic impact fee zone alternatives, the Board has chosen to consolidate the eight traffic impact fee zones into three for purposes of allocating the costs of the public transportation facilities;

WHEREAS, after a full public hearing during which the fee structure was studied and reviewed, the Board made the following findings pursuant to Government Code Section 66001:

Government Section 66001(a)(1): Identify the purpose of the fee.

Finding for Government Code Section 66001(a)(1): The purpose of the TIF is to fund capital transportation/circulation improvements which are related directly to the incremental traffic/vehicle burden imposed upon the County's transportation/circulation system by new development in the unincorporated west slope of El Dorado County through 2040. The TIF and TIF program are an implementation measure, as required by Implementation Measure TC-B of the 2004 General Plan adopted by the County Board of Supervisors: "2004 El Dorado County General Plan: A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Road; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief". The TIF program addresses the need to fund a road system capable of achieving the traffic level of service standards of the County's General Plan. Transportation improvements funded by the TIF include future improvements as well as improvements already installed which are subject to reimbursement agreements. Improvements included in the TIF program are necessary to accommodate new development; such improvements include, but are not limited to, new local roads, local road upgrades and widenings, signalization and intersection improvements, operational and safety improvements, Highway 50 improvements, and bridge replacement and rehabilitation. The TIF advances a legitimate County interest by enabling the County to provide infrastructure to new development and to require new development to pay its fair share.

Government Code Section 66001(a)(2): Identify the use to which the fee is to be put. If the use is financing public facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in Section 65403 or 66002, may be made in applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the public facilities for which the fee is charged.

Finding for Government Code Section 66001(a)(2): The fee is to be used to fund transportation/circulation improvements necessary to accommodate new development in the unincorporated west slope of El Dorado County through 2040 as contemplated by the General Plan, including future improvements as well as improvements already installed which are subject to reimbursement agreements. The TIF will fund new local roads, local road upgrades and widenings, signalization and intersection improvements, operational and safety improvements, Highway 50 improvements, bridge replacement and rehabilitation, provide funding for transit improvements in accordance to the El Dorado County Transit Authority's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and costs associated with ongoing program staff and consultant costs for annual updates, major updates, and ongoing administrated related to the TIF Program. The County's CIP, which is updated and adopted annually, identifies every project to be funded by the TIF and includes the following information for each project: detailed cash pro-formas which show all revenues by funding source and all expenditures per fiscal year; a current year work program; a future work program broken down into five year, ten year and twenty year timeframes; and additional details for each capital project, including project description, a financing plan and tentative schedule.

Government Code Section 66001(a)(3): Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

Finding for Government Code Section 66001(a)(3): There is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed as set forth in:

- The *El Dorado County Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program Update Nexus & Funding Model* (Nexus Study) prepared by Urban Economics, dated December 8, 2020.
- *2020 TIF Program Update Supporting Documentation*, prepared by DKS Associates and Kimley-Horn Associates, November 2020
- The most currently adopted El Dorado County *Capital Improvement Program*.

- *The 2016 Programmatic Environmental Impact Report for the Western Slope Roadway Capital Improvement Program and Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program for El Dorado County*, certified on December 6, 2016.
- *The Western Slope Roadway Capital Improvement Program and Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program for El Dorado County Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report*, March 2018.
- *The El Dorado Countywide Housing and Employment Projections, 2018 - 2040* Final Memorandum prepared by BAE Urban Economics, dated March 17, 2020.

There is a reasonable relationship between the TIF's use and the type of development projects on which the fee is imposed because the transportation/circulation facilities funded by the TIF are needed to accommodate the incremental new traffic/vehicle burdens generated by the development of new commercial, industrial and residential uses upon which the fee is imposed. (See documents cited above.) There is a reasonable relationship between the need for the transportation/circulation facilities and the development of new commercial, industrial and residential projects upon which the fee is imposed because the new development projects paying the fee will receive a direct benefit from the transportation/circulation facilities funded by the fee; the transportation/circulation facilities funded by the fee will increase traffic/vehicle circulation capacity on streets and highways directly burdened by the increase in traffic/vehicles generated by new development projects upon which the fee is charged.

Government Code Section 66001(a)(4): Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

Finding for Government Code Section 66001(a)(4): There is reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed as set forth in:

- *The El Dorado County Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program Update Nexus & Funding Model* (Nexus Study) prepared by Urban Economics, dated December 8, 2020.
- The most currently adopted El Dorado County *Capital Improvement Program*.
- *The 2016 Programmatic Environmental Impact Report for the Western Slope Roadway Capital Improvement Program and Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program for El Dorado County*, certified on December 6, 2016.
- *The Western Slope Roadway Capital Improvement Program and Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program for El Dorado County Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report*, March 2018.
- *The El Dorado Countywide Housing and Employment Projections, 2018 - 2040* Final Memorandum prepared by BAE Urban Economics, dated March 17, 2020.

There is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development projects on which the fee is imposed because the transportation/circulation facilities funded by the TIF are needed to accommodate the incremental new traffic/vehicle burdens generated by the development including those from new commercial, industrial and residential uses upon which the fee is imposed. (See documents cited above.) There is a reasonable relationship between the need for the transportation/circulation facilities and the development of projects including new commercial, industrial and residential projects upon which the fee is imposed because the new development projects paying the fee will receive a direct benefit from the transportation/circulation facilities funded by the fee; the transportation/circulation facilities funded by the fee will increase traffic/vehicle circulation capacity on streets and highways directly burdened by the increase in traffic/vehicles generated by new development projects upon which the fee is charged.

The *El Dorado County Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program Update Nexus & Funding Model* (Nexus Study) prepared by Urban Economics, dated December 8, 2020 provides a thorough analysis of the required transportation facilities to be improved as a result of development, and provides information of the fair share analysis and fees required by Traffic Impact Fee Zone, and further broken down by development type. On November 17, 2020, the Board considered three alternative fee zone structures for purposes of allocating the costs of the public transportation facilities: the existing eight zone structure, a three zone proposal, or a two zone proposal. The Board chose the three zone proposal for implementation as part of the Major Update. Under

the three zone proposal, the rural fee zones 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 would be consolidated into TIF Zone A. The consolidation of the rural zones into TIF Zone A would normalize the fee increases throughout the rural areas of the County. The County previously consolidated zones 2 and 3, which contain the Cameron Park and Shingle Springs area, and the proposal would formally consolidate those two zones into TIF Zone B. The proposal also would rename TIM Zone 8, which contains the El Dorado Hills area, to TIF Zone C. The TIF Program Schedule Resolution, which may be amended from time to time, provides the most current TIF rates per development type by TIF Zone.

WHEREAS, the collection process and the amount of fees for improvement of roadways and intersections identified in the El Dorado County General Plan TIF 2020 Update are set forth in Ordinance 5045 and in the TIM Fee Administration Manual.

THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED,


- A. The Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the amended General Plan TIF Program fees as shown in the attached Exhibit A; which shall become effective sixty (60) days following adoption of this Resolution, and the updated project costs as shown in the attached Exhibit C; and
- B. Applicants shall pay the TIF rate in effect at time of building permit issuance or at time of approval of an application for a change in the use of a building or property as defined in the TIM Fee Ordinance and TIM Fee Administrative Manual;
- C. The fees listed in the attached Exhibit A will not apply to any permit issued prior to adoption of this Resolution;
- D. All TIF Program receipts are to be expended on projects shown on Exhibit C, and may be amended from time to time in accordance with General Plan Policy TC-Xb;
- E. A map of the Three TIF Zones is provided in Exhibit B;
- F. The TIF Program Nexus study is provided in Exhibit C;

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado at a regular meeting of said Board, held the 8th day of December 2020, by the following vote of said Board:

Attest:
Kim Dawson
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Ayes: Hidahl, Frentzen, Novasel
Noes: Parlin
Absent: None

By: _____


Clerk


John Hidahl
First Vice Chair, Board of Supervisors


EXHIBIT A

Table 23: TIF Schedule - 3 Zones

	EDU Rate ¹	Fee Basis	Zone A	Zone B	Zone C
		<i>Original Zones >></i>	<i>1,4,5,6,7</i>	<i>2,3</i>	<i>8</i>
Residential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	<i>9,613</i>	<i>24,062</i>	<i>29,704</i>
SFD Not Age Restricted					
Less than 1,000 SqFt	0.82	Dwelling Unit	7,882	19,731	24,357
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	0.89	Dwelling Unit	8,556	21,416	26,437
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	0.95	Dwelling Unit	9,133	22,859	28,219
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	1.00	Dwelling Unit	9,613	24,062	29,704
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	1.06	Dwelling Unit	10,190	25,506	31,486
4,000 SqFt or more	1.10	Dwelling Unit	10,574	26,468	32,675
MFD Not Age Restricted	0.57	Dwelling Unit	5,479	13,715	16,931
SFD Age Restricted	0.30	Dwelling Unit	NA	7,218	8,912
MFD Age Restricted	0.26	Dwelling Unit	NA	6,256	7,723
Nonresidential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	<i>1,078</i>	<i>4,685</i>	<i>6,568</i>
General Commercial	1.55	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.67	7.26	10.18
Hotel/Motel/B&B	0.28	Room	302	1,311	1,839
Church	0.25	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.27	1.17	1.64
Office/Medical	1.28	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.37	5.99	8.39
Industrial/Warehouse	0.51	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.55	2.39	3.35
¹ "EDU" (equivalent dwelling unit) equals the demand placed on the transportation network relative to one single family detached dwelling unit. EDU factors are expressed per dwelling unit for residential development, per room for hotel/motel/B&B, and per 1,000 square feet for all other nonresidential development.					
Sources: Tables 22.					



Map displayed in State Plane Coordinate System
(NAD 1983 California Zone 2, feet)



- Legend**
- TIF Zone Boundaries
 - TIF Zone A
 - TIF Zone B
 - TIF Zone C
 - Cities
 - Rivers & Creeks
 - Lakes
 - Major Roads
 - US Highway
 - State Routes

EXHIBIT B

Three TIF Zone Map

County of El Dorado

DISCLAIMER:
THIS DEPICTION WAS COMPILED FROM UNVERIFIED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SOURCES AND IS ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY. NO REPRESENTATION IS MADE AS TO ACCURACY OF THIS INFORMATION. PARCELS, BOUNDARIES AND PARTICULARS, IF AVAILABLE, USERS MAKE USE OF THIS DEPICTION AT THEIR OWN RISK.

