

## Regional Impact Fee Nexus Study Update Deliverable 2 Task Force Comments

#	Agency	Commenter	Segment	Comment	Action
1	City of Salinas	Robert Russell	S Main St & John St	combine into a single Hwy 68 project	If South Main and John Street are added to the project list, they will be treated as a combined project.
2	City of Salinas	Robert Russell	Market St from Davis to Main	Identify project XXV as Highway 183 Project; a state route.	If Market Street is included in the project list, it will be identified as a State route.
3	City of Salinas	Robert Russell	Blanco from Davis to Reservation	I understand that the primary connection between Salinas and the Peninsula will be a 4-lane Davis Road project extending from Market Street in Salinas to Reservation Road, and a 4-lane Reservation Road project from Davis Road to the Fort Ord entrance. This project is included in the FORA CIP, and is being designed by Monterey County. This should be identified as one project, and include 4-laning Blanco Road from Alisal Street to Davis Road. The 4-laning of Blanco Road from Davis to Reservation should be deleted from the list.	See Powerpoint Presentation slides for further discussion of corridor. The Blanco Road improvements are not included in the project list.
4	Task Force Meeting Notes		Blanco from Davis to Reservation	Blanco probably won't be widened (per County) from Reservation to Davis.	
5	Task Force Meeting Notes		Blanco, Davis Road	Eliminate Blanco Road widening and modify Davis Road widening to shorten segment	
6	Task Force Meeting Notes		Davis Road	Davis Road widening impacted by Westside Bypass	
7	Monterey County	Ronald Lundquist	Davis Road	Regional Planning efforts have designated the Davis/Resevation Road route as the preferred route to carry regional traffic between Salinas and the Monterey Peninsula. Thus, Davis Road between SR183 and Reservation Road should be widened to accommodate the additional traffic.	
8	Task Force Meeting Notes		Davis Road, Western Bypass	Add Davis Road to Reservation Road, Imjin Pkwy, Westside Bypass to project list	
9	Task Force Meeting Notes		Western Bypass, Eastern Pypass, Prunedale Bypass	Potential projects: Prunedale Bypass/Eastside Bypass/Westside Bypass	
10	City of Salinas	Robert Russell	Western Bypass	Project list should include the Western Bypass (from the US-101 to the Blanco/Davis intersection)	
11	Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce	John Fair	Western Bypass	The project list fails to include the projects in the region necessary to address the future traffic needs. As an example, the regional does not include the Western by pass necessary to carry regional traffic away from local streets in the City of Salinas.	See Powerpoint Presentation slides for further discussion of project. It has been added to the project list.
12	Task Force Meeting Notes		Western Bypass	What is cost of Westside Bypass?	

#	Agency	Commenter	Segment	Comment	Action	
13	City of Salinas	Robert Russell	Local streets	Many streets identified appear to be more local serving in nature, and should be considered for inclusion in local traffic impact fee programs in lieu of this regional fee.	See Powerpoint Presentation slides for description of Lighthouse Ave and Foam St projects. Other Monterey streets projects are not included in the regional fee program project list.	
14	Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce	John Fair	Local streets	The local roads included in the regional transportation network should be removed from this consideration. Examples of local roads that are in the network and should be treated as local streets are Lighthouse Avenue, Del Monte Avenue, Munras Avenue, Abrego Street and Del Monte Boulevard.		
15		Brian Finegan	Foam Street - Drake Avenue to Lighthouse Avenue (add 2 lanes).	Appears to be a City project, not regional.		
16		Brian Finegan	Lighthouse Avenue - Prescott Avenue to Washington Street (add 2 lanes)	Appears to be a City project, not regional.		
17		Brian Finegan	Del Monte Avenue - Washington Street to SR-1 (add 1 to 2 lanes)	Appears to be a City project, not regional.		
18		Brian Finegan	Munras Avenue/Abrego Street - Fremont Streets to Camino Aguajito Road (add one lane)	Appears to be a City project, not regional.		
19		Brian Finegan	Munras Avenue/Abrego Street - Fremont Street to Soledad Road (enhance operations)	Appears to be a City project, not regional.		
20		Brian Finegan	Del Monte Boulevard - SR-1 to Canyon del Rey Boulevard (add one lane)	Appears to be a City project, not regional.		
