

AGENDA

Legislative Committee

The next meeting of the Legislative Committee will be as follows.

Date: Thursday, April 13, 2017 - 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
 Place: San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
 1250 San Carlos Avenue
4th Floor Dining Room
 San Carlos, California

PLEASE CALL Jean Higaki (599-1462) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

1	Public comment on related items not on the agenda.	Presentations are limited to 3 Minutes	
2	Approval of Minutes from February 9, 2017.	Action (Gordon)	Pages 1-4
3	Update from Shaw/Yoder/Antwih	Information (Shaw/Yoder/Antwih)	
4	Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified). Letters to discuss: AB 733 (Berman) SCA 6 (Weiner)	Action (Gordon)	Page 5- 38
5	Lobby Day Schedule	Information (Shaw/Yoder/Antwih)	Handout
6	Adjournment	Action (Gordon)	

NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

¹From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 390, 391, 292, KX, PX, RX, or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue.

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES
March 9, 2017**

At 5:30 P.M. Chair Gordon called the Legislative Committee meeting to order in the 2nd Floor auditorium at the San Mateo Transit District Office.

Attendance sheet is attached.

Guests or Staff Attending:

Matt Robinson - Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih Inc.
Sandy Wong, Jean Higaki, Matt Fabry - C/CAG Staff

1. Public comment on related items not on the agenda.

None

2. Approval of Minutes from March 9, 2017.

Member O'Connell moved and Aguirre seconded approval of the March 9, 2017 minutes. Motion passed 6-0. Member Mahanpour abstained.

3. Update from Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih (SYA).

Matt Robinson, from Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih provided an update from Sacramento.

2,495 bills were introduced in this first year of the two year session. About one quarter of them are spot bills.

Nothing has happened on the transportation funding bill so far. This month the Governor and the leadership in both houses appear to be more engaged and interested in passing a bill. It will probably need 2/3 vote which will be difficult to obtain from moderate delegates in other parts of the state. San Mateo county delegates are pretty solid. There is a target of April 6th to pass something before the legislative spring break.

It is anticipated that something in the housing realm will happen this session given the strong focus around the state. It may be funding affordable housing funding or relaxed regulations for affordable housing production.

There are a couple of bills for consideration by the Legislative Committee and the Board.

SCA 6 (Weiner) proposes to lower the voter threshold on local transportation taxes from 2/3 to

55 percent. This was a constitutional amendment introduced by Frazier last year that C/CAG supported. This would make it easier to pass another transportation sales tax measure (e.g. San Mateo Transportation Authority transportation sales tax). The 2% statewide cap on sales tax was raised two years ago to 2.5% for San Mateo County specifically for transportation.

ACA 4 (Aguilar-Curry) would lower the voter threshold from 2/3 to 55 percent for local infrastructure taxes for a wider range of infrastructure improvements across the board. This would also make it easier for local governments to add debt to the property tax roll (by lowering the threshold to 55 percent).

Process wise, it was proposed to have the Legislative Committee and Board approve of letters without respect to the addressee, since the addressee will change with respect to the committee that will be hearing the bill. Unless a bill changes substantially letters will be modified to the appropriate committee and will be sent at the appropriate date. The urgency process will still be followed when time does not permit a letter to be reviewed by the committee and board.

Matt Fabry asked if storm water was included in ACA 4. Matt Robinson will research this for the next meeting.

Member Carlton had concerns about lowering the threshold for very general and broad purposes.

Member Papan was concerned that the legislature would use this bill as an excuse to not fund important issues at the state level. It would also result in competing sales tax efforts with a limited cap.

Member O'Connell feels that this provides a tool for self-help.

Matt Robinson said that with a special tax provisions can be added to make exemptions. This would not hold true for a sales tax.

SB 231 (Hertzberg) would broaden the definition of sewers to include stormwater. This would allow make it easier to raise sewer rates. The previous four attempts were constitutional amendments that didn't make it to the finish line. There is some speculation that this will be challenged.

AB 1613 (Mullin) would allow SamTrans to adopt a sales tax that exceeds the 2% limit. This currently exists for the County Transportation Authority but allowing SamTrans to be the body that adopts the sales tax would provide an easier path according to SamTrans.

4. Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified).

Regarding SB 231 (Hertzberg) – Chair Gordon moved and Member Papan seconded recommending that the C/CAG Board send a letter of support for SB 231 (Hertzberg) that would broaden the definition of sewers to include stormwater.

Regarding SCA 6 (Weiner) - Matt Robinson will gather clarification with the authors office regarding specifics of this bill.

Regarding ACA 4 (Aguiar-Curry) – It was decided to present it to the Board but not recommend that an action by the Board be made at this time.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:25 P.M.

Legislative Committee 2017 Attendance Record

Agency	Name	Jan 12	Feb 9	March 9	April 13	May 11	June 8	July 13	August	Sept 14	Dec 8
Menlo Park	Catherine Carlton	x	x	x							
Millbrae	Gina Papan	x	x	x							
Portola Valley	Maryann Moise Derwin (C/CAG Vice Chair)	x	x	x							
Redwood City	Alicia Aguirre (C/CAG Chair)		x	x							
San Bruno	Irene O'Connell (Leg Vice Chair)	x	x	x							
Sounth San Francisco	Richard Garbarino		x								
Woodside	Deborah Gordon (Leg Chair)	x	x	x							
Foster City	Catherine Mahanpour	N/A	N/A	x							
Vacant											

 no meeting

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 13, 2017
To: C/CAG Legislative Committee
From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director
Subject: Review and recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified)

(For further information or response to questions, contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee recommend the C/CAG Board to take a position on any legislation or direct staff to monitor any legislation for future positions to be taken.

FISCAL IMPACT

Unknown.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

The C/CAG Legislative Committee receives monthly written reports and oral briefings from the C/CAG's State legislative advocates. Important or interesting issues that arise out of that meeting are reported to the Board.

On April 6, 2017 is the day the legislature will vote on the proposed transportation funding proposal SB 1. It is also the start of spring break.

There are two letters of support to discuss.

AB 733(Berman) would allow a city or a county to establish an enhanced infrastructure financing district (EIFD) for projects that adapt to the impacts of climate change, including sea level rise.

SCA 6 (Weiner) proposes to lower the voter threshold on local transportation taxes from 2/3 to 55 percent. This was a constitutional amendment introduced by Frazier last year that C/CAG supported.

ATTACHMENTS

1. April 2017 Legislative update from Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih, Inc.
2. Latest Transportation Funding proposal
3. Letter of support for AB 733(Berman)
4. Letter of support for SCA 6 (Wiener)
5. Full Legislative information is available for specific bills at <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>



SHAW/YODER/ANTWIH, inc.
LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY • ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

DATE: March 30, 2017
TO: Board Members, City/County Association of Governments, San Mateo County
FROM: Andrew Antwih and Matt Robinson, Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.
RE: STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – April 2017

Legislative Update

The Legislature is in full swing, already having heard several bills in policy and fiscal committees. The Legislature is also deliberating in the budget subcommittees the fiscal requests made in the Governor’s proposed January budget. Finally, **AB 28 (Frazier), which would extend California’s NEPA delegation for three years, was signed by the Governor on March 29.** We highlight additional bills of note impacting C/CAG under ***Bills of Interest***, below. The Legislature will break for Spring Recess on April 6.