NOTES:
LAYER INFORMATION MAY COVER ADDITIONAL AREAS OUTSIDE OF THE DISPLAYED AREA.
PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF: DOT & H, PAID: DATE: 1/15/2023
MAP PREPARED BY: JIM MARRAS, DATE: 1/15/2023

EXHIBIT C

**El Dorado County
Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program Update
Nexus & Funding Model**

BOS Approval Date: December 8, 2020

List of Tables and Model Notes

<p>Section 1: New Development and Equivalent Dwelling Unit Projections</p> <p>Table 1: Existing and Future Land Use</p> <p>Table 2: Growth Projections by Fee Zone (2018-2040)</p> <p>Table 3: Land Use Categories, Trip Generation Rates & EDU Factors</p> <p>Table 4: New Equivalent Dwelling Units (2018-2040)</p> <p>Table 5: Local Serving Employment</p> <p>Section 2: TIF CIP Cost Estimates and Cost Allocation By Zone</p> <p>Table 6: Bridge Replacement Projects</p> <p>Table 7: Intersection and Safety Improvements</p> <p>Table 8: Transit Capital Projects</p> <p>Table 9: Program Administration</p> <p>Table 10: TIF Program Costs</p> <p>Table 11: Trip Allocation By Zone</p> <p>Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone</p> <p>Section 3: Non-TIF Funding Estimates</p> <p>Table 13: State & Federal Funding for TIF Program</p> <p>Table 14: TIF Program Fund Balances</p> <p>Section 4: TIF Schedules and Budget Summaries</p> <p>Table 15: Hwy 50 TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue</p> <p>Table 16: Local Roads TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue</p> <p>Table 17: Total TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue</p> <p>Table 20: Hwy 50 TIF Schedule</p> <p>Table 21: Local Roads TIF Schedule</p> <p>Table 22: TIF Schedule (Hwy 50 & Local Roads)</p> <p>Table 18: Allocation of State & Federal Funding</p> <p>Table 19: TIF Program Budget Summary</p> <p>Table 20: Hwy 50 TIF Schedule</p> <p>Table 21: Local Roads TIF Schedule</p> <p>Table 22: TIF Schedule (Hwy 50 & Local Roads)</p> <p>Table 23: TIF Schedule - 3 Zones</p> <p>Table 24: 2020 Update TIF and Current (FY 2020-21) Schedules</p> <p>Table 25: Difference Between 2020 Update TIF and Current (FY 2020-21) TIF</p> <p>All data entries in BLUE are copied from external sources (see "Sources" in each table).</p> <p>All other data is generated internally by the model.</p>
--

Section 1

New Development and Equivalent Dwelling Unit Projections

Table 1: Existing and Future Land Use

Land Use		2018			2040			Growth, 2018-2040		
		House-holds	Dwelling Units	Share	House-holds	Dwelling Units	Share	House-holds	Dwelling Units	Share
Residential										
Single Family		48,778	54,739	89%	56,630	63,127	89%	7,852	8,388	85%
Multi-Family		6,143	6,666	11%	7,457	8,101	11%	1,314	1,435	15%
Total		54,921	61,404	100%	64,087	71,228	100%	9,166	9,822	100%
Nonresidential										
	Sq. Ft. per Job	1,000 Building			1,000 Building			1,000 Building		
		Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Share	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Share	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Share
Commercial	500	8,653	4,327	26%	10,140	5,071	26%	1,487	744	29%
Office	275	16,195	4,454	27%	18,758	5,159	27%	2,563	705	28%
Medical	312	305	95	1%	1,270	396	2%	965	301	12%
Industrial / Other ¹	1,000	7,769	7,769	47%	8,549	8,549	45%	780	780	31%
Total		32,922	16,644	100%	38,717	19,175	100%	5,795	2,529	100%

Note: Negative growth results by traffic analysis zone are excluded assuming that growth does not occur on redeveloped parcels resulting in a fee credit.

¹ Includes "manufacturing/other" and "education" job categories in travel demand model.

Sources: County of El Dorado (land use data input to travel demand model based on Matt Kowta, BAE Associates memorandum to Natalie Porter, El Dorado County, March 17, 2020).

Table 2: Growth Projections by Fee Zone (2018-2040)

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Total
Residential	(dwelling units)								
Single Family									
Not Restricted	48	1,549	695	233	136	70	64	4,911	7,708
Age Restricted	-	50	50	-	-	-	-	580	680
Subtotal	48	1,599	745	233	136	70	64	5,491	8,388
Multi-family									
Not Restricted	-	755	64	-	2	-	-	1	823
Age Restricted	-	100	200	-	-	-	-	312	612
Subtotal	-	855	264	-	2	-	-	313	1,435
Total	48	2,454	1,009	233	139	70	64	5,804	9,822
Nonresidential	(1,000 sq. ft.)								
Commercial	-	304	144	4	97	-	-	195	744
Office	-	40	67	2	52	-	-	544	705
Medical	-	163	42	-	26	-	-	70	301
Industrial / Other	-	135	59	28	142	-	-	416	780
Total	-	642	312	34	317	-	-	1,224	2,529
Sources: County of El Dorado (for land use data input to travel demand model); Table 1 (for employment density factors to convert employees to building square feet).									

Table 3: Land Use Categories, Trip Generation Rates & EDU Factors

Land Use	Institute for Transportation Engineers Category	Unit	Trip Rate ¹	New Trip Ends	Average Trip Length ²	New VMT ³ per Unit	EDU Factor ⁴
Residential							
SFD Not Restricted							
Less than 1,000 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	EDU rates adjusted for persons per household by unit size.				0.82
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	EDU rates adjusted for persons per household by unit size.				0.89
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	EDU rates adjusted for persons per household by unit size.				0.95
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	0.99	100%	5.0	4.95	1.00
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	EDU rates adjusted for persons per household by unit size.				1.06
4,000 SqFt or more	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	EDU rates adjusted for persons per household by unit size.				1.10
MFD Not Restricted	220: Apartment	Dwelling Unit	0.56	100%	5.0	2.80	0.57
SFD Age Restricted	251: Senior Adult - Detached	Dwelling Unit	0.30	100%	5.0	1.50	0.30
MFD Age Restricted	252: Senior Adult - Attached	Dwelling Unit	0.26	100%	5.0	1.30	0.26
Nonresidential							
Commercial	820: Shopping Center	1,000 SqFt	6.51	47%	2.5	7.65	1.55
Hotel / Motel / B&B	320: Motel	Room	0.38	58%	6.4	1.41	0.28
Church	560: Church	1,000 SqFt	0.49	64%	3.9	1.22	0.25
Office / Medical	[Weighted average based on office and medical growth - See Table 2]						1.28
Office	710: General Office	1,000 SqFt	1.15	77%	5.1	4.52	0.91
Medical	720: Medical-Dental Office	1,000 SqFt	3.46	60%	5.1	10.59	2.14
Industrial / Other	110: General Light Industrial	1,000 SqFt	0.63	79%	5.1	2.54	0.51

¹ Rates for evening peak hour. Commercial trip rate based on a 50,000 square foot building.

² Average trip length reflects trip length within El Dorado County. Factors are similar to those used by other Sacramento region communities for transportation planning.

³ VMT = vehicle miles travelled.

⁴ The equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) factor is new VMT normalized so one single family unit, 2,000 to 2,999 square feet in size, is 1.00 EDU.

Sources: (1) Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), *Trip Generation 10th Edition*, Sept. 2017 (for trip rates); (2) San Diego Association of Governments, *Brief Guide of Vehicular Trip Generation Rates*, April 2002 (for new trip ends factor); (3) John P. Long, P.E. (for average trip length); (4) Appendix A (attached to this model documentation), "Fee Structure and Needs Analysis Supporting Documentation" (for single family dwelling EDU factors by dwelling unit size); (5) Table 2 (this model, for office and medical growth weighted average).

Table 4: New Equivalent Dwelling Units (2018-2040)

Land Use	Existing 2018 ¹	Growth - 2018-2040									Total 2040 ¹
		Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Total	
Residential											
SFD Not Restricted	54,739	48	1,549	695	233	136	70	64	4,911	7,708	62,650
MFD Not Restricted	3,799	-	430	36	-	1	-	-	1	469	4,427
SFD Age Restricted	NA	-	15	15	-	-	-	-	174	204	NA
MFD Age Restricted	NA	-	26	52	-	-	-	-	81	159	NA
Subtotal	58,538	48	2,021	798	233	138	70	64	5,167	8,540	67,077
Nonresidential											
Commercial	6,706	-	471	223	6	150	-	-	301	1,152	7,859
Office	4,053	-	37	61	2	47	-	-	495	641	4,694
Medical	204	-	349	91	-	56	-	-	149	644	848
Industrial	3,962	-	69	30	14	72	-	-	212	398	4,360
Subtotal	14,925	-	925	405	22	326	-	-	1,158	2,836	17,761
Total EDU, 2015-2035	73,463	48	2,946	1,203	255	463	70	64	6,325	11,375	84,838
Total EDU, 2015	86.59%								Growth Share >>>	13.41%	100.00%

¹ For residential, age restricted units included in not restricted category.

Sources: Tables 2 and 3.

Table 5: Local Serving Employment

Land Use	Units	2018-2040 EDU	Local Serving Employment Share	EDU Shift For Local Serving Business ²	2018-2040 Adjusted EDU	Change
Residential	Dwelling Units	8,540	NA	2,071	10,611	24%
Nonresidential						
Commercial	1,000 SqFt	1,152	79%	(910)	242	
Office	1,000 SqFt	641	54%	(346)	295	
Medical	1,000 SqFt	644	100%	(644)	0	
Industrial / Other	1,000 SqFt	398	43%	(171)	227	
Total	1,000 SqFt	2,836	73%	(2,071)	765	(73%)
Total Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU)		11,375		-	11,375	

Note: Preliminary EDU rates for land use categories without development data (age-restricted housing, hotel / motel / B&B, and church) are adjusted based on the final versus preliminary rate for the related land use category, e.g. age-restricted housing rates are adjusted based on the change in the not restricted housing rates, and the two nonresidential rates are adjusted based the change in the commercial rate.