21	City of Salinas	Robert Russell		Provide a bit more detail on project limits as discussed at the last meeting, and exclude those "deficient" segments that are not a direct result from future development within Monterey County.		The proposed projects include specific limits. The projects on the draft list will be tested for relationship to growth.
22	City of Salinas	Robert Russell		Ultimately, there will like be some candidate interchange projects that should be considered at a future date, or they should be included/detailed in the street/highway segment listing.		The draft project list does include some interchange projects. The cost estimates for projects will include interchange and intersection costs.
23	City of Salinas	Robert Russell		I understand the 2030 traffic analysis will identify the number of future trips that are not internally generated in the County, but travel through Monterey County (i.e. trips from SF to LA). These trips will not be included as development-generated traffic volume increases.	A select link analysis will be used to back out those trips that merely pass-through the county.	
24	City of Salinas	Robert Russell		Table A-1: As noted by Gary Black of Hexagon Engineers, some of the volume/capacity ratios seem unreasonably high for existing conditions (those with a v/c above 1.3 - my perspective). I suggest re-visiting these segments to confirm the appropriate roadway classification is being used. Some of the volume thresholds noted in the table for the various street/highway types seem low. Please re-review and confirm appropriate threshold volumes	The classification of some segments have been adjusted. Appropriate capacity thresholds have been reviewed and were based on Florida DOT standards.	
25	City of Salinas	Robert Russell		Table A-3: Modify the "roadway classification" and "LOS E Capacity" information to reflect the current geometry and lane layout for street/highway segments. The "improvement" should be identified in either a separate column, or a new table. There may also be some "lesser improvements"/operational enhancements that will return deficiencies to an acceptable level, which should be reviewed after we determine the final deficiency/improvement list along corridors.	Table A-3 includes improvements in geometry in error. Improvement table was removed from deliverable per request.	
26	City of Salinas	Robert Russell		I would suggest a meeting in the very near future to obtain a consensus on how we will deal with the Fort Ord regional impact fee payment or "credit". At a minimum, the nexus document needs to include the regional projects to which said FORA fee contributes, the funding amount that will be generated by said fee for each project, and the number of trips FORA generates on those streets K-H is analyzing. I would also suggest identifying those projects the FORA fee does not cover, but which will be included in the TAMC fee.	FORA CIP contains information on projects funded in part by FORA. This list can be included in the final report. Additional FORA discussion at task force meeting.	
27		Brian Finegan	SR-68 (Monterey-Salinas Highway) SR-1 to Portola Drive (add two lanes).	This project is not feasible. There is too much public opposition. It will not be constructed within the 2030 horizon of this fee.	Only a portion of this project was included in the draft project list.	

#	Agency	Commenter	Segment	Comment	Action
28		Brian Finegan	SR-146 US-101 to County Road G-15 (add two lanes).	This appears to be a city street in Soledad leading from the freeway to the County road to the Pinnacles. Not a significant piece of the regional road network. 2000 LOS only at C.	This project is not included in the draft project list.
29		Brian Finegan	County Road G-12 (Hall Road/San Miguel Canyon Road) Elkhorn Road to US 101 (add 2 to 3 lanes).	This project is identified in the Greater Salinas MOU Exhibit B as being a County impact fee project.	This project is not included in the draft project list.
30		Brian Finegan	County Road G-16 (Carmel Valley Road) Valley Greens Drive to Ford Road (add 2 lanes).	This project is not feasible. There is too much public opposition. It will not be constructed within the 2030 horizon of this fee. The County has a fee in place for Carmel Valley Road operational improvements.	This project is not included in the draft project list.
31	City of Monterey	Andrea Renny	Foam Street: From David to Lighthouse Avenue	Add 1 lane and enhance operations	See Powerpoint Presentation slides for description of Lighthouse Ave and Foam St projects. Other Monterey streets projects are not included in the regional fee program project list. The possibility of adding projects to the proposed list will be discussed at the Task Force meeting.