Transportation Funding

For the last several weeks, leadership in both houses, as well as staff from the Governor’s Office and the California State Transportation Agency, have been negotiating the final details of a comprehensive transportation funding package, based largely on the work done by Senator Jim Beall and Assembly Member Jim Frazier in their SB 1 and AB 1, respectively. The funding package, formally announced at a press conference on March 29, is a \$5.2 billion plan, with revenues coming from increasing gasoline and diesel excise taxes, an increase in diesel sales tax, a new transportation fee based on the value of vehicles, and a fee on zero emission vehicles. The proposal would fund local streets & roads, state highways, goods movement projects, public transit, planning, and active transportation, as follows:

Statewide Investments (50%)

- \$1.5 billion for highway maintenance
- \$400 million for bridge repair
- \$300 million for good movement
- \$250 million for congested commute corridors (new program)
- \$80 million for ag, OHV, and boating
- \$27.5 million in additional STIP (see note below)
- \$7 million for university ITS programs

Local Investments (50%)

- \$1.5 billion for local streets and roads
- \$750 million for public transit
- \$200 million for state-local partnership (self-help counties)
- \$100 million for ATP
- \$82.5 million in additional STIP (see note below)
- \$25 million for local planning grants

The tax increases are adjusted over time by a Consumer Price Index (CPI) factor. The increases in STIP funding mentioned above are due to the CPI adjustment. **However, the proposal would also end the swap-based excise tax adjustments that have wreaked havoc on the STIP over the last few years, establishing it at 17.3 cents and adjusting it for CPI moving forward.** This would result in approximately \$1 billion coming back to the State Highway Account, with approximately \$440 million available for STIP projects.

In addition to the funding elements, the package also includes a number of reform/efficiency items, including:

- Constitutional protections for the new revenues
- Performance measures for Caltrans and local agencies
- CTC oversight of Caltrans staffing for SHOPP projects
- New independent Inspector General position at Caltrans
- Advanced environmental mitigation for Caltrans projects

Governor Jerry Brown, Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León, and Speaker Anthony Rendon, along with dozens of interest groups and other stakeholders, will work to secure the package's passage in both houses of the Legislature. The legislation, now in print as SB 1, requires a two-thirds vote in both houses. The leaders have announced that this package must be voted up or down by April 6, after which they intend on moving on to other priorities.

Attached please find two fact sheets on SB 1 and a breakdown of the funding across all modes for regions, cities, counties, and transit.

Lower-Vote Threshold Measures

As discussed at the C/CAG meeting in March, we committed to providing an overview of SCA 6 (Wiener) and ACA 4 (Aguiar-Curry), which would lower the threshold for voter-approved sales and/or property tax measures, each for different purposes. Currently, for a local agency (defined to mean a city, county, or special district) to successfully pass a special tax – a tax used for a specific purpose – it must first receive a two-thirds vote from the voters in the local jurisdiction, or 66.67 percent (i.e. a county-wide special tax would need two-thirds of the voters in the county to approve it).

SCA 6 would lower the voter-approval requirement to 55 percent for a local government to pass a special tax to provide funding for transportation purposes.

ACA 4 goes beyond the purpose specified in SCA 6 (limited to transportation) and would lower the voter-threshold to 55 percent for several project-types, including:

- Affordable housing
- Water or protect water quality
- Sanitary sewer
- Treatment of wastewater or reduction of pollution from stormwater runoff
- Protection of property from impacts of sea level rise
- Parks
- Open space and recreation facilities
- Improvements to transit and streets and highways
- Flood control
- Broadband expansion in underserved areas
- Local hospital construction

The special tax for these purposes may be placed on the ballot by a city, county, or special district. Additionally, under ACA 4, a city or county (not a special district), may increase property tax revenues

with the approval of more than 55 percent to incur bond debt to pay for any of the aforementioned project-types.

The existing voter-threshold was established by Proposition 13 (1978) to thwart growth in local taxes amidst rising property taxes. In November 2016, the following major local transportation sales tax proposals narrowly failed passage under the current two-thirds voter-threshold requirement, despite receiving overwhelming popular support.

Local Sales Tax Measures – Existing Self-Help Counties:

- San Diego – Measure A Failed: Yes 57.04%, No 42.96%
- Contra Costa – Measure X Failed: Yes 62.54%, No 37.46%
- Sacramento – Measure B Failed: Yes 64.81%, No 35.19%

Local Sales Tax Measures – Aspiring Self-Help Counties:

- Placer – Measure M Failed: Yes 63.71%, No 36.29%
- San Luis Obispo–Measure J Failed: Yes 65.0%, No 35.0%
- Ventura – Measure AA Failed: Yes 56.91%, No 43.09%

These measures would have passed under the revised voter-threshold proposed by this constitutional amendment.

Bills of Interest

AB 1 (Frazier) – Transportation Funding Package

This bill would increase several taxes and fees to address issues of deferred maintenance on state highways and local streets and roads, as well as provide new funding for public transit. Specifically, this bill would increase both the gasoline and diesel excise taxes by 12 and 20 cents, respectively; increase the vehicle registration fee by \$38; create a new \$165 vehicle registration fee applicable to zero-emission motor vehicles; increase Cap and Trade funding for transit; increase the rate of sales tax on diesel by another 3.5% for the State Transit Assistance Program, limit the borrowing of weight-fee revenues, and repay outstanding transportation loans. As a result, transportation funding would increase by approximately \$6 billion per year. ***The C/CAG Board SUPPORTS this bill.***

AB 28 (Frazier) – Caltrans NEPA Delegation

This bill would grant Caltrans the authority to continue performing federal environmental responsibilities for highway projects under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other federal laws until January 1, 2020. ***The C/CAG Board SUPPORTS this bill.***

AB 496 (Fong) – Transportation Funding

This bill represents the “Republican” transportation funding plan, which would provide \$7.8 billion (\$5.6 billion in ongoing and \$2.2 billion in one-time revenues) for transportation without raising taxes. This bill largely relies on the redirection of existing revenues, including the sales tax on vehicle sales, truck weight fees, car insurance taxes, and outstanding loan repayments, as well as increased spending from Cap and Trade.

AB 733 (Berman) – Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts

Existing law authorizes a city or a county to establish an enhanced infrastructure financing district (EIFD) to finance capital projects with property tax increment under certain conditions. This bill would allow the financing of projects that adapt to the impacts of climate change, including sea level rise. ***We recommend the C/CAG Board SUPPORT this measure.***

AB 1613 (Mullin) – SamTrans Sales Tax Authority

Existing law authorizes the San Mateo County Transit District to adopt a sales tax ordinance in accordance with specified provisions of law, including a requirement that the combined rate of all such taxes imposed in the county may not exceed 2%. This bill would authorize the board to exceed that 2% limit to impose a sales tax of no more than 0.5%, if approved by the board before January 1, 2021.