¹ EDU rate for Office / Medical is the average for the Office and Medical categories, weighted by amount of 2015 development.

² Shift local serving share of nonresidential EDUs to residential EDUs. The remaining nonresidential EDUs are associated with export-based businesses (providing products and services outside the El Dorado County western slope unincorporated area).

³ Final EDU rates are converted from revised EDU rates so that one single family dwelling equals 1.0 EDU.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, On The Map (<http://onthemap.ces.census.gov>) (2017 employment data); Urban Economics (local employment share); Table 4.

Section 2

TIF CIP Cost Estimates and Cost Allocation By Zone

Table 6: Bridge Replacement Projects

River	Crossing	CIP Account	Cost
Indian Creek	Green Valley Rd	Zones 1-7	\$ 5,663,000
Mound Springs Creek	Green Valley Rd	Zones 1-7	6,225,000
Weber Creek	Green Valley Rd	Zones 1-7	11,999,000
South Fork American River	Salmon Falls Rd	EDH Zone 8	25,000,000
Weber Creek	Cedar Ravine Rd	Zones 1-7	3,248,000
Carson Creek	White Rock Rd	EDH Zone 8	5,050,000
North Fork Cosumnes River	Mt. Aukum Rd	Zones 1-7	5,050,000
North Fork Cosumnes River	Bucks Bar Rd	Zones 1-7	8,658,000
South Fork Weber Creek	Newtown Rd	Zones 1-7	5,846,000
New York Creek	Malcolm Dixon Rd	EDH Zone 8	<u>4,500,000</u>
Total			\$ 81,239,000
New Development Share ¹			<u>11.47%</u>
TIF Program Share			\$ 9,318,000

¹ Development share based on federal funding for 88.53 percent of total costs. Developer share is less than could be allocated based on growth as a share of total development at the planning horizon (see Table 5).

Sources: County of El Dorado.

Table 7: Intersection and Safety Improvements

Type of Deficiency	Location	Cost per Intersection ¹	New Development Share ²	New Development Cost per Intersection	Number of Projects	Cost
Tier 1 - Existing Deficiency						
Intersections	To Be Determined	\$ 2,200,000	13.41%	\$ 295,020	2	\$ 590,000
Safety Improvements	To Be Determined	1,260,000	13.41%	168,966	10	1,690,000
Tier 2 - Future Deficiency						
Intersections	To Be Determined	2,200,000	100.00%	2,200,000	16	35,200,000
Intersections	Cameron Park Dr / Hacienda Rd ³	500,000	100.00%	500,000	1	500,000
Intersections	El Dorado Hill Blvd/Saratoga Way/Park Dr	979,000	100.00%	979,000	1	<u>979,000</u>
TIF Program Share						\$ 38,959,000
¹ Intersection costs based on \$350,000 for signal equipment plus \$1,850,000 for channelization and other costs. Includes intelligent transportation systems (ITS). Safety improvements based on actual costs for seven safety-focused projects completed between 2001 and 2016, adjusted for inflation. ² For existing deficiencies, TIF program share is equal to new development as a share of total development at the planning horizon (see Table 5). ³ For signal equipment only.						
Sources: County of El Dorado; Table 4.						

Table 8: Transit Capital Projects

Capital Project	Source	No.	Unit Cost	Total Cost	New Development Share ¹	TIF Program Share
Bus Stop Improvements	Short-range Capital Plan			\$ 13,000	13.41%	\$ 2,000
Missouri Flat Transfer Point Expansion	Short-range Capital Plan			310,000	100.00%	310,000
Cambridge Park-and-Ride Improvements	Short-range Capital Plan			200,000	13.41%	27,000
Operations and Maintenance Facility Improvements	Short-range Capital Plan			40,000	13.41%	5,000
Fleet Expansion						
Paratransit Van	Short-range Capital Plan	1	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000		
Dial-A-Ride Vans	Long-range Capital Plan	5	42,000	210,000		
Local Route Buses	Long-range Capital Plan	2	504,000	1,008,000		
Subtotal				\$ 1,285,000	100.00%	1,285,000
Cambridge Park-and-Ride Improvements	Long-range Capital Plan			\$ 2,725,000	13.41%	365,000
County Line Transit Center	Long-range Capital Plan					
Land				\$ 1,406,000		
Construction				7,117,000		
Subtotal				\$ 8,523,000	13.41%	\$1,143,000
Total				\$ 13,096,000		\$ 3,137,000

Notes:
 Costs do not include planned transition to zero emission vehicle fleet.
 Costs exclude projects within the City of Placerville.
 Bass Lake Hills Park and Ride improvements are anticipated to be funded directly by nearby development projects.

¹ For capital projects not directly related to growth, TIF program share is equal to new development as a share of total development at the planning horizon (see Table 5).

Sources: El Dorado County Transportation Commission, *Western El Dorado County 2019 Short and Long Range Transit Plan*, prepared by LSC Consultants, Inc. November 20, 2019, pp. 165-167, 173-174; El Dorado Transit staff (for fleet vehicles and County Line Transit Center cost estimates); Table 4 (this model).

Table 9: Program Administration

Task	Unit Cost	Frequency	Total 20-yr. Program	
			Units	Cost
Annual program updates ¹	45,000	Annually	20	900,000
Major program updates	1,000,000	Every 5 Years	4	4,000,000
Travel demand model updates	330,000	Every 5 Years	4	<u>1,320,000</u>
Total				6,220,000
¹ Includes periodic minor technical (transportation analysis) updates.				
Sources: County of El Dorado.				

Table 10: TIF Program Costs

Map ID	CIP Acct.	Project No.	Project Name	Total Cost	Prior Year Funding ¹	Future Local Funding ²	Net Cost
Hwy 50 Auxiliary Lanes							
A-1	Hwy 50 Blackstone	53115	Auxiliary Lane Westbound	\$ 3,100,000	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 3,090,000
			Subtotal	\$ 3,100,000	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 3,090,000
Hwy 50 Interchanges Projects							
I-1	EDH Zone 8	71323	El Dorado Hills Blvd	\$ 9,517,000	\$ 550,000	\$ -	\$ 8,967,000
I-2	Silva Valley IC	71345/71368	Silva Valley Pkwy-Phases 1&2	10,793,000	250,000	-	10,543,000
I-3	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71330	Bass Lake Rd	5,417,000	22,000	405,000	4,990,000
I-4	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71332	Cambridge Rd	9,665,000	39,000	-	9,626,000
I-5	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	72361	Cameron Park Dr	22,837,000	1,416,000	-	21,421,000
I-6	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71333/71338/71339	Ponderosa Rd/S Shingle Rd	21,900,000	1,456,000	-	20,444,000
I-7	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71347	El Dorado Rd	5,782,000	181,000	-	5,601,000
			Subtotal	\$ 85,911,000	\$ 3,914,000	\$ 405,000	\$ 81,592,000
Roadway Improvements							
R-1	Zones 1-7	72143	Cameron Park Dr Widening	\$ 3,621,000	\$ 146,000	\$ -	\$ 3,475,000
R-2	EDH Zone 8	72376	Green Valley Rd Widening	Under Construction - See Table 14			
R-3	EDH Zone 8	GP178	Green Valley Rd Widening	14,498,000	-	-	14,498,000
R-4	EDH Zone 8	72374	White Rock Rd Widening	9,467,000	5,000	-	9,462,000
R-5	Zones 1-7	72142	Missouri Flat Rd	7,629,000	-	-	7,629,000
R-6	EDH Zone 8	GP147	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 2	13,290,000	-	-	13,290,000
R-7	EDH Zone 8	72377	Country Club Dr Extension	21,190,000	-	-	21,190,000
R-8	EDH Zone 8	71362	Country Club Dr Extension	11,703,000	-	-	11,703,000
R-9	EDH Zone 8	71361	Country Club Dr Extension	17,923,000	-	-	17,923,000
R-10	Zones 1-7	71360	Country Club Dr Realignment	Under Construction - See Reimbursement Agmts & Table 14			
R-11	Zones 1-7	72334	Diamond Springs Pkwy-Phs 1B	28,293,000	5,633,000	14,739,000	7,921,000
R-12	EDH Zone 8	66116	Latrobe Connection	2,874,000	353,000	-	2,521,000
R-13	Zones 1-7	71375	Headington Rd Extension	14,899,000	704,000	-	14,195,000
R-14	EDH Zone 8	72BASS	Bass Lake Rd	1,654,000	-	-	1,654,000
R-15	EDH Zone 8	72LATROBE	Latrobe Rd Widening	Deleted - Not Deficient			
R-16	EDH Zone 8	72381	White Rock Rd Widening	11,765,000	317,000	-	11,448,000
R-17	EDH Zone 8	NA	Latrobe Rd Widening	5,865,000	-	-	5,865,000
R-18	Zones 1-7	NA	Pleasant Valley Rd	409,000	-	-	409,000
			Subtotal	\$ 165,080,000	\$ 7,158,000	\$ 14,739,000	\$ 143,183,000