32	Task Force Meeting Notes		Foam	Can't widen Foam	
33	City of Monterey	Andrea Renny	Lighthouse Avenue: David to Foam	Enhance operations	
34	Task Force Meeting Notes		Lighthouse	City of Monterey to look at projects involving Lighthouse	
35	City of Monterey	Andrea Renny	Del Monte Avenue: Camino El Estero to Camino Aguajito	Add 2 lanes	
36	City of Monterey	Andrea Renny	Del Monte Avenue: Camino Aguajito to Palo Verde	Add 1 lane	
37	City of Monterey	Andrea Renny	Del Monte Avenue from Washington to Camino Aguajito	5 lane major roadway	
38	City of Monterey	Andrea Renny	Fremont Avenue from Abrego St to Camino El Estero	4 lane major roadway	
39	City of Monterey	Andrea Renny	Fremont Avenue from Camino El Estero to Aguajito	6 lane major roadway	
40	Hexagon (Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Gary Black		Hexagon believes that the AMBAG model validation at screenlines is not very good. We would like to see all state highways within 10%. The validations shows Highway 101 to be off by 30% at the north border and 26% mid-county. SR 1 is off by 51% in the Marina Area. However, in other places the model matches the counts. It appears to us that the model distribution is off, as opposed to the trip generation equations being off. We understand that it may not be within your scope of work to wrestle with the model. In that case, we would like to see the future forecasts adjusted rather than used straight from the model output. We suggest calculating the difference between the 2030 and 2000 model runs and then adding that difference to the actual counts.	
41	Hexagon (Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Gary Black		In some cases the model forecasts do not make sense given the underlying demographic data. We have prepared the attached table that shows the "expected" growth on various state highways compared to the model forecasts. We developed the "expected" growth rates based on the AMBAG land use data, which are summarized in an accompanying table. We acknowledge that our calculations are crude. Nevertheless, the forecasts are way off from our expectations in some cases. In particular, along SR 1 and along SR 156 the model forecasts are much lower than expected. We suspect that since these state highways are low, other facilities may be high. We would like to see an explanation for these illogical forecasts.	The model will be rerun with a widened SR-156. The current capacity may be restricting future volume growth since it is a constrained model, which in turn impacts other segments in the area.

#	Agency	Commenter	Segment	Comment	Action														
42	Hexagon (Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce)	Gary Black		<p>We believe the assumed capacities for the roadway types are too low. As evidence, we call your attention to the numerous cases where the existing volume-to-capacity ratios (v/c) are shown to be much greater than 1.0. We recognize that this could be due to peak spreading in some congested areas, but we still believe the v/c ratios are out of line. Based on the observed traffic count, we suggest the following facility type definitions and daily traffic capacities:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4-lane Freeway</td> <td>90,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4-lane Highway (with turn lanes)</td> <td>72,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4-lane Arterial</td> <td>40,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3-lane Arterial</td> <td>31,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-lane Highway (with no turn lanes)</td> <td>30,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-lane Highway (no turn lanes)</td> <td>25,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-lane Arterial</td> <td>22,000</td> </tr> </table> <p>We have revised your v/c table with these definitions and capacities. We still see some existing highways with v/c greater than 1.0, but to us these locations make sense because they have congestion lasting longer than just one hour in the morning and one hour in the evening. More importantly, if we use these capacities for the 2030 v/c analysis, some of the road segments that were identified as having problems before no longer have problems. (Note that in our revision to your v/c table we included only those road segments that previously were shown to operate at LOS E or F in 2030.)</p>	4-lane Freeway	90,000	4-lane Highway (with turn lanes)	72,000	4-lane Arterial	40,000	3-lane Arterial	31,000	2-lane Highway (with no turn lanes)	30,000	2-lane Highway (no turn lanes)	25,000	2-lane Arterial	22,000	The suggested classifications don't match FDOT classifications, which were the basis of determining deficient impacts. Would require major change in analysis.
4-lane Freeway	90,000																		
4-lane Highway (with turn lanes)	72,000																		
4-lane Arterial	40,000																		
3-lane Arterial	31,000																		
2-lane Highway (with no turn lanes)	30,000																		
2-lane Highway (no turn lanes)	25,000																		
2-lane Arterial	22,000																		
43	Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce	John Fair		The AMBAG model is producing numbers that can be validated in relation with the population projections.	No response needed														
44	Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce	John Fair		Impacts fees are specific in nature and restrictive in application and provide only a small portion of the total funding needed to improve the regional transportation network. The funding approach to improve the area transportation system must use a broader mechanism (special tax) to accomplish the level of improvements required. The impact fee can only fund improvements to offset development impacts to the transportation system and can not correct existing deficiencies. Without a completely funded plan that builds the required projects then the fees will have to be refunded to the developer.	The Transportation Agency Board intends to pursue a transportation sales tax measure for the November 2008 election.														