ACA 4 (Aguiar-Curry) – Lower Vote Threshold for Local Infrastructure Taxes

The California Constitution subjects the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of two-thirds of the voters. This measure would lower that threshold to 55 percent of voters for taxes for purposes of funding the construction, rehabilitation or replacement of public infrastructure or affordable housing, which specifically includes improvements to transit and streets & highways, as well as protection from impacts of sea-level rise. ***We recommend the C/CAG Board SUPPORT this measure.***

SB 1 (Beall) – Transportation Funding Package

This bill would increase several taxes and fees to address issues of deferred maintenance on state highways and local streets and roads, as well as provide new funding for public transit. Specifically, this bill would increase both the gasoline (over three years) and diesel excise taxes by 12 and 20 cents, respectively; increase the vehicle registration fee by \$38; create a new \$100 vehicle registration fee applicable to zero-emission motor vehicles; increase Cap and Trade funding for transit; increase the rate of sales tax on diesel by another 4% for the State Transit Assistance Program and intercity rail, limit the borrowing of weight-fee revenues, and repay outstanding transportation loans. As a result, transportation funding would increase by approximately \$6 billion per year. ***The C/CAG Board SUPPORTS this bill.***

SB 231 (Hertzberg) – Stormwater

The California Constitution (Proposition 218) generally requires that assessments, fees, and charges be submitted to property owners for approval or rejection after the provision of written notice and the holding of a public hearing. The Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act prescribes specific procedures and parameters for local jurisdictions to comply with the California Constitution and defines terms. This bill would define the term “sewer” for these purposes to include outlets for surface or storm waters, and any and all other works, property, or structures necessary or convenient for the collection or disposal of sewage, industrial waste, or surface or storm waters. ***The C/CAG Board SUPPORTS this bill.***

SCA 6 (Wiener) – Lower Vote Threshold for Local Transportation Taxes

The California Constitution subjects the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of two-thirds of the voters. This measure would lower that threshold to 55 percent of voters for taxes for transportation purposes. ***We recommend the C/CAG Board SUPPORT this measure.***



Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017

- California’s highway and bridge repair and rehabilitation backlog is more than \$6 billion annually
- California ranks 45th nationally in overall highway condition
- As recently as 2016, 41% of the highways and pavement in California require rehabilitation, replacement or preventative maintenance
- More than 500 bridges in California currently require major repair and nearly 400 of them are considered “structurally deficient” according to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- There’s a price to be paid for neglect. California’s crumbling roads cost drivers \$762 each year in vehicle repairs
- California has not increased funding for transportation in 23 years. As a result, road repairs now receive only 50% of the funding they did back in 1994
- Other states have acted, since just 2013, nineteen other states – governed by Republicans and Democrats – have acted to increase funding for transportation
- This proposal is the largest investment in the state’s history to fix roads and invest in transportation improvements, including public transit
- The revenue will be constitutionally protected so that funds raised must go toward transportation; revenue will come from a mixture of funding sources

STATEWIDE INVESTMENT PROGRAMS (50%)	
Fix-it-First Highways	\$15 billion
Bridge and Culvert Repair	\$4 billion
Trade Corridor Investments	\$3 billion
Solutions for Congested Commute Corridors	\$2.5 billion
Parks Funding for Ag, Off-Highway Vehicle & Boating	\$800 million
STIP (State Share)	\$275 million
Freeway Service Patrol	\$250 million
California Public Universities Transportation Research	\$70 million
Local or Regional Investment Programs (50%)	
Fix-it-First Local Roads	\$15 billion
Transit Capital and Operations	\$7.5 billion
Local Partnership Funds	\$2 billion
Active Transportation Program Bicycle and Pedestrian Investments	\$1 billion
STIP (Local Share)	\$825 million
Local Planning Grants	\$250 million
TOTAL	\$52.4 billion

This Proposal will Strengthen the Economy, Expand Trade and Create Good-Paying Jobs in California



Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017

- About two-thirds of the new revenue generated is from fuel taxes paid by drivers as they use the roads
- The proposal ends the annual Board of Equalization Gas Excise “tax swap” adjustment that has varied from 9.8-21.5 cents in recent years. The rate will be adjusted prospectively by the Consumer Price Index
- The adjustment will stabilize available funding going forward
- About one-third of the new funding will come from a Transportation Improvement Fee on vehicles
- The Transportation Improvement Fee, which is based on the value of the vehicle, combined with the Gas Excise Tax equates to less than \$10 a month for most car owners
- Zero-Emission Vehicle Fees (ZEV fee) will pay \$100 annually starting July 1, 2020 so the expanding fleet of ZEVs will pay a portion for their use of the roads. Gasoline-Electric hybrid vehicles (partial ZEVs) are excluded from this fee

10-Year Revenue by Type	
Fuel Taxes	
Gas Excise	\$24.4 billion
Diesel Excise	\$7.3 billion
Diesel Sales	\$3.5 billion
Vehicle-Based Fees	
Value-Based Transportation Improvement Fee	\$16.3 billion
ZEV Fee Commencing in 2020	\$.2 billion
One-Time Repayment of Transportation Loans	
Repaying Outstanding Loans from General Fund	\$706 million
TOTAL	\$52.4 billion

This Proposal will Strengthen the Economy, Expand Trade and Create Good-Paying Jobs in California

NEW REGIONAL INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

Region	Counties	SHOPP	Maintenance	Local Partnership
Northern California	Butte, Lassen, Shasta, Colusa, Mendocino, Sierra, Del Norte, Modoc, Siskiyou, Glenn, Nevada, Tehama, Humboldt, Plumas, Trinity, Lake, El Dorado, Sacramento, Yolo, Placer, Sutter, Yuba	\$3,730	\$270	\$110
Greater Bay Area	Alameda, Napa, Santa Clara, Contra Costa, San Francisco, Solano, Marin, San Mateo, Sonoma	\$2,515	\$200	\$590
Central Valley and Coast	Mono, Inyo, Madera, Fresno, Kings, Tulare, Kern, Merced, San Joaquin, Tuolumne, Mariposa, Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, San Benito, Santa Barbara	\$3,256	\$280	\$200
Greater Los Angeles Area	Los Angeles, Ventura	\$4,968	\$200	\$630
Inland Empire	San Bernardino, Riverside	\$2,260	\$120	\$310
Orange County	Orange County	\$741	\$50	\$200
San Diego	San Diego, Imperial	\$1,530	\$80	\$210
Total		\$19,000	\$1,200	\$2,250

Assumptions:

SHOPP Distribution based on 5 year history of SHOPP allocations

Maintenance Distribution based on 5 year history of Maintenance Program expenditures

Local Partnership Distribution based on Prop 1B SLPP program allocations

Program Amounts based on DOF 10-year spreadsheet for specified programs except for STIP which is based on the estimate amount specified in GB A-pages which will be adjusted based on adoption of 2018 Fund Estimate