Table 10: TIF Program Costs

Map ID	CIP Acct.	Project No.	Project Name	Total Cost	Prior Year Funding ¹	Future Local Funding ²	Net Cost
Reimbursement Agreements							
R-6	EDH Zone 8	71324	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 1	\$ 10,958,000	NA	NA	\$ 10,958,000
R-10	EDH Zone 8	71360	Country Club Dr Realignment	4,381,000	NA	NA	4,381,000
R-10	Zones 1-7	71360	Country Club Dr Realignment	7,256,000	NA	NA	7,256,000
R-10	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71360	Country Club Dr Realignment	148,000	NA	NA	148,000
R-12	EDH Zone 8	66116	Latrobe Connection	55,000	NA	NA	55,000
I-2	Silva Valley IC	71328	Silva Valley Interchange	193,000	NA	NA	193,000
I-2	Silva Valley IC	71328	Silva Valley Interchange-Design	5,602,000	NA	NA	5,602,000
NA	EDH Zone 8	71353	Bass Lake Rd (SIA)	1,477,000	NA	NA	1,477,000
NA	Zones 1-7	76107	Silver Springs Pkwy	2,127,000	NA	NA	2,127,000
NA	Zones 1-7	66108/76108	Silver Springs Pkwy	4,274,000	NA	NA	4,274,000
NA	Zones 1-7	76114	Deer Valley Rd	70,000	NA	NA	70,000
			Subtotal	\$ 36,541,000	NA	NA	\$ 36,471,000
Other Programs							
NA	EDH Zn 8 & Zn 1-7	NA	Bridge Replacement	\$ 9,318,000	NA	NA	9,318,000
NA	EDH Zn 8 & Zn 1-7	NA	Intersection Improvements	38,959,000	NA	NA	38,959,000
NA	EDH Zn 8 & Zn 1-7	53118	Transit	3,137,000	NA	NA	3,137,000
NA	EDH Zn 8 & Zn 1-7	NA	Fee Program Admin	6,220,000	NA	NA	6,220,000
			Subtotal	\$ 57,634,000	NA	NA	\$ 57,634,000
			Total	\$ 348,266,000	\$ 11,082,000	\$ 15,144,000	\$ 322,040,000
				100%	3%	4%	92%
<p>¹ Amounts represents spending through June 30, 2020 based on EDC DOT June 2020 CIP Book (see sources).</p> <p>² Includes funding for Bass Lake Rd. Interchange (Map ID I-3) from the Bass Lake Hills Public Facilities Financing Plan (BLHPFFP), and funding for Diamond Springs Parkway (Map ID R-11) from Missouri Flats Master Cicalation and Funding Plan (MC&FP) and local Tribes.</p> <p>Sources: Appendix B (attached to this model documentation), "TIM Fee Capital Improvement Costs Supporting Documentation" (for total project cost estimates), County of El Dorado, Department of Transportation (DOT), <i>Adopted 2020 Capital Improvement Program, June 9, 2020</i> (for prior year funding and future local funding estimates); Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9.</p>							

Table 11: Trip Allocation By Zone

Map ID	Project Name	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Internal Subtotal	External ¹	Total
Hwy 50 Auxiliary Lanes												
A-1	Auxiliary Lane Westbound	1.42%	37.23%	8.89%	5.45%	4.85%	2.86%	2.12%	28.09%	90.92%	9.08%	100.00%
	Subtotal	1.42%	37.23%	8.89%	5.45%	4.85%	2.86%	2.12%	28.09%	90.92%	9.08%	100.00%
Hwy 50 Interchanges Projects												
I-1	El Dorado Hills Blvd	0.01%	1.95%	0.35%	1.65%	0.09%	0.03%	0.81%	93.34%	98.21%	1.79%	100.00%
I-2	Silva Valley Pkwy-Phases 1&2	0.11%	17.08%	3.27%	1.42%	0.82%	0.33%	0.44%	76.04%	99.50%	0.50%	100.00%
I-3	Bass Lake Rd	0.01%	41.18%	1.38%	0.16%	0.23%	0.07%	0.19%	56.79%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
I-4	Cambridge Rd	0.02%	85.26%	1.99%	0.38%	0.34%	0.12%	0.23%	11.65%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
I-5	Cameron Park Dr	0.05%	86.09%	3.53%	0.38%	0.78%	0.29%	0.27%	8.60%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
I-6	Ponderosa Rd/S Shingle Rd	0.21%	63.63%	12.52%	11.09%	0.90%	0.13%	4.49%	6.80%	99.77%	0.23%	100.00%
I-7	El Dorado Rd	0.16%	9.28%	79.77%	1.92%	4.92%	0.78%	0.37%	2.40%	99.61%	0.39%	100.00%
	Subtotal	0.09%	54.18%	10.32%	3.43%	0.94%	0.23%	1.40%	29.06%	99.66%	0.34%	100.00%
Roadway Improvements												
R-1	Cameron Park Dr Widening	0.02%	38.55%	2.67%	0.19%	0.44%	0.14%	0.24%	57.75%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-2	Green Valley Rd Widening	Under Construction - See Table 14										
R-3	Green Valley Rd Widening	0.08%	28.99%	0.34%	14.09%	0.07%	0.02%	0.02%	50.70%	94.30%	5.70%	100.00%
R-4	White Rock Rd Widening	0.14%	10.40%	2.12%	0.68%	0.64%	0.29%	0.71%	84.44%	99.41%	0.59%	100.00%
R-5	Missouri Flat Rd	1.24%	5.75%	70.31%	0.91%	0.55%	9.73%	6.02%	2.20%	96.71%	3.29%	100.00%
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 2	0.00%	0.34%	0.00%	1.99%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	96.31%	98.69%	1.31%	100.00%
R-7	Country Club Dr Extension	0.05%	18.59%	2.83%	0.65%	0.66%	0.24%	0.20%	76.78%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-8	Country Club Dr Extension	0.00%	34.41%	0.00%	0.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%	65.39%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-9	Country Club Dr Extension	0.00%	17.11%	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%	82.72%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	Under Construction - See Tables 10 and 14										
R-11	Diamond Springs Pkwy-Phs 1B	2.24%	8.92%	58.91%	0.76%	1.06%	12.89%	8.36%	3.76%	96.89%	3.11%	100.00%
R-12	Latrobe Connection	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.97%	83.74%	89.71%	10.29%	100.00%
R-13	Headington Rd Extension	0.03%	12.08%	82.51%	0.13%	0.39%	0.90%	0.49%	3.47%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-14	Bass Lake Rd	0.02%	38.55%	2.67%	0.19%	0.44%	0.14%	0.24%	57.75%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-15	Latrobe Rd Widening	Deleted - Not Deficient in 2020 TIF Update										
R-16	White Rock Rd Widening	0.11%	2.75%	0.63%	0.52%	0.25%	0.14%	3.57%	85.76%	93.72%	6.28%	100.00%
R-17	Latrobe Rd Widening	0.02%	5.33%	1.01%	0.40%	0.27%	0.10%	2.80%	87.43%	97.36%	2.64%	100.00%
R-18	Pleasant Valley Rd	2.22%	8.26%	50.05%	0.89%	1.43%	22.45%	9.10%	2.61%	97.00%	3.00%	100.00%
	Subtotal	0.23%	15.20%	16.11%	1.95%	0.32%	1.46%	1.47%	61.37%	98.12%	1.88%	100.00%

Table 11: Trip Allocation By Zone

Map ID	Project Name	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Internal Subtotal	External ¹	Total
Reimbursement Agreements												
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 1	0.00%	0.34%	0.00%	2.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	97.59%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	0.00%	71.87%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	28.01%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	0.00%	71.87%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	28.01%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	0.00%	71.87%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	28.01%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-12	Latrobe Connection	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.65%	93.35%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange	0.11%	17.17%	3.28%	1.43%	0.83%	0.33%	0.44%	76.42%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange-Design	0.11%	17.17%	3.28%	1.43%	0.83%	0.33%	0.44%	76.42%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Bass Lake Rd (SIA)	0.02%	38.55%	2.67%	0.19%	0.44%	0.14%	0.24%	57.75%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	0.00%	17.21%	0.00%	0.79%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%	81.97%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	0.00%	17.21%	0.00%	0.79%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%	81.97%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Deer Valley Rd	0.08%	30.75%	0.36%	14.94%	0.07%	0.02%	0.02%	53.76%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	Subtotal	0.02%	30.64%	0.63%	1.02%	0.15%	0.06%	0.14%	67.35%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Programs²												
NA	Bridge Replacement	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Intersection Improvements	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Transit	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Fee Program Admin	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	Subtotal	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total Program Costs												
	Total	0.18%	27.50%	12.09%	2.22%	0.50%	0.94%	1.25%	54.32%	98.99%	1.01%	100.00%
	Hwy 50 TIF ²	0.17%	66.58%	12.74%	4.09%	1.26%	0.36%	1.67%	12.61%	99.47%	0.53%	100.00%
	Local TIF ³	0.18%	17.55%	11.93%	1.74%	0.31%	1.08%	1.15%	64.93%	98.87%	1.13%	100.00%

¹ Reimbursement agreements and programs have no external share to ensure full funding.

² Programs are allocated by zone based on cost shares by zone for all Local Roads TIF projects.

Sources: County of El Dorado (for select link data from travel demand model).

Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone

Map ID	Project Name	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8
Hwy 50 Auxiliary Lanes									
A-1	Auxiliary Lane Westbound	43,905	1,150,451	274,838	168,418	149,801	88,459	65,454	868,107
	Subtotal	43,905	1,150,451	274,838	168,418	149,801	88,459	65,454	868,107
Hwy 50 Interchanges Projects									
I-1	El Dorado Hills Blvd	593	174,525	31,627	147,568	7,809	2,922	72,207	8,369,605
I-2	Silva Valley Pkwy-Phases 1&2	11,189	1,800,835	344,284	150,059	86,897	34,568	46,316	8,016,461
I-3	Bass Lake Rd	364	2,054,827	68,724	7,952	11,325	3,634	9,427	2,833,746
I-4	Cambridge Rd	1,450	8,207,447	191,676	36,408	33,196	11,553	22,368	1,121,902
I-5	Cameron Park Dr	10,355	18,441,754	756,410	82,127	167,415	61,905	57,873	1,843,161
I-6	Ponderosa Rd/S Shingle Rd	43,072	13,007,686	2,559,584	2,267,163	183,954	27,574	917,067	1,390,910
I-7	El Dorado Rd	9,119	519,941	4,467,865	107,799	275,657	43,532	20,789	134,640
	Subtotal	76,140	44,207,016	8,420,170	2,799,075	766,254	185,689	1,146,047	23,710,425
Roadway Improvements									
R-1	Cameron Park Dr Widening	644	1,339,534	92,857	6,462	15,349	4,896	8,408	2,006,850
R-2	Green Valley Rd Widening	Under Construction - See Table 14							
R-3	Green Valley Rd Widening	11,218	4,203,528	49,250	2,042,745	9,677	3,174	2,496	7,349,888
R-4	White Rock Rd Widening	13,467	983,809	200,201	64,031	60,870	27,155	67,240	7,989,795
R-5	Missouri Flat Rd	94,247	438,780	5,364,258	69,345	42,145	741,970	459,336	167,778
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 2	-	44,931	-	264,543	-	-	6,556	12,799,469
R-7	Country Club Dr Extension	10,564	3,938,793	599,175	137,751	140,075	51,340	41,621	16,270,682
R-8	Country Club Dr Extension	-	4,026,621	-	15,134	-	-	8,465	7,652,780
R-9	Country Club Dr Extension	-	3,066,864	-	17,118	-	-	13,291	14,825,727
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	Under Construction - See Tables 10 and 14							
R-11	Diamond Springs Pkwy-Phs 1B	177,514	706,852	4,666,387	60,005	83,773	1,020,683	661,873	297,897
R-12	Latrobe Connection	-	-	-	-	-	-	150,386	2,111,143
R-13	Headington Rd Extension	3,588	1,714,869	11,711,721	19,138	55,192	128,154	69,716	492,623
R-14	Bass Lake Rd	307	637,579	44,197	3,076	7,306	2,330	4,002	955,203
R-15	Latrobe Rd Widening	Deleted - Not Deficient in TIF 2020 Update							
R-16	White Rock Rd Widening	12,060	314,750	71,963	59,241	28,694	15,784	408,545	9,818,204
R-17	Latrobe Rd Widening	1,454	312,511	59,178	23,341	15,663	5,855	164,271	5,127,875
R-18	Pleasant Valley Rd	9,072	33,767	204,686	3,661	5,830	91,804	37,218	10,677
	Subtotal	334,135	21,763,188	23,063,873	2,785,590	464,574	2,093,145	2,103,424	87,876,589

Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone

Map ID	Project Name	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8
Reimbursements									
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 1	-	37,540	-	221,026	-	-	5,477	10,693,957
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	-	3,148,637	-	1,537	-	-	3,796	1,227,030
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	-	5,214,907	-	2,546	-	-	6,287	2,032,260
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	-	106,368	-	52	-	-	128	41,452
R-12	Latrobe Connection	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,657	51,343
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange	206	33,131	6,334	2,761	1,599	636	852	147,482
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange-Design	5,975	961,649	183,848	80,132	46,403	18,459	24,733	4,280,802
NA	Bass Lake Rd (SIA)	274	569,350	39,468	2,747	6,524	2,081	3,574	852,984
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	-	366,087	-	16,699	-	-	653	1,743,561
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	-	735,617	-	33,554	-	-	1,313	3,503,516
NA	Deer Valley Rd	57	21,522	252	10,459	50	16	13	37,631
	Subtotal	6,512	11,194,808	229,902	371,512	54,575	21,193	50,483	24,612,016
Programs¹									
NA	Bridge Replacement	16,740	1,654,227	1,124,272	164,092	29,157	102,208	107,931	6,119,373
NA	Intersection Imps.	69,990	6,916,400	4,700,636	686,075	121,908	427,338	451,264	25,585,390
NA	Transit	5,636	556,912	378,498	55,243	9,816	34,410	36,336	2,060,150
NA	Fee Program Admin	11,174	1,104,238	750,480	109,535	19,463	68,227	72,046	4,084,836
	Subtotal	103,540	10,231,777	6,953,887	1,014,945	180,344	632,183	667,577	37,849,749
Total Program Costs									
	Hwy 50 TIF ²	108,264	43,488,474	8,319,097	2,669,919	821,349	236,659	1,093,106	8,233,918
	Local Roads TIF ³	455,968	45,058,765	30,623,572	4,469,621	794,200	2,784,011	2,939,879	166,682,969
	Total	564,232	88,547,239	38,942,669	7,139,540	1,615,549	3,020,670	4,032,985	174,916,887

¹ Programs are allocated by zone based on cost shares by zone for all other TIF Program costs.

² Highway 50 TIF component includes all Highway 50 auxilliary lands and all interchanges except the El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Silva Valley Parkway interchanges.

³ Local Roads TIF component includes all roadway improvements, reimbursements, and programs, plus El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Silva Valley Parkway interchanges.

Sources: Tables 10 and 11.

Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone

Map ID	Project Name	Internal Subtotal	External	Total
Hwy 50 Auxiliary Lanes				
A-1	Auxiliary Lane Westbound	2,809,433	280,567	3,090,000
	Subtotal	2,809,433	280,567	3,090,000
Hwy 50 Interchanges Projects				
I-1	El Dorado Hills Blvd	8,806,856	160,144	8,967,000
I-2	Silva Valley Pkwy-Phases 1&2	10,490,609	52,391	10,543,000
I-3	Bass Lake Rd	4,990,000	-	4,990,000
I-4	Cambridge Rd	9,626,000	-	9,626,000
I-5	Cameron Park Dr	21,421,000	-	21,421,000
I-6	Ponderosa Rd/S Shingle Rd	20,397,011	46,989	20,444,000
I-7	El Dorado Rd	5,579,343	21,657	5,601,000
	Subtotal	81,310,818	281,182	81,592,000
Roadway Improvements				
R-1	Cameron Park Dr Widening	3,475,000	-	3,475,000
R-2	Green Valley Rd Widening			
R-3	Green Valley Rd Widening	13,671,977	826,023	14,498,000
R-4	White Rock Rd Widening	9,406,568	55,432	9,462,000
R-5	Missouri Flat Rd	7,377,859	251,141	7,629,000
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 2	13,115,499	174,501	13,290,000
R-7	Country Club Dr Extension	21,190,000	-	21,190,000
R-8	Country Club Dr Extension	11,703,000	-	11,703,000
R-9	Country Club Dr Extension	17,923,000	-	17,923,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment			
R-11	Diamond Springs Pkwy-Phs 1B	7,674,985	246,015	7,921,000
R-12	Latrobe Connection	2,261,529	259,471	2,521,000
R-13	Headington Rd Extension	14,195,000	-	14,195,000
R-14	Bass Lake Rd	1,654,000	-	1,654,000
R-15	Latrobe Rd Widening			
R-16	White Rock Rd Widening	10,729,242	718,758	11,448,000
R-17	Latrobe Rd Widening	5,710,148	154,852	5,865,000
R-18	Pleasant Valley Rd	396,714	12,286	409,000
	Subtotal	140,484,520	2,698,480	143,183,000

Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone

Map ID	Project Name	Internal Subtotal	External	Total
Reimbursements				
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 1	10,958,000	-	10,958,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	4,381,000	-	4,381,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	7,256,000	-	7,256,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	148,000	-	148,000
R-12	Latrobe Connection	55,000	-	55,000
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange	193,000	-	193,000
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange-Design	5,602,000	-	5,602,000
NA	Bass Lake Rd (SIA)	1,477,000	-	1,477,000
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	2,127,000	-	2,127,000
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	4,274,000	-	4,274,000
NA	Deer Valley Rd	70,000	-	70,000
	Subtotal	36,541,000	-	36,541,000
Programs¹				
NA	Bridge Replacement	9,318,000	-	9,318,000
NA	Intersection Imps.	38,959,000	-	38,959,000
NA	Transit	3,137,000	-	3,137,000
NA	Fee Program Admin	6,220,000	-	6,220,000
	Subtotal	57,634,000	-	57,634,000
Total Program Costs				
	Hwy 50 TIF ²	64,970,787	349,213	65,320,000
	Local Roads TIF ³	253,808,984	2,911,016	256,720,000
	Total	318,779,771	3,260,229	322,040,000
¹ Programs are allocated by zone based on cost ² Highway 50 TIF component includes all Highway ³ Local Roads TIF component includes all roadway Sources: Tables 10 and 11.				

Section 3

Non-TIF Funding Estimates

Table 13: State & Federal Funding for TIF Program

Funding Source	Funding Distribution Method	Estimated Annual Funding		20-year TIF Program Funding (\$2019 \$)		
		EDCTC Total	El Dorado County Allocation	Potential	Maximum Potential Allocation for TIF Projects ¹	Maximum Potential TIF Program Funding
Federal						
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	Competitive ²	\$1,588,088	\$ 619,354	\$12,387,080	50%	\$ 6,193,540
Urban Surface Transportation Block Grant	Formula	860,274	860,274	17,205,480	80%	13,764,384
Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP)	Formula ³	522,678	422,322	8,446,440	80%	6,757,152
Subtotal		\$2,971,040	\$1,901,950	\$38,039,000	70%	\$26,715,076
State						
State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	Competitive ⁴	6,044,000	2,115,400	42,308,000	80%	33,846,400
Exchange (Rural) Surface Transportation Block Grant	Formula ⁵	831,597	548,437	10,968,740	80%	8,774,992
Subtotal		\$6,875,597	\$2,663,837	\$53,276,740	80%	\$42,621,392
Total		\$9,846,637	\$ 4,565,787	\$ 91,315,740	76%	\$ 69,336,468
<p>Note: EDCTC is the El Dorado County Transportation Commission.</p> <p>Note: Funding sources represent those likely applicable to TIF projects. Excluded sources that TIF projects would unlikely be eligible for such as funding for active transportation (bicycle and pedestrian), roadways maintenance, transit, and airport projects. Excluded funding sources that could apply to TIF projects but are too speculative or competitive to rely on for funding, such as SB 1 Local Partnership Program. Transit funding sources excluded because TIF transit projects costs represent the TIF share only.</p> <p>¹ Share of El Dorado County funding allocated to the TIF program is based on estimate of funding needs for projects not included in the TIF program.</p> <p>² CMAQ funding allocated through competitive process, approximately every three years. Funding estimate based on the County's historical share of CMAQ funding (39 percent) since 2009/10.</p> <p>³ HIP is a new funding source for EDCTC and currently not allocated by formula or competitive process. Currently funds are allocated to the City of Placerville to complete a specific project (WPI phases 2 and 2.2). Assume funds in the future are allocated using the same formula as the Exchange STBGP.</p> <p>⁴ STIP is programmed to regionally significant projects by the EDCTC and the California Transportation Commission. Funding based on the County's historical share of STIP funding since 2000.</p> <p>⁵ The County receives 80.8% or the remaining balance of Rural STBGP funding after the City of Placerville receives a minimum of \$200,000</p> <p>Source: El Dorado County Transportation Commission (for total estimated funding); County of El Dorado (for TIF program allocation).</p>						