45	Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce	John Fair		In order to provide a uniform approach to securing funding, the local jurisdictions that are represented on the TAMC Board must adopt their own traffic fee to fund impact mitigation measures related to local development.	This effort addresses regional impacts. Some local jurisdictions have adopted or are in the process of studying fees.														
46	Task Force Meeting Notes	Enrique Saavedra		Do an unconstrained model run or confirm this was already done?	Model is constrained														
47	Task Force Meeting Notes	Brian Finegan		What are assumptions on 1982 General Plan?	The current version of the AMBAG model is based on current General Plan documents, updated to reflect land use changes formally adopted by local jurisdictions. In the case of Monterey County, the current General Plan is the 1982 version														
48	Task Force Meeting Notes		Moss Landing/Dolan Road	Moss Landing/Dolan Road improvements (relieve capacity for Sr-1/SR-183)	Dolan Road improvements were not included in the model														
49	Task Force Meeting Notes		Imjin/12th St		The Imjin-Blanco connector is to be built by the FORA project and will be included in the with projects run of the model.														

#	Agency	Commenter	Segment	Comment	Action
50	Task Force Meeting Notes		Carmel Valley Rd	Maybe remove #13 (covered by County improvement)	
51	Monterey County	Ronald Lundquist	Carmel Valley Rd, Laureles Grade	The County of Monterey has an adopted traffic fee program for the Carmel Valley Master Plan Area to address traffic impacts within its boundaries, which includes sections of Carmel Valley Road (Carmel Rancho Boulevard to M.P. 14.0) and Laureles Grade (Carmel Valley Road to M.P. 3.20). Accordingly, we recommend that those sections of Carmel Valley Road and Laureles Grade be removed from the roads included in the TAMC Regional Fee Program.	The draft project list does not include any projects at these segments.
52	Task Force Meeting Notes			How will the zones be implemented and how will that impact the selected projects?	A select link analysis will be used to prepare the zonal fees.
53	Task Force Meeting Notes		River Road (G-17)	Potentially delete - problem is at SR-68 interchange	The draft project list does not include any projects on River Road
54	Monterey County	Ronald Lundquist	River Road (G-17)	River Road (G-17) between SR 68 and Las Palmas Road has been widened to four lanes.	River Road is still 2 lanes from Las Palmas Road to Las Palmas Parkway, which are the extents of the segment. Segment will be broken into 2 segments and evaluated as 2-lane and 4-lane segments separately.
55	Task Force Meeting Notes			Clarify add 1 lane (which direction or turn lane)	The draft project list clarifies all improvement projects.
56	Task Force Meeting Notes			What projects are in the pipeline and what are the cost estimates?	The draft project list is partially based on the 14-year plan and the RTP and cost estimates will be provided.
57	TAMC	Debbie Hale		How is FORA paying?	Will have further discussion on FORA at 6/15 meeting.
58	TAMC	Debbie Hale		Do we want project scenarios? High/low? Do we have project cost info?	Planning level cost information for the draft list of projects is being developed and will be presented at the July meeting.
59	TAMC	Debbie Hale		Include in one of the docs how the regional network was selected	This will be included in the final report.
60	TAMC	Debbie Hale		Add cities to the project list	Can be done, several projects include multiple cities
61	TAMC	Debbie Hale		Double check the LOS tables/capacities	Has been done. A few capacities have been adjusted.
62	TAMC	Debbie Hale		Let's spend some time on the project list: cost, matching w/ existing projects in the pipeline	The project list, based on previously identified projects, will be discussed by the Task Force.
63	Monterey County	Ronald Lundquist		Most county-maintained regional routes identified in the study are two-lane, rural highways with shallow pavement sections, poor alignment, and narrow shoulders. New development should contribute to improvements needed to bring these roads to current engineering standards to accommodate additional traffic.	Segments in the study area were evaluated for capacity only based on lanes and access. Updates in standards could be included in the design of segments funded by fees or other revenue sources.
64	Monterey County	Ronald Lundquist		The list of mitigating projects identified in northern Monterey County need to consider improvements to parallel routes along the State Highway system that may attract regional traffic, i.e. Crazy Horse, Old Stage, Blackie roads, etc.	Parallel route improvements could be considered for the project list as mitigations to primary routes.
65	Monterey County	Ronald Lundquist	Metz Rd (G-15)	Metz Road (G-15) links the cities of Soledad, Greenfield, and King City and should be included in the list of regional routes.	See previous comment.