Amounts rounded to avoid inference of certainty/precision

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

ADELANTO	\$7.67
AGOURA HILLS	\$4.85
ALAMEDA	\$18.14
ALBANY	\$4.32
ALHAMBRA	\$19.86
ALISO VIEJO	\$11.56
ALTURAS	\$0.65
AMADOR CITY	\$0.04
AMERICAN CANYON	\$4.66
ANAHEIM	\$81.95
ANDERSON	\$2.40
ANGELS	\$0.93
ANTIOCH	\$25.85
APPLE VALLEY	\$17.08
ARCADIA	\$13.06
ARCATA	\$4.16
ARROYO GRANDE	\$4.06
ARTESIA	\$3.86
ARVIN	\$4.80
ATASCADERO	\$7.07
ATHERTON	\$1.64
ATWATER	\$6.88
AUBURN	\$3.22
AVALON	\$0.85
AVENAL	\$3.55
AZUSA	\$11.32
BAKERSFIELD	\$86.75
BALDWIN PARK	\$17.25
BANNING	\$7.06
BARSTOW	\$5.57
BEAUMONT	\$10.32
BELL	\$8.40
BELL GARDENS	\$9.83
BELLFLOWER	\$17.53
BELMONT	\$6.37
BELVEDERE	\$0.49
BENICIA	\$6.29
BERKELEY	\$27.44
BEVERLY HILLS	\$7.95
BIG BEAR LAKE	\$1.15
BIGGS	\$0.43
BISHOP	\$0.91

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

BLUE LAKE	\$0.29
BLYTHE	\$4.76
BRADBURY	\$0.26
BRAWLEY	\$6.08
BREA	\$10.00
BRENTWOOD	\$13.45
BRISBANE	\$1.08
BUELLTON	\$1.13
BUENA PARK	\$19.07
BURBANK	\$24.05
BURLINGAME	\$6.80
CALABASAS	\$5.55
CALEXICO	\$9.20
CALIFORNIA CITY	\$3.23
CALIMESA	\$1.90
CALIPATRIA	\$1.76
CALISTOGA	\$1.19
CAMARILLO	\$16.00
CAMPBELL	\$9.74
CANYON LAKE	\$2.44
CAPITOLA	\$2.32
CARLSBAD	\$25.84
CARMEL-BY-THE-SEA	\$0.88
CARPINTERIA	\$3.19
CARSON	\$21.51
CATHEDRAL CITY	\$12.42
CERES	\$10.79
CERRITOS	\$11.31
CHICO	\$21.16
CHINO	\$19.66
CHINO HILLS	\$18.05
CHOWCHILLA	\$4.28
CHULA VISTA	\$60.66
CITRUS HEIGHTS	\$19.75
CLAREMONT	\$8.29
CLAYTON	\$2.57
CLEARLAKE	\$3.54
CLOVERDALE	\$2.02
CLOVIS	\$24.72
COACHELLA	\$10.39
COALINGA	\$4.14
COLFAX	\$0.47

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

COLMA	\$0.35
COLTON	\$12.21
COLUSA	\$1.45
COMMERCE	\$3.00
COMPTON	\$23.16
CONCORD	\$29.68
CORCORAN	\$5.68
CORNING	\$1.75
CORONA	\$37.68
CORONADO	\$5.77
CORTE MADERA	\$2.14
COSTA MESA	\$26.23
COTATI	\$1.66
COVINA	\$11.28
CRESCENT CITY	\$1.75
CUDAHY	\$5.63
CULVER CITY	\$9.26
CUPERTINO	\$13.34
CYPRESS	\$11.38
DALY CITY	\$24.97
DANA POINT	\$7.65
DANVILLE	\$9.81
DAVIS	\$15.63
DEL MAR	\$0.98
DEL REY OAKS	\$0.38
DELANO	\$12.14
DESERT HOT SPRINGS	\$6.65
DIAMOND BAR	\$13.06
DINUBA	\$5.64
DIXON	\$4.35
DORRIS	\$0.22
DOS PALOS	\$1.23
DOWNEY	\$26.13
DUARTE	\$5.07
DUBLIN	\$13.12
DUNSMUIR	\$0.38
EAST PALO ALTO	\$6.99
EASTVALE	\$14.45
EL CAJON	\$23.42
EL CENTRO	\$10.34
EL CERRITO	\$5.58
EL MONTE	\$26.06

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

El Paso de Robles (Paso Robles)	\$7.18
EL SEGUNDO	\$3.81
ELK GROVE	\$38.44
EMERYVILLE	\$2.68
ENCINITAS	\$14.17
ESCALON	\$1.63
ESCONDIDO	\$34.50
ETNA	\$0.17
EUREKA	\$6.22
EXETER	\$2.53
FAIRFAX	\$1.70
FAIRFIELD	\$25.78
FARMERSVILLE	\$2.55
FERNDALE	\$0.33
FILLMORE	\$3.55
FIREBAUGH	\$1.87
FOLSOM	\$17.68
FONTANA	\$48.03
FORT BRAGG	\$1.76
FORT JONES	\$0.16
FORTUNA	\$2.73
FOSTER CITY	\$7.60
FOUNTAIN VALLEY	\$12.98
FOWLER	\$1.36
FREMONT	\$52.48
FRESNO	\$119.10
FULLERTON	\$32.60
GALT	\$5.82
GARDEN GROVE	\$40.57
GARDENA	\$13.91
GILROY	\$12.62
GLENDALE	\$46.15
GLENDORA	\$11.98
GOLETA	\$7.15
GONZALES	\$1.94
GRAND TERRACE	\$2.82
GRASS VALLEY	\$2.96
GREENFIELD	\$3.99
GRIDLEY	\$1.51
GROVER BEACH	\$3.07
GUADALUPE	\$1.68
GUSTINE	\$1.34

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

HALF MOON BAY	\$2.87
HANFORD	\$12.78
HAWAIIAN GARDENS	\$3.42
HAWTHORNE	\$20.14
HAYWARD	\$36.38
HEALDSBURG	\$2.68
HEMET	\$18.32
HERCULES	\$5.67
HERMOSA BEACH	\$4.53
HESPERIA	\$21.33
HIDDEN HILLS	\$0.43
HIGHLAND	\$12.28
HILLSBOROUGH	\$2.67
HOLLISTER	\$8.35
HOLTVILLE	\$1.39
HUGHSON	\$1.64
HUNTINGTON BEACH	\$44.67
HUNTINGTON PARK	\$13.67
HURON	\$1.58
IMPERIAL	\$4.16
IMPERIAL BEACH	\$6.28
INDIAN WELLS	\$1.24
INDIO	\$20.15
INDUSTRY	\$0.10
INGLEWOOD	\$26.69
IONE	\$1.81
IRVINE	\$59.13
IRWINDALE	\$0.33
ISLETON	\$0.19
JACKSON	\$1.12
JURUPA VALLEY	\$22.47
KERMAN	\$3.29
KING CITY	\$3.25
KINGSBURG	\$2.77
La Cañada Flintridge	\$4.70
LA HABRA	\$14.20
LA HABRA HEIGHTS	\$1.25
LA MESA	\$13.73
LA MIRADA	\$11.36
LA PALMA	\$3.67
LA PUENTE	\$9.27
LA QUINTA	\$9.15