Table 14: TIF Program Fund Balances

TIF Account	Map ID	Project No.		
EDH TIF Zone 8 & Silva Valley Interchange Set-aside				
EDH TIF Zone 8 Fund Balance 6/30/2020				15,955,000
Silva Valley Interchange Set-aside Fund Balance 6/30/2020				2,227,000
Subtotal				18,182,000
Remaining Costs for Projects In Design / Under Construction				
Saratoga Way Extension - Phase 1	NA	71324	120,000	
Country Club Dr Realignment	R-10	71360	16,000	
Green Valley Rd Widening (County line to Sophia Pkwy)	R-2	72376	17,000	
Subtotal				153,000
Available EDH TIF Zone 8 & Silva Valley Interchange Fund Balance				\$ 18,029,000
TIF Zones 1-7				
TIF Zones 1-7 Fund Balance 6/30/2020				\$ 10,263,000
Remaining Costs for Projects In Design / Under Construction				
Country Club Dr Realignment	R-10	71360	24,000	
Missouri Flat Rd Widening - Plaza Dr to Headington Rd	NA	71374	42,000	
Enterprise Dr Signalization	NA	73365	302,000	
Silver Springs Pkwy Offsite (south segment to Bass Lake Rd)	NA	76108	58,000	
Green Valley Rd at Weber Creek - Bridge Replacement	NA	77114	36,000	
Bucks Bar Rd at N. Fork Consumnes River - Bridge Replacement	NA	77116	838,000	
Green Valley Rd at Indian Creek - Bridge Replacement	NA	77127	442,000	
Green Valley Rd at Mound Springs Creek - Bridge Replacement	NA	77136	510,000	
Cedar Ravine Rd at Weber Creek - Bridge Rehabilitation	NA	77142	232,000	
Subtotal				2,484,000
Available TIF Zones 1-7 Fund Balance				\$ 7,779,000
Hwy 50 Zones 1-8 & Hwy 50-Blackstone				
Hwy 50 TIF Fund Balance 6/30/2020				\$ 16,194,000
Hwy 50 TIF-Blackstone Fund Balance 6/30/2020				7,110,000
Subtotal				23,304,000

Table 14: TIF Program Fund Balances

TIF Account	Map ID	Project No.		
Remaining Costs for Projects In Design / Under Construction				
U.S. 50 / Bass Lake Rd Eb Offramp Signalization		73367	687,000	
Subtotal				687,000
Available Hwy 50 Zones 1-8 & Blackstone Fund Balance				\$ 22,617,000
Total Available TIF Program Fund Balances				\$ 48,425,000
Sources: County of El Dorado, Chief Fiscal Officer (for fund balances); County of El Dorado, Department of Transportation, <i>Adopted 2020 Capital Improvement Program</i> , June 9, 2020 (for project cost estimates).				

Section 4

TIF Schedules and Budget Summaries

Table 15: Hwy 50 TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Total
Cost Allocation By Zone Adjusted For Fund Balances									
Hwy 50 TIF Cost Share	108,264	43,488,474	8,319,097	2,669,919	821,349	236,659	1,093,106	8,233,918	64,970,787
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) ¹	(37,688)	(15,138,786)	(2,895,963)	(929,426)	(285,920)	(82,383)	(380,522)	(2,866,312)	(22,617,000)
Costs Net of Fund Balances	70,576	28,349,689	5,423,134	1,740,493	535,429	154,275	712,585	5,367,606	42,353,787
Cost Allocation By Land Use Adjusted For Local-Serving Nonresidential									
Residential									
Initial	70,576	19,444,494	3,598,813	1,588,956	158,877	154,275	712,585	4,385,057	30,113,633
Local-Serving Nonresidential ²	50,459	2,114,965	835,563	244,007	143,932	73,774	67,398	5,408,550	8,938,650
Final (before offset)	121,036	21,559,459	4,434,376	1,832,963	302,809	228,049	779,983	9,793,607	39,052,283
Nonresidential									
Initial	-	8,905,194	1,824,321	151,537	376,552	-	-	982,549	12,240,154
Local-Serving Nonresidential ²	-	(6,503,220)	(1,332,252)	(110,663)	(274,986)	-	-	(717,529)	(8,938,650)
Final (before offset)	-	2,401,974	492,069	40,874	101,566	-	-	265,020	3,301,504
Equivalent Dwelling Units									
Residential	48	2,021	798	233	138	70	64	5,167	8,540
Nonresidential	-	925	405	22	326	-	-	1,158	2,836
Total	48	2,946	1,203	255	463	70	64	6,325	11,375
Cost per EDU Adjusted For Offsets³									
Residential									
Initial	5,896	9,222	9,222	5,896	5,896	5,896	5,896	1,895	
Offset	65%	20%	20%	65%	65%	65%	65%	0%	
Final	2,064	7,377	7,377	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	1,895	
Nonresidential									
Initial	409	2,176	2,176	409	409	409	409	229	
Offset	0%	30%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Final	409	1,523	1,523	409	409	409	409	229	

Table 15: Hwy 50 TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Total
Revenue									
TIF Residential	99,487	14,906,090	5,888,978	481,089	283,780	145,454	132,884	9,793,607	31,731,370
TIF Nonresidential	-	1,409,477	616,353	9,096	133,344	-	-	265,020	2,433,291
TIF Revenue Requirement	99,487	16,315,567	6,505,331	490,186	417,124	145,454	132,884	10,058,628	34,164,660
Fund Balances (6/30/2020)¹	37,688	15,138,786	2,895,963	929,426	285,920	82,383	380,522	2,866,312	22,617,000
Residential Offset	184,761	3,726,522	1,472,245	893,452	527,020	270,129	246,784	-	7,320,913
Nonresidential Offset	-	604,062	264,151	-	-	-	-	-	868,213
Subtotal Offset	184,761	4,330,584	1,736,396	893,452	527,020	270,129	246,784	-	8,189,126
Total TIF Program⁴	321,935	35,784,937	11,137,691	2,313,064	1,230,064	497,967	760,190	12,924,939	64,970,787

¹ Fund balance allocated based on total Hwy. 50 cost shares by zone.

² Local-serving nonresidential cost allocation is based on the overall local-serving nonresidential percentage (see Table 5) applied to the initial nonresidential cost, by zone. The total local-serving cost share is then redistributed back to each zone based on each zone's residential EDUs as a share of total residential EDUs.

³ Offsets are the percentage of the initial residential or nonresidential cost per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) that is allocated to state and federal funding, resulting in a reduction in the TIF cost per EDU. Cost per EDU for zones that have no nonresidential cost allocation (because no nonresidential development is anticipated) are set equal to the zone with the lowest nonresidential cost per EDU. Offsets for Hwy. 50 TIF are set equal to offsets for Local Roads TIF (see Table 16).

⁴ Excludes costs allocated to external trips (see Table 12).

Sources: Tables 4, 5, 12, 14, and 16.

Table 16: Local Roads TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Total
Cost Allocation By Zone Adjusted For Fund Balances									
Local Roads TIF Cost Share	455,968	45,058,765	30,623,572	4,469,621	794,200	2,784,011	2,939,879	166,682,969	253,808,984
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) ¹	(40,711)	(4,023,048)	(2,734,209)	(399,068)	(70,910)	(248,569)	(262,486)	(18,029,000)	(25,808,000)
Costs Net of Fund Balances	415,257	41,035,717	27,889,362	4,070,553	723,290	2,535,442	2,677,394	148,653,969	228,000,984
Cost Allocation By Land Use Adjusted For Local-Serving Nonresidential									
Residential									
Initial	415,257	28,145,592	18,507,490	3,716,148	214,620	2,535,442	2,677,394	121,442,624	177,654,566
Local-Serving Nonresidential ²	207,550	8,699,311	3,436,854	1,003,655	592,026	303,449	277,224	22,246,544	36,766,614
Final (before offset)	622,808	36,844,903	21,944,344	4,719,803	806,646	2,838,891	2,954,618	143,689,168	214,421,180
Nonresidential									
Initial	-	12,890,125	9,381,873	354,405	508,670	-	-	27,211,345	50,346,418
Local-Serving Nonresidential ²	-	(9,413,306)	(6,851,325)	(258,813)	(371,467)	-	-	(19,871,702)	(36,766,614)
Final (before offset)	-	3,476,819	2,530,547	95,593	137,202	-	-	7,339,643	13,579,804
Equivalent Dwelling Units									
Residential	48	2,021	798	233	138	70	64	5,167	8,540
Nonresidential	-	925	405	22	326	-	-	1,158	2,836
Total	48	2,946	1,203	255	463	70	64	6,325	11,375
Cost per EDU Adjusted For Offsets³									
Residential									
Initial	21,569	20,856	20,856	21,569	21,569	21,569	21,569	27,809	
Offset	65%	20%	20%	65%	65%	65%	65%	0%	
Final	7,549	16,685	16,685	7,549	7,549	7,549	7,549	27,809	
Nonresidential									
Initial	669	4,517	4,517	669	669	669	669	6,339	
Offset	0%	30%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Final	669	3,162	3,162	669	669	669	669	6,339	

Table 16: Local Roads TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Total
Revenue									
TIF Residential	363,921	33,712,524	13,318,873	1,759,822	1,038,065	532,071	486,089	143,689,168	194,900,533
TIF Nonresidential	-	2,925,750	1,279,407	14,866	217,929	-	-	7,339,643	11,777,594
TIF Revenue Requirement	363,921	36,638,274	14,598,280	1,774,688	1,255,994	532,071	486,089	151,028,811	206,678,127
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) ¹	40,711	4,023,048	2,734,209	399,068	70,910	248,569	262,486	18,029,000	25,808,000
Residential Offset	675,854	8,428,131	3,329,718	3,268,241	1,927,835	988,131	902,736	-	19,520,647
Nonresidential Offset	-	1,253,893	548,317	-	-	-	-	-	1,802,210
Subtotal Offset	675,854	9,682,024	3,878,035	3,268,241	1,927,835	988,131	902,736	-	21,322,857
Total TIF Program ⁴	1,080,486	50,343,345	21,210,525	5,441,997	3,254,739	1,768,771	1,651,310	169,057,811	253,808,984

¹ Fund balance allocated based on total Hwy. 50 cost shares by zone.

² Local-serving nonresidential cost allocation is based on the overall local-serving nonresidential percentage (see Table 5) applied to the initial nonresidential cost, by zone. The total local-serving cost share is then redistributed back to each zone based on each zone's residential EDUs as a share of total residential EDUs.

³ Offsets are the percentage of the initial residential or nonresidential cost per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) that is allocated to state and federal funding, resulting in a reduction in the TIF cost per EDU. Cost per EDU for zones that have no nonresidential cost allocation (because no nonresidential development is anticipated) are set equal to the zone with the lowest nonresidential cost per EDU.

⁴ Excludes costs allocated to external trips (see Table 12).

Sources: Tables 4, 5, 12, and 14.

Table 17: Total TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Total
Cost Allocation By Zone Adjusted For Fund Balances									
Total TIF Cost Share	564,232	88,547,239	38,942,669	7,139,540	1,615,549	3,020,670	4,032,985	174,916,887	318,779,771
Fund Balances (6/30/2020)	(78,399)	(19,161,834)	(5,630,173)	(1,328,494)	(356,830)	(330,952)	(643,007)	(20,895,312)	(48,425,000)
Costs Net of Fund Balances	485,834	69,385,406	33,312,496	5,811,046	1,258,719	2,689,717	3,389,978	154,021,575	270,354,771
Cost Allocation By Land Use Adjusted For Local-Serving Nonresidential									
Residential									
Initial	485,834	47,590,086	22,106,302	5,305,103	373,497	2,689,717	3,389,978	125,827,681	207,768,199
Local-Serving Nonresidential ¹	258,010	10,814,276	4,272,417	1,247,663	735,958	377,223	344,623	27,655,094	45,705,264
Final (before offset)	743,843	58,404,362	26,378,720	6,552,766	1,109,455	3,066,940	3,734,601	153,482,775	253,473,463
Nonresidential									
Initial	-	21,795,320	11,206,194	505,942	885,222	-	-	28,193,894	62,586,571
Local-Serving Nonresidential ¹	-	(15,916,527)	(8,183,577)	(369,476)	(646,453)	-	-	(20,589,230)	(45,705,264)
Final (before offset)	-	5,878,793	3,022,617	136,466	238,768	-	-	7,604,663	16,881,308
Equivalent Dwelling Units									
Residential	48	2,021	798	233	138	70	64	5,167	8,540
Nonresidential	-	925	405	22	326	-	-	1,158	2,836
Total	48	2,946	1,203	255	463	70	64	6,325	11,375
Cost per EDU Adjusted For Offsets²									
Residential									
Initial	27,466	30,078	30,078	27,466	27,466	27,466	27,466	29,704	
Offset	65%	20%	20%	65%	65%	65%	65%	0%	
Final	9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704	
Nonresidential									
Initial	1,078	6,693	6,693	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	6,568	
Offset	0%	30%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Final	1,078	4,685	4,685	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	6,568	

Table 17: Total TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Total
Revenue									
TIF Residential	463,408	48,618,614	19,207,852	2,240,911	1,321,845	677,525	618,972	153,482,775	226,631,903
TIF Nonresidential	-	4,335,227	1,895,760	23,962	351,273	-	-	7,604,663	14,210,885
TIF Revenue Requirement	463,408	52,953,841	21,103,611	2,264,874	1,673,118	677,525	618,972	161,087,438	240,842,788
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) ¹	78,399	19,161,834	5,630,173	1,328,494	356,830	330,952	643,007	20,895,312	48,425,000
Residential Offset	860,615	12,154,654	4,801,963	4,161,692	2,454,855	1,258,261	1,149,520	-	26,841,560
Nonresidential Offset	-	1,857,954	812,468	-	-	-	-	-	2,670,423
Subtotal Offset	860,615	14,012,608	5,614,431	4,161,692	2,454,855	1,258,261	1,149,520	-	29,511,983
Total TIF Program ⁴	1,402,422	86,128,283	32,348,216	7,755,060	4,484,803	2,266,738	2,411,500	181,982,750	318,779,771

¹ Local-serving nonresidential cost allocation is based on the overall local-serving nonresidential percentage (see Table 5) applied to the initial nonresidential cost, by zone. The total local-serving cost share is then redistributed back to each zone based on each zone's residential EDUs as a share of total residential EDUs.

² Offsets are the percentage of the initial residential or nonresidential cost per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) that is allocated to state and federal funding, resulting in a reduction in the TIF cost per EDU. Cost per EDU for zones that have no nonresidential cost allocation (because no nonresidential development is anticipated) are set equal to the zone with the lowest nonresidential cost per EDU.

⁴ Excludes costs allocated to external trips (see Table 12).

Sources: Tables 15 and 16.

Table 18: Allocation of State & Federal Funding

		Share
Allocation of State & Federal Funding		
State & Federal Funding (Table 13)	\$ 91,315,740	100%
Reserve for Non-TIF Projects (Table 13)	<u>21,979,272</u>	<u>24%</u>
Net Available Funding After TIF Program Allocation	\$ 69,336,468	76%
TIF Program Allocation		
External Trip Share (Table 12)	\$ 3,260,229	4%
Affordable Housing TIF ¹	20,000,000	22%
Offsets (Table 17)	<u>29,511,983</u>	<u>32%</u>
Total TIF Program Allocation	<u>52,772,212</u>	<u>58%</u>
Net Available Funding After TIF Program Allocation	\$ 16,564,256	18%
¹ "Affordable housing TIF" funding is used to fully fund TIF on affordable housing based on a 20-year estimate of future affordable housing units.		
Source: County of El Dorado (for affordable housing estimate); Tables 12, 13, and 17.		

Table 19: TIF Program Budget Summary

		Share
TIF CIP Total Costs (Table 10)	\$ 348,266,000	100%
Non-TIF Funding (except state & federal funding)		
Prior Year (Table 10)	\$ 11,082,000	3%
Future Local Funding (Table 10)	15,144,000	4%
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) (Table 14)	<u>48,425,000</u>	<u>14%</u>
Subtotal - Non-TIF Funding (except state & federal funding)	\$ 74,651,000	21%
State & Federal Funding ¹		
External Trip Share (Table 12)	\$ 3,260,229	1%
Affordable Housing TIF ¹ (Table 18)	20,000,000	6%
Offsets		
Residential Offset - Hwy. 50 (Table 15)	\$ 7,320,913	2%
Residential Offset - Local Roads (Table 16)	<u>19,520,647</u>	<u>6%</u>
Subtotal - Residential Offset	<u>\$ 26,841,560</u>	<u>8%</u>
Nonresidential Offset - Hwy. 50 (Table 15)	868,213	0%
Nonresidential Offset - Local Roads (Table 16)	<u>1,802,210</u>	<u>1%</u>
Subtotal - Nonresidential Offset	<u>\$ 2,670,423</u>	<u>1%</u>
Subtotal Offsets	<u>\$ 29,511,983</u>	<u>8%</u>
Subtotal - State & Federal Funding	<u>\$ 52,772,212</u>	<u>15%</u>
Total TIF Revenue Requirement¹	\$ 220,842,788	63%
<p>¹ "Affordable housing TIF" funding is used to fully fund the TIF on affordable housing based on a 20-year estimate of future affordable housing units. This funding does not reduce the total TIF revenue requirement because it does not reduce project costs but simply replaces TIF revenue that would be due from affordable housing projects. Therefore, the total revenue requirement shown in this table is lower than the total revenue requirement shown in in Table 17. Table 17 includes affordable housing funding as part of the revenue requirement whereas in this table affordable housing funding is deducted (as part of state and federal funding) before calculating the TIF revenue requirement.</p>		
<p>Source: Tables 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 18.</p>		

Table 20: Hwy 50 TIF Schedule

	EDU Rate ¹	Fee Basis	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8
Residential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	2,064	7,377	7,377	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	1,895
SFD Not Age Restricted										
Less than 1,000 SqFt	0.82	Dwelling Unit	1,692	6,049	6,049	1,692	1,692	1,692	1,692	1,554
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	0.89	Dwelling Unit	1,837	6,566	6,566	1,837	1,837	1,837	1,837	1,687
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	0.95	Dwelling Unit	1,961	7,008	7,008	1,961	1,961	1,961	1,961	1,801
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	1.00	Dwelling Unit	2,064	7,377	7,377	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	1,895
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	1.06	Dwelling Unit	2,188	7,820	7,820	2,188	2,188	2,188	2,188	2,009
4,000 SqFt or more	1.10	Dwelling Unit	2,270	8,115	8,115	2,270	2,270	2,270	2,270	2,085
MFD Not Age Restricted	0.57	Dwelling Unit	1,176	4,205	4,205	1,176	1,176	1,176	1,176	1,080
SFD Age Restricted	0.30	Dwelling Unit	NA	2,213	2,213	NA	NA	NA	NA	569
MFD Age Restricted	0.26	Dwelling Unit	NA	1,918	1,918	NA	NA	NA	NA	493
Nonresidential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	409	1,523	1,523	409	409	409	409	229
General Commercial	1.55	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.63	2.36	2.36	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.35
Hotel/Motel/B&B	0.28	Room	115	426	426	115	115	115	115	64
Church	0.25	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.10	0.38	0.38	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.06
Office/Medical	1.28	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.52	1.95	1.95	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.29
Industrial/Warehouse	0.51	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.21	0.78	0.78	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.12

¹ "EDU" (equivalent dwelling unit) equals the demand placed on the transportation network relative to one single family detached dwelling unit. EDU factors are expressed per dwelling unit for residential development, per room for hotel/motel/B&B, and per 1,000 square feet for all other nonresidential development.

Sources: Tables 3 and 15.