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

LA VERNE	\$7.60
LAFAYETTE	\$5.70
LAGUNA BEACH	\$5.40
LAGUNA HILLS	\$7.02
LAGUNA NIGUEL	\$15.14
LAGUNA WOODS	\$3.72
LAKE ELSINORE	\$13.96
LAKE FOREST	\$19.20
LAKEPORT	\$1.09
LAKESWOOD	\$18.32
LAMTA	\$0.00
LANCASTER	\$35.95
LARKSPUR	\$2.85
LATHROP	\$5.06
LAWNDALE	\$7.67
LEMON GROVE	\$6.09
LEMOORE	\$6.00
LINCOLN	\$10.83
LINDSAY	\$2.97
LIVE OAK	\$1.92
LIVERMORE	\$20.17
LIVINGSTON	\$3.17
LODI	\$14.47
LOMA LINDA	\$5.64
LOMITA	\$4.64
LOMPOC	\$10.10
LONG BEACH	\$110.98
LOOMIS	\$1.53
LOS ALAMITOS	\$2.69
LOS ALTOS	\$7.17
LOS ALTOS HILLS	\$1.98
LOS ANGELES	\$922.41
LOS BANOS	\$9.01
LOS GATOS	\$7.18
LOYALTON	\$0.18
LYNWOOD	\$16.59
MADERA	\$14.98
MALIBU	\$2.91
MAMMOTH LAKES	\$1.88
MANHATTAN BEACH	\$8.08
MANTECA	\$16.90
MARICOPA	\$0.26

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

MARINA	\$4.80
MARTINEZ	\$8.48
MARYSVILLE	\$2.76
MAYWOOD	\$6.46
MCFARLAND	\$3.35
MENDOTA	\$2.69
MENIFEE	\$20.37
MENLO PARK	\$7.75
MERCED	\$19.21
MILL VALLEY	\$3.41
MILLBRAE	\$5.29
MILPITAS	\$17.28
MISSION VIEJO	\$22.13
MODESTO	\$48.49
MONROVIA	\$8.59
MONTAGUE	\$0.33
MONTCLAIR	\$8.85
MONTE SERENO	\$0.80
MONTEBELLO	\$14.63
MONTEREY	\$6.55
MONTEREY PARK	\$14.04
MOORPARK	\$8.40
MORAGA	\$3.78
MORENO VALLEY	\$47.00
MORGAN HILL	\$9.99
MORRO BAY	\$2.45
MOUNTAIN VIEW	\$17.83
Mount SHASTA	\$0.78
MURRIETA	\$26.04
NAPA	\$18.44
NATIONAL CITY	\$13.91
NEEDLES	\$1.15
NEVADA CITY	\$0.75
NEWARK	\$10.24
NEWMAN	\$2.48
NEWPORT BEACH	\$19.49
NORCO	\$6.19
NORWALK	\$24.15
NOVATO	\$12.53
OAKDALE	\$5.11
OAKLAND	\$96.76
OAKLEY	\$9.19

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

OCEANSIDE	\$40.26
OJAI	\$1.71
ONTARIO	\$38.87
ORANGE	\$32.36
ORANGE COVE	\$2.11
ORINDA	\$4.29
ORLAND	\$1.76
OROVILLE	\$4.12
OXNARD	\$47.37
PACIFIC GROVE	\$3.51
PACIFICA	\$8.65
PALM DESERT	\$11.29
PALM SPRINGS	\$10.68
PALMDALE	\$36.63
PALO ALTO	\$15.61
PALOS VERDES ESTATES	\$3.14
PARADISE	\$6.00
PARAMOUNT	\$12.91
PARLIER	\$3.52
PASADENA	\$32.27
PATTERSON	\$5.17
PERRIS	\$16.87
PETALUMA	\$13.82
PICO RIVERA	\$14.71
PIEDMONT	\$2.57
PINOLE	\$4.29
PISMO BEACH	\$1.87
PITTSBURG	\$15.52
PLACENTIA	\$11.96
PLACERVILLE	\$2.45
PLEASANT HILL	\$7.80
PLEASANTON	\$17.16
PLYMOUTH	\$0.23
POINT ARENA	\$0.10
POMONA	\$35.61
PORT HUENEME	\$5.20
PORTERVILLE	\$13.75
PORTOLA	\$0.50
PORTOLA VALLEY	\$1.09
POWAY	\$11.47
RANCHO CORDOVA	\$16.52
RANCHO CUCAMONGA	\$40.10

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

RANCHO MIRAGE	\$4.14
RANCHO PALOS VERDES	\$9.85
RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA	\$11.10
RED BLUFF	\$3.22
REDDING	\$20.65
REDLANDS	\$15.73
REDONDO BEACH	\$15.90
REDWOOD CITY	\$19.68
REEDLEY	\$5.95
RIALTO	\$24.56
RICHMOND	\$25.26
RIDGECREST	\$6.42
RIO DELL	\$0.78
RIO VISTA	\$1.97
RIPON	\$3.37
RIVERBANK	\$5.47
RIVERSIDE	\$74.30
ROCKLIN	\$13.81
ROHNERT PARK	\$9.61
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	\$1.85
ROSEMEAD	\$12.64
ROSEVILLE	\$30.68
ROSS	\$0.58
SACRAMENTO	\$111.14
SALINAS	\$36.85
SAN ANSELMO	\$2.94
SAN BERNARDINO	\$49.31
SAN BRUNO	\$10.38
San Buenaventura (Ventura)	\$24.84
SAN CARLOS	\$6.64
SAN CLEMENTE	\$15.16
SAN DIEGO	\$318.46
SAN DIMAS	\$7.81
SAN FERNANDO	\$5.61
SAN FRANCISCO	\$198.30
SAN GABRIEL	\$9.25
SAN JACINTO	\$10.91
SAN JOAQUIN	\$0.93
SAN JOSE	\$238.47
SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	\$0.43
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	\$8.26
SAN LEANDRO	\$20.07

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

SAN LUIS OBISPO	\$10.55
SAN MARCOS	\$21.35
SAN MARINO	\$3.10
SAN MATEO	\$23.49
SAN PABLO	\$7.05
SAN RAFAEL	\$13.86
SAN RAMON	\$17.93
SAND CITY	\$0.09
SANGER	\$5.96
SANTA ANA	\$78.47
SANTA BARBARA	\$21.33
SANTA CLARA	\$28.32
SANTA CLARITA	\$51.60
SANTA CRUZ	\$14.79
SANTA FE SPRINGS	\$4.22
SANTA MARIA	\$23.89
SANTA MONICA	\$21.43
SANTA PAULA	\$7.04
SANTA ROSA	\$40.20
SANTEE	\$12.99
SARATOGA	\$6.92
SAUSALITO	\$1.65
SCOTTS Valley	\$2.78
SEAL Beach	\$5.74
SEASIDE	\$7.80
SEBASTOPOL	\$1.72
SELMA	\$5.69
SHAFTER	\$4.13
SHASTA Lake	\$2.41
SIERRA Madre	\$2.52
SIGNAL Hill	\$2.67
SIMI Valley	\$29.10
SOLANA Beach	\$3.09
SOLEDAD	\$5.89
SOLVANG	\$1.25
SONOMA	\$2.49
SONORA	\$1.12
SOUTH EL MONTE	\$4.76
SOUTH GATE	\$22.79
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	\$4.90
SOUTH PASADENA	\$5.96
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	\$14.78