Table 21: Local Roads TIF Schedule

	EDU Rate ¹	Fee Basis	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8
Residential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	7,549	16,685	16,685	7,549	7,549	7,549	7,549	27,809
SFD Not Age Restricted										
Less than 1,000 SqFt	0.82	Dwelling Unit	6,190	13,682	13,682	6,190	6,190	6,190	6,190	22,803
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	0.89	Dwelling Unit	6,719	14,850	14,850	6,719	6,719	6,719	6,719	24,750
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	0.95	Dwelling Unit	7,172	15,851	15,851	7,172	7,172	7,172	7,172	26,418
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	1.00	Dwelling Unit	7,549	16,685	16,685	7,549	7,549	7,549	7,549	27,809
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	1.06	Dwelling Unit	8,002	17,686	17,686	8,002	8,002	8,002	8,002	29,477
4,000 SqFt or more	1.10	Dwelling Unit	8,304	18,353	18,353	8,304	8,304	8,304	8,304	30,590
MFD Not Age Restricted	0.57	Dwelling Unit	4,303	9,510	9,510	4,303	4,303	4,303	4,303	15,851
SFD Age Restricted	0.30	Dwelling Unit	NA	5,005	5,005	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,343
MFD Age Restricted	0.26	Dwelling Unit	NA	4,338	4,338	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,230
Nonresidential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	669	3,162	3,162	669	669	669	669	6,339
General Commercial	1.55	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.04	4.90	4.90	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	9.83
Hotel/Motel/B&B	0.28	Room	187	885	885	187	187	187	187	1,775
Church	0.25	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.17	0.79	0.79	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	1.58
Office/Medical	1.28	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.85	4.04	4.04	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	8.10
Industrial/Warehouse	0.51	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.34	1.61	1.61	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	3.23
¹ "EDU" (equivalent dwelling unit) equals the demand placed on the transportation network relative to one single family detached dwelling unit. EDU factors are expressed per dwelling unit for residential development, per room for hotel/motel/B&B, and per 1,000 square feet for all other nonresidential development.										
Sources: Tables 3 and 16.										

Table 22: TIF Schedule (Hwy 50 & Local Roads)

	EDU Rate ¹	Fee Basis	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8
Residential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704
SFD Not Age Restricted										
Less than 1,000 SqFt	0.82	Dwelling Unit	7,882	19,731	19,731	7,882	7,882	7,882	7,882	24,357
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	0.89	Dwelling Unit	8,556	21,416	21,416	8,556	8,556	8,556	8,556	26,437
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	0.95	Dwelling Unit	9,133	22,859	22,859	9,133	9,133	9,133	9,133	28,219
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	1.00	Dwelling Unit	9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	1.06	Dwelling Unit	10,190	25,506	25,506	10,190	10,190	10,190	10,190	31,486
4,000 SqFt or more	1.10	Dwelling Unit	10,574	26,468	26,468	10,574	10,574	10,574	10,574	32,675
MFD Not Age Restricted	0.57	Dwelling Unit	5,479	13,715	13,715	5,479	5,479	5,479	5,479	16,931
SFD Age Restricted	0.30	Dwelling Unit	NA	7,218	7,218	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,912
MFD Age Restricted	0.26	Dwelling Unit	NA	6,256	6,256	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,723
Nonresidential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	1,078	4,685	4,685	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	6,568
General Commercial	1.55	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.67	7.26	7.26	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	10.18
Hotel/Motel/B&B	0.28	Room	302	1,311	1,311	302	302	302	302	1,839
Church	0.25	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.27	1.17	1.17	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	1.64
Office/Medical	1.28	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.37	5.99	5.99	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.37	8.39
Industrial/Warehouse	0.51	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.55	2.39	2.39	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	3.35

¹ "EDU" (equivalent dwelling unit) equals the demand placed on the transportation network relative to one single family detached dwelling unit. EDU factors are expressed per dwelling unit for residential development, per room for hotel/motel/B&B, and per 1,000 square feet for all other nonresidential development.

Sources: Tables 20 and 21.

Table 23: TIF Schedule - 3 Zones

	EDU Rate ¹	Fee Basis	Zone A	Zone B	Zone C
		<i>Original Zones >></i>	1,4,5,6,7	2.3	8
Residential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	9,613	24,062	29,704
SFD Not Age Restricted					
Less than 1,000 SqFt	0.82	Dwelling Unit	7,882	19,731	24,357
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	0.89	Dwelling Unit	8,556	21,416	26,437
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	0.95	Dwelling Unit	9,133	22,859	28,219
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	1.00	Dwelling Unit	9,613	24,062	29,704
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	1.06	Dwelling Unit	10,190	25,506	31,486
4,000 SqFt or more	1.10	Dwelling Unit	10,574	26,468	32,675
MFD Not Age Restricted	0.57	Dwelling Unit	5,479	13,715	16,931
SFD Age Restricted	0.30	Dwelling Unit	NA	7,218	8,912
MFD Age Restricted	0.26	Dwelling Unit	NA	6,256	7,723
Nonresidential		<i>Cost per EDU¹ >></i>	1,078	4,685	6,568
General Commercial	1.55	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.67	7.26	10.18
Hotel/Motel/B&B	0.28	Room	302	1,311	1,839
Church	0.25	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.27	1.17	1.64
Office/Medical	1.28	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.37	5.99	8.39
Industrial/Warehouse	0.51	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.55	2.39	3.35
¹ "EDU" (equivalent dwelling unit) equals the demand placed on the transportation network relative to one single family detached dwelling unit. EDU factors are expressed per dwelling unit for residential development, per room for hotel/motel/B&B, and per 1,000 square feet for all other nonresidential development.					
Sources: Tables 22.					

Table 24: 2020 Update TIF and Current (FY 2020-21) Schedules

	Fee Basis	EDU Rate	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8
2020 Update TIF										
Residential	<i>Cost per EDU >></i>		9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704
SFD Not Age Restricted ¹	Dwelling Unit	1.00	9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704
MFD Not Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.57	5,479	13,715	13,715	5,479	5,479	5,479	5,479	16,931
SFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.30	NA	7,218	7,218	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,912
MFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.26	NA	6,256	6,256	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7,723
Nonresidential	<i>Cost per EDU >></i>		1,078	4,685	4,685	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	6,568
General Commercial	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.55	1.67	7.26	7.26	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	10.18
Hotel/Motel/B&B	Room	0.28	302	1,311	1,311	302	302	302	302	1,839
Church	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.25	0.27	1.17	1.17	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	1.64
Office/Medical	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.28	1.37	5.99	5.99	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.37	8.39
Industrial/Warehouse	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.51	0.55	2.39	2.39	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	3.35
FY 2020-21 TIF (current)										
Residential	<i>Cost per EDU >></i>		4,765	21,216	21,216	4,835	4,809	7,755	12,030	30,472
SFD Not Age Restricted ¹	Dwelling Unit	1.00	4,765	21,216	21,216	4,835	4,809	7,755	12,030	30,472
MFD Not Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.62	2,954	13,154	13,154	2,997	2,982	4,808	7,459	18,892
SFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.27	N/A	5,728	5,728	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,228
MFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.25	N/A	5,304	5,304	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7,618
Nonresidential	<i>Cost per EDU >></i>		2,764	12,306	12,306	2,805	2,789	4,498	6,977	17,674
General Commercial	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.51	1.41	6.28	6.28	1.43	1.42	2.30	3.56	9.01
Hotel/Motel/B&B	Room	0.08	221	984	984	224	223	360	558	1,414
Church	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.10	0.28	1.23	1.23	0.28	0.28	0.45	0.70	1.77
Office/Medical	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.33	0.91	4.06	4.06	0.93	0.92	1.48	2.30	5.84
Industrial/Warehouse	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.23	0.64	2.83	2.83	0.65	0.64	1.03	1.60	4.06

¹ The 2020 update added multiple single family dwelling fee categories based on dwelling size (not age restricted). The single family not age restricted fee for the 2020 update shown in this table is for a 2,000 to 2,999 square foot dwelling and provides the best comparison with the current fee.

Sources: County of El Dorado (for existing fee schedule); Tables 3 and 22.

Table 25: Difference Between 2020 Update TIF and Current (FY 2020-21) TIF

	Fee Basis	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	
Difference - Amount										
Residential	<i>Cost per EDU >></i>	4,848	2,846	2,846	4,778	4,804	1,858	(2,417)	(768)	
SFD Not Age Restricted ¹	Dwelling Unit	\$4,848	\$ 2,846	\$ 2,846	\$4,778	\$4,804	\$1,858	\$(2,417)	\$ (768)	
MFD Not Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	2,525	561	561	2,482	2,497	671	(1,980)	(1,961)	
SFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	N/A	1,490	1,490	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	684	
MFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	N/A	952	952	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	105	
Nonresidential										
	<i>Cost per EDU >></i>	(1,686)	(7,621)	(7,621)	(1,727)	(1,711)	(3,420)	(5,899)	(11,106)	
General Commercial	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.26	0.98	0.98	0.24	0.25	(0.63)	(1.89)	1.17	
Hotel/Motel/B&B	Room	81	327	327	78	79	(58)	(256)	425	
Church	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	(0.01)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.18)	(0.43)	(0.13)	
Office/Medical	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.46	1.93	1.93	0.44	0.45	(0.11)	(0.93)	2.55	
Industrial/Warehouse	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	(0.09)	(0.44)	(0.44)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.48)	(1.05)	(0.71)	
Difference - Percent										
Residential	<i>Cost per EDU >></i>	102%	13%	13%	99%	100%	24%	(20%)	(3%)	
SFD Not Age Restricted ¹	Dwelling Unit	102%	13%	13%	99%	100%	24%	(20%)	(3%)	
MFD Not Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	85%	4%	4%	83%	84%	14%	(27%)	(10%)	
SFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	N/A	26%	26%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8%	
MFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	N/A	18%	18%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1%	
Nonresidential										
	<i>Cost per EDU >></i>	(61%)	(62%)	(62%)	(62%)	(61%)	(76%)	(85%)	(63%)	
General Commercial	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	18%	16%	16%	17%	18%	(27%)	(53%)	13%	
Hotel/Motel/B&B	Room	37%	33%	33%	35%	35%	(16%)	(46%)	30%	
Church	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	(4%)	(5%)	(5%)	(4%)	(4%)	(40%)	(61%)	(7%)	
Office/Medical	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	51%	48%	48%	47%	49%	(7%)	(40%)	44%	
Industrial/Warehouse	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	(14%)	(16%)	(16%)	(15%)	(14%)	(47%)	(66%)	(17%)	
¹ The 2020 update added multiple single family dwelling fee categories based on dwelling size (not age restricted). The single family not age restricted fee for the 2020 update shown in this table is for a 2,000 to 2,999 square foot dwelling and provides the best comparison with the current fee.										
Sources: Table 24.										