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

ST. HELENA	\$1.37
STANTON	\$9.10
STOCKTON	\$72.22
SUISUN CITY	\$6.66
SUNNYVALE	\$33.95
SUSANVILLE	\$4.11
SUTTER CREEK	\$0.59
TAFT	\$2.15
TEHACHAPI	\$3.30
TEHAMA	\$0.10
TEMECULA	\$24.96
TEMPLE CITY	\$8.36
THOUSAND OAKS	\$30.29
TIBURON	\$2.17
TORRANCE	\$33.68
TRUCKEE	\$3.70
TRACY	\$20.41
TRINIDAD	\$0.08
TULARE	\$14.53
TULELAKE	\$0.23
TURLOCK	\$16.49
TUSTIN	\$18.93
TWENTYNINE PALMS	\$5.98
UKIAH	\$3.70
UNION CITY	\$16.69
UPLAND	\$17.34
VACAVILLE	\$22.35
VALLEJO	\$26.85
VERNON	\$0.05
VICTORVILLE	\$28.26
VILLA PARK	\$1.36
VISALIA	\$29.80
VISTA	\$22.63
WALNUT	\$6.90
WALNUT CREEK	\$16.02
WASCO	\$6.06
WATERFORD	\$2.01
WATSONVILLE	\$12.10
WEED	\$0.68
WEST COVINA	\$24.69
WEST HOLLYWOOD	\$8.22
WEST SACRAMENTO	\$12.15

NEW CITY STREETS AND ROADS INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

WESTLAKE VILLAGE	\$1.92
WESTMINSTER	\$21.53
WESTMORLAND	\$0.52
WHEATLAND	\$0.81
WHITTIER	\$20.22
WILDOMAR	\$8.05
WILLIAMS	\$1.24
WILLITS	\$1.12
WILLOWS	\$1.42
WINDSOR	\$6.19
WINTERS	\$1.65
WOODLAKE	\$1.75
WOODLAND	\$13.16
WOODSIDE	\$1.30
YORBA LINDA	\$15.48
YOUNTVILLE	\$0.68
YREKA	\$1.79
YUBA CITY	\$15.57
YUCAIPA	\$12.31
YUCCA VALLEY	\$4.87
Total	\$7,500.00

Assumptions:

Cities receive 50% of Funding Package fund for Local Streets and Roads.

Local Streets and Road Distribution based on January 2017 allocation shares.

NEW COUNTY INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

County	STIP Share	County Road Share
Alameda	\$29	\$232
Alpine	\$1	\$4
Amador	\$2	\$21
Butte	\$6	\$76
Calaveras	\$2	\$33
Colusa	\$2	\$25
Contra Costa	\$20	\$194
Del Norte	\$1	\$13
El Dorado	\$4	\$69
Fresno	\$22	\$233
Glenn	\$2	\$31
Humboldt	\$6	\$60
Imperial	\$10	\$106
Inyo	\$8	\$37
Kern	\$29	\$219
Kings	\$4	\$46
Lake	\$2	\$33
Lassen	\$4	\$32
Los Angeles	\$173	\$1,405
Madera	\$4	\$67
Marin	\$5	\$53
Mariposa	\$1	\$21
Mendocino	\$5	\$49
Merced	\$7	\$88
Modoc	\$2	\$31
Mono	\$6	\$23
Monterey	\$10	\$99
Napa	\$4	\$37
Nevada	\$3	\$38
Orange	\$53	\$480
Placer	\$7	\$99
Plumas	\$2	\$25
Riverside	\$47	\$387
Sacramento	\$27	\$286
San Benito	\$2	\$22
San Bernardino	\$54	\$374
San Diego	\$61	\$538
San Francisco	\$15	\$109
San Joaquin	\$15	\$155
San Luis Obispo	\$11	\$89
San Mateo	\$15	\$131
Santa Barbara	\$12	\$91
Santa Clara	\$34	\$292
Santa Cruz	\$6	\$60

NEW COUNTY INVESTMENTS (In Millions)

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

County	STIP Share	County Road Share
Shasta	\$6	\$70
Sierra	\$1	\$12
Siskiyou	\$4	\$50
Solano	\$9	\$85
Sonoma	\$11	\$127
Stanislaus	\$11	\$125
Sutter	\$2	\$38
Tahoe RPA	\$1	\$0
Tehama	\$3	\$44
Trinity	\$2	\$23
Tulare	\$13	\$151
Tuolumne	\$2	\$31
Ventura	\$18	\$147
Yolo	\$5	\$54
Yuba	\$2	\$31
Interregional	\$	\$0
Total	\$1,174	\$7,500

STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE - NEW INVESTMENTS IN LOCAL ENTITIES

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

Regional Entity	PUC 99313 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	PUC 99314 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	Local Entities – Both PUC 99313 & 99314 Allocations (Projected 10-Yr Increase)
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma)	\$414,955,503	\$1,148,758,290	\$1,563,713,792
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba)	\$103,126,623	\$48,235,908	\$151,362,531
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System	\$134,043,130	\$71,012,864	\$205,055,994
San Diego Association of Governments	\$44,348,031	\$21,449,019	\$65,797,050
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (El Dorado, Placer)	\$5,501,778	\$0	\$5,501,778
Alpine	\$61,555	\$3,519	\$65,074
Amador	\$2,080,609	\$107,252	\$2,187,861
Butte	\$12,542,446	\$778,654	\$13,321,100
Calaveras	\$2,544,451	\$0	\$2,544,451
Colusa	\$1,227,376	\$63,599	\$1,290,975
Del Norte	\$1,607,136	\$113,732	\$1,720,868
El Dorado	\$8,863,963	\$956,649	\$9,820,612
Fresno	\$53,920,116	\$7,036,622	\$60,956,738
Glenn	\$1,605,377	\$0	\$1,605,377
Humboldt	\$7,656,743	\$1,275,834	\$8,932,577
Imperial	\$10,196,652	\$473,251	\$10,669,903
Inyo	\$1,051,773	\$0	\$1,051,773
Kern	\$48,580,918	\$4,334,692	\$52,915,610
Kings	\$8,608,008	\$1,692,862	\$10,300,870
Lake	\$3,654,323	\$341,080	\$3,995,403
Lassen	\$1,892,657	\$126,639	\$2,019,296
Los Angeles	\$563,915,838	\$670,152,084	\$1,234,067,921
Madera	\$8,647,857	\$0	\$8,647,857
Mariposa	\$1,020,796	\$5,173	\$1,025,969
Mendocino	\$4,999,825	\$360,678	\$5,360,503
Merced	\$14,863,847	\$1,187,316	\$16,051,163
Modoc	\$539,221	\$0	\$539,221

STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE - NEW INVESTMENTS IN LOCAL ENTITIES

Estimated Amounts Based on Historical Data

Regional Entity	PUC 99313 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	PUC 99314 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	Local Entities – Both PUC 99313 & 99314 Allocations (Projected 10-Yr Increase)
Mono	\$820,727	\$1,179,603	\$2,000,330
Monterey	\$23,868,748	\$4,014,948	\$27,883,696
Nevada	\$5,494,086	\$193,768	\$5,687,854
Orange	\$174,519,205	\$60,240,798	\$234,760,003
Placer	\$16,199,666	\$2,586,597	\$18,786,263
Plumas	\$1,112,359	\$0	\$1,112,359
Riverside	\$127,701,554	\$24,124,207	\$151,825,762
San Benito	\$3,209,109	\$0	\$3,209,109
San Bernardino	\$117,577,141	\$32,466,387	\$150,043,528
San Joaquin	\$39,550,414	\$8,515,676	\$48,066,089
San Luis Obispo	\$15,413,088	\$1,426,118	\$16,839,206
Santa Barbara	\$24,305,131	\$8,289,634	\$32,594,765
Santa Cruz	\$15,100,773	\$15,860,672	\$30,961,446
Shasta	\$10,113,982	\$707,258	\$10,821,241
Sierra	\$179,291	\$0	\$179,291
Siskiyou	\$2,536,748	\$190,217	\$2,726,965
Stanislaus	\$29,680,575	\$2,103,441	\$31,784,016
Tehama	\$3,611,333	\$0	\$3,611,333
Trinity	\$761,269	\$42,905	\$804,174
Tulare	\$25,800,084	\$2,922,915	\$28,722,999
Tuolumne	\$3,078,340	\$0	\$3,078,340
Ventura	\$47,309,825	\$6,669,137	\$53,978,963
TOTAL	\$2,150,000,000	\$2,150,000,000	\$4,300,000,000

Regional Entity-Transit Operator	PUC 99314 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	County/Region Total
REGIONS		
Metropolitan Transportation Commission		\$1,148,758,290
AC Transit	***	
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	\$2,469,040	
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	\$6,816,934	
City of Dixon	\$54,095	
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority	\$3,129,116	
City of Fairfield	\$1,221,539	
Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District	\$51,606,111	
City of Healdsburg	\$0	
Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority	\$2,896,046	
Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency	\$512,806	
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	\$60,557,465	
City of Petaluma	\$290,673	
City of Rio Vista	\$43,031	
City of San Francisco	***	
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	***	
San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority	\$26,582,669	
San Mateo County Transit District	\$44,055,145	
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	\$134,968,644	
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	\$2,782,377	
City of Santa Rosa	\$1,543,537	
Solano County Transit	\$2,363,885	
Sonoma County	\$1,782,244	
City of Union City	\$496,800	
Western Contra Costa Transit Authority	\$3,496,221	
*** AC Transit, City of SF + BART share this total, based on local formula	\$801,089,911	
Sacramento Area Council of Governments		\$48,235,908
City of Davis	\$1,549,311	
City of Elk Grove	\$1,213,500	
City of Folsom	\$173,485	
Sacramento Regional Transit District	\$42,327,154	
Yolo County Transportation District	\$2,154,291	
Yuba Sutter Transit Authority	\$818,167	
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System	\$71,012,864	
San Diego Association of Governments		

Regional Entity-Transit Operator	PUC 99314 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	County/Region Total
North San Diego County Transit District	\$21,449,019	
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency		
Tahoe Transportation District	\$0	
COUNTIES		
Alpine County		\$3,519
Amador Regional Transit System	\$107,252	
Amador County		\$107,252
Butte County Association of Governments	\$778,654	
Butte County		\$778,654
Calaveras County		\$0
Colusa County		\$63,599
Redwood Coast Transit Authority	\$113,732	
Del Norte County		\$113,732
El Dorado County Transit Authority	\$956,649	
El Dorado County		\$956,649
City of Clovis	\$479,057	
City of Fresno	\$5,774,770	
Fresno County Rural Transit Agency	\$782,795	
Fresno County		\$7,036,622
Glenn County		\$0
City of Arcata	\$119,601	
City of Eureka	\$361,690	
City of Fortuna	\$7,523	
Humboldt Transit Authority	\$787,020	
Humboldt County		\$1,275,834
City of Imperial	\$71,185	
Imperial County Transportation Commission	\$330,775	
Imperial County Transportation Commission - Specialized Services	\$71,291	
Imperial County		\$473,251

Regional Entity-Transit Operator	PUC 99314 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	County/Region Total
Inyo County		\$0
City of Arvin	\$41,946	
City of California City	\$15,763	
City of Delano	\$52,272	
Golden Empire Transit District	\$3,225,209	
Kern County	\$555,848	
City of Ridgecrest	\$204,874	
City of Shafter	\$17,522	
City of Taft	\$204,147	
City of Tehachapi	\$2,518	
City of Wasco	\$14,593	
Kern County		\$4,334,692
City of Corcoran	\$42,505	
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	\$1,650,357	
Kings County		\$1,692,862
Lake Transit Authority	\$341,080	
Lake County		\$341,080
Lassen County		\$126,639
Antelope Valley Transit Authority	\$6,835,300	
City of Arcadia	\$905,494	
City of Claremont	\$385,302	
City of Commerce	\$985,867	
City of Culver City	\$4,638,030	
Foothill Transit Zone	\$28,219,560	
City of Gardena	\$6,570,357	
City of La Mirada	\$500,109	
Long Beach Public Transportation Company	\$27,446,543	
City of Los Angeles	\$36,122,154	
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	\$438,769,323	
City of Montebello	\$9,510,467	
City of Norwalk	\$2,553,017	
City of Redondo Beach	\$1,101,316	
City of Redondo Beach - Specialized Service	\$269,252	
City of Santa Monica	\$22,022,757	
Southern California Regional Rail Authority - LA Metro	\$80,144,467	
City of Torrance	\$3,172,769	

Regional Entity-Transit Operator	PUC 99314 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	County/Region Total
Los Angeles County		\$670,152,084
Madera County		\$0
Mariposa County		\$5,173
Mendocino Transit Authority	\$360,678	
Mendocino County		\$360,678
Merced Transit Joint Powers Authority of Merced County	\$741,207	
Merced Transit Joint Powers Authority of Merced County - Specialized Service	\$446,109	
Merced County		\$1,187,316
Modoc County		\$0
Eastern Sierra Transit Authority	\$1,179,603	
Mono County		\$1,179,603
Monterey-Salinas Transit	\$4,014,948	
City of Soledad	\$0	
Monterey County		\$4,014,948
Nevada County		\$193,768
City of Laguna Beach	\$295,025	
Orange County Transportation Authority	\$23,426,980	
Orange County Transportation Authority - Corresponding to the Southern California Regional Rail Authority	\$36,518,793	
Orange County		\$60,240,798
City of Auburn	\$16,922	
City of Lincoln	\$29,819	
Placer County	\$1,968,847	
City of Roseville	\$571,010	
Placer County		\$2,586,597
Plumas County		\$0
City of Banning	\$93,618	
City of Beaumont	\$111,951	

Regional Entity-Transit Operator	PUC 99314 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	County/Region Total
City of Corona	\$257,915	
Palo Verde Valley Transit Agency	\$54,422	
City of Riverside	\$201,597	
Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	\$10,567,920	
Riverside Transit Agency	\$9,372,332	
SunLine Transit Agency	\$3,464,453	
Riverside County		\$24,124,207
San Benito County		\$0
Morongo Basin Transit Authority	\$224,619	
Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority	\$184,854	
Omnitrans	\$9,197,088	
San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	\$21,576,480	
Victory Valley Transit Authority	\$1,283,347	
San Bernardino County		\$32,466,387
Altamont Commuter Express Authority - San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission	\$2,156,388	
City of Lodi	\$379,623	
City of Ripon	\$653	
San Joaquin Regional Transit District	\$5,979,012	
San Joaquin County		\$8,515,676
City of Atascadero	\$52,989	
City of Morro Bay	\$6,965	
City of Paso Robles Transit	\$101,899	
City of San Luis Obispo	\$384,670	
San Luis Obispo County	\$35,129	
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Agency	\$768,982	
South County Area Transit	\$75,484	
San Luis Obispo County		\$1,426,118
City of Guadalupe	\$55,812	
City of Lompoc	\$308,427	
Santa Barbara County	\$86,969	
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District	\$6,907,718	
City of Santa Maria	\$883,114	
City of Solvang	\$47,594	

Regional Entity-Transit Operator	PUC 99314 - STA Allocation (Projected 10-Yr Increase)	County/Region Total
Santa Barbara County		\$8,289,634
Santa Cruz County Metropolitan Transit District	\$15,860,672	
Santa Cruz County		\$15,860,672
Redding Area Bus Authority	\$707,258	
Shasta County		\$707,258
Sierra County		\$0
Siskiyou County		\$190,217
City of Modesto	\$1,723,018	
Stanislaus County	\$291,621	
City of Turlock	\$88,802	
Stanislaus County		\$2,103,441
Tehama County		\$0
Trinity County		\$42,905
City of Exeter	\$13,297	
City of Porterville	\$285,615	
City of Tulare	\$241,436	
Tulare County	\$305,835	
City of Visalia	\$2,076,731	
Tulare County		\$2,922,915
Tuolumne County		\$0
Gold Coast Transit	\$1,989,899	
Ventura County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	\$4,679,238	
Ventura County		\$6,669,137
PUC 99314 Projected 10-Yr Total	\$2,150,000,000	

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANTS
Breakdown of the MPO distribution of \$1B in funding over 10 years

Metropolitan Planning Organization	Percent	Yearly Distribution	10 Year Distribution
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	53.20%	\$21,280,000	\$212,800,000
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	21.00%	\$8,400,000	\$84,000,000
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)	9.10%	\$3,640,000	\$36,400,000
Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG)	6.70%	\$2,680,000	\$26,800,000
Fresno Council of Governments (FCOG)	2.70%	\$1,080,000	\$10,800,000
Kern Council of Governments (KCOG)	2.50%	\$1,000,000	\$10,000,000
San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG)	2.00%	\$800,000	\$8,000,000
Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG)	1.50%	\$600,000	\$6,000,000
Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG)	1.30%	\$520,000	\$5,200,000
TOTAL		\$40,000,000	\$400,000,000

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

April XX, 2017

Per new procedures, to be modified
and sent to appropriate committees
when needed
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SUPPORT for AB 733 (Berman)

Dear Chair Gonzales- Fletcher:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) is pleased to **SUPPORT** AB 733 (Berman). This bill would revise the projects eligible to be funded using an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFDs) to clarify that those projects that “enable communities to adapt to the impacts of climate change including, but not limited to, extreme weather events, sea level rise, flooding, heat waves, wildfires, and drought” are eligible for funding from an EIFD.

In 2014, SB 628 (Beall) authorized the creation of EIFDs by a local agency to fund the construction of certain types of infrastructure projects. In San Mateo County, the impacts of climate change are very real as our County is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the West and the San Francisco Bay to the East. Our coastal and bay front communities are already seeing the impacts of rising seas and San Mateo County has been referred to as “Ground Zero for sea-level rise. If not addressed, sea-level rise will very soon impact our infrastructure, ports, beaches, and coastal habitats and agriculture. This bill would add a tool to San Mateo County’s tool box for mitigating the effects of climate change.

C/CAG **SUPPORTS** AB 733 and appreciates your favorable consideration of this legislation as our member agencies work to address the impacts of climate change. Please feel free to contact Sandy Wong, C/CAG’s Executive Director, at 650-599-1409 or slwong@smcgov.org with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Alicia Aguirre, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: Assembly Member Kevin Mullin
Assembly Member Marc Berman
Assembly Member Phil Ting
Senator Jerry Hill
Senator Scott Wiener

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

April XX, 2017

The Honorable
Chair
State
Sacramento

Per new procedures, to be modified and sent to appropriate committees when needed

Transportation and Housing Committee

RE: **SUPPORT** for Senate Constitutional Amendment 6 (Wiener)

Dear Senator Beall:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Mateo County, is pleased to write to you today in **SUPPORT** of SCA 6 (Wiener). This measure would lower the voter-threshold for the imposition, extension or increase of a special tax by a local government for transportation purposes, from two-thirds to 55 percent.

As you know, the California Constitution conditions the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of two-thirds of the voters of the city, county, or special district voting on that tax. In recent years, this supermajority requirement has resulted in several major local transportation sales tax proposals narrowly failing passage. For example, Measure X (2016) in nearby Contra Costa County received 62.5 percent approval and Measure B (2016) in Sacramento County received 64.81 percent approval, just short of the 66.7 percent voter-threshold. Both measures would have passed decisively under the revised voter-threshold proposed by this constitutional amendment. San Mateo County, through Measure A (2012), voted to assess a half-cent sales tax to fund transportation improvements in the County. In the coming years, we may be looking to invest more local funding to address the maintenance needs of our local streets & roads.

By lowering the voter-threshold for a special tax for local transportation projects from two-thirds to 55 percent, this constitutional amendment would provide a city, county or special district with a renewed ability to generate new revenue to fund much-needed local transportation projects that increase access to jobs and schools, reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality.

We **SUPPORT** SCA 6 and appreciate Senator Wiener's efforts to make it easier for local agencies to access additional transportation funding as the state and local agencies continue to face significant shortfalls. Please feel free to contact Sandy Wong, the C/CAG Executive Director, at slwong@smcgov.org with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Alicia Aguirre, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: Assembly Member Marc Berman
Assembly Member Kevin Mullin
Assembly Member Phil Ting
Senator Jerry Hill