

# AGENDA

## Legislative Committee

Date: Thursday, December 13, 2018 - 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.  
 Place: San Mateo County Transit District Office<sup>1</sup>  
 1250 San Carlos Avenue  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium  
 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 July 12, 2018.	Action (Gordon)	Pages 1-5
3	Review/ 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).	Action (Update from Shaw/Yoder/Antwih)	Page 6-10
4	Review and recommend approval of the Annual C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2019	Action (Gordon)	Page 11-15
5	Review and approval of the 2019 C/CAG Legislative Committee calendar	Action (Gordon)	Page 16-17
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.

**PUBLIC NOTICING:** All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, and on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

**PUBLIC RECORDS:** Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker. Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

---

<sup>1</sup>From 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  
July 12, 2018**

At 5:35 P.M. the Legislative Committee meeting was called 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.  
Bill Higgins – California Association of Councils of Government (CALCOG) (Call in)  
Sandy Wong, Matt Fabry - C/CAG Staff

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

No public comments.

**2. Approval of Minutes from June 14, 2018.**

Member Garbarino moved and member Vaterlaus seconded approval of the March 8, 2018 minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

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

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

The Legislature is on summer recess at this time and will reconvene on August 6, 2018.

The Budget was sent to the Governor’s office which was signed on June 27, 2018. In the trailer bill a 12-year moratorium on local agency sugar beverage tax was attached to placate the beverage industry, which threatened to introduce a two-thirds requirement on all general taxes. The Governor also added a trailer bill that allows “rainy day fund reserves”, above a \$450 million cap, may be split on rail modernization and affordable housing.

Cap and Trade was passed with very similar programs as last cycle with a new emphasis on programs that expand the use of zero emissions vehicles.

The SB 1 repeal effort has been assigned a proposition number (Proposition 6) and will be on the November 2018 ballot. Recent polling is evenly split and the most effective way to message is to describe projects that are at risk if Proposition 6 passes.

Matt Robinson recommended that the Legislative Committee recommend the Board to take action by taking a position on Proposition 6 that is consistent with the Boards opposition of the SB 1 repeal effort.

AB 1405 (Mullin) - Digital Billboards is not moving forward this year as concerns about safety and scenic highway impacts could not be addressed at the time.

SB 961 (Allen) - Second Neighborhood Infill Finance and Transit Improvements Act removes voter approval for tax increment financing for affordable housing and transportation infrastructure to support affordable housing. This bill makes it easier to define financing districts for property tax and sales tax increments. Amendments were made to protect sales taxes initiatives passed for other purposes (such and the SamTrans sales tax effort) from being rediverted to this purpose.

Member Papan moved and member Mazur seconded the motion to recommend that the C/CAG Board oppose Proposition 6. Motion passed unanimously.

A call was made to the CALCOG Executive Director, Bill Higgins, to discuss his perspective on the issues surrounding both AB 828 (Weiner) and AB 1771 (Bloom). Both bills had some policy overlaps which are problematic.

AB 828 speaks more to how California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) assigns the overall region its number (such as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)) and how the region distributes that number.

AB 1771 deals more with after the region gets the number how the region is supposed to distribute numbers between cities and the appeal process with the goal of furthering affordable housing at a regional level.

Higgins view is that this bill has been improved by taking out the 125% of RHNA zoning requirement in addition to the production rollover requirement. The bill has 3 variables that HCD must consider when setting numbers. Those are vacancy rates, overcrowding rates, and number of cost burdened households. The base number could be increased or decreased (it will likely be an increase for San Mateo County) to increase the size of potential sites for development with the assumption that housing units will follow. There are still outstanding concerns by some local agencies regarding using the same vacancy rate number for rentals and for sale units. Many regions would like a range vs. a number.

Regarding the policy overlap. Both bills have a provision that requires a distribution of housing such that more lower income units would have to go to areas of higher wealth. Both are proposing differing methodologies to make that distribution. This is where CALCOG has a concern. CALOG prefers the methods proposed in SB 828 as a weighting factor over AB 1771. AB 1771 requires a jobs housing fit analysis that is often unavailable or costly to produce.

Member Mazur asked about conflict about how housing may be pushed towards wealthy neighborhoods without transit options while at the same time would also have a weight factor

based on transit hub locations. How does it get reconciled? Because the COG would have more discretion it would give the region more flexibility to make those weights and determinations.

AB 1771 is proposing a more streamlined appeal process which is a positive thing. Under the old process a city would have 60 days to request a revision. The subregion would have 60 days to accept if they would make the change, then there would be another 60 to make an appeal. The proposal allows the Cities to make a request and call it an appeal. This allows other Cities to then comment and then the COG can decide based on all comments received.

AB 1771 also has a different jobs housing fit provision and some consideration of affirmatively furthering affordable housing. There are not as much with this bill except the conflicts with SB 828.

Under these bills COGs are supposed to distribute the housing to address equity and yet the MPO has been given a target to distribute housing to maximize GHG reduction. Those distributions may not look the same and the ability to meet the SB 375 target may be affected. CALCOG wants CARB and HCD to talk and come to one point of resolution.

On a positive note, Blooms office had committed to look at finding funding the RHNA process in the next legislative session.

Member Mazur asked if there were consequences after the inventory of regional fair housing policies take place. The inventory of policies would inform and have an influence of how the numbers get distributed. The League of Cities is still negotiating with the legislatures office on what that would look like.

Member Papan asked about what the League of California Cities (League) concern is at this time. The League is worried about local control and even having the regions make observations about their policies is construed as conceding some of that power. There was a general question as to how the region would judge the effectiveness of a very local policy. The state will not require inclusionary housing rates on a project by project basis.

Member Papan asked about how planned developments were counted or got credit. HCD has a defined process for where they draw the line between planning and construction as far as production credit is concerned. It is not known how temporary rental units are treated by HCD.

In conclusion, staff was directed to facilitate a discussion with others knowledgeable about housing law and policy to investigate the possibility of working with Senator Wiener's office on amendments acceptable to San Mateo County.

Matt Robinson asked if he would recommend C/CAG to take any actions at this time or just to hold tight. Bill said we should thank Weiner and encourage him to talk to Bloom regarding the distribution difference and to point out that it is an unfunded effort. We should also urge him to come back with an idea on how to fund this as part of the budget next year.

Member Mazur requested that, given the short deadlines remaining in session, information about

revisions go out to the members as soon as available. Member O'Connell suggested a recommendation that the Board direct staff to send out any information regarding amendments that they need action on and that the Board authorize the C/CAG Chair and Legislative Chair to direct staff to work with delegate's staff or send letters based on feedback via email. Member Papan stated that any position made should be made by the full Board. (These suggestions were overridden and defined at the C/CAG Board meeting under legal counsel advice).

#### **4. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:27 P.M.

**Legislative Committee 2018 Attendance Record**

Agency	Name	Jan	Feb 8	March 8	April 12	May 10	June 14	July 12	August	Sept 13	Oct	Nov	Dec 13	
Foster City	Catherine Mahanpour			x				x						
Hillsborough	Marie Chuang (C/CAG Vice Chair)		N/A	N/A	Canceled	Canceled	x	x		Canceled				
Menlo Park	Catherine Carlton						x	x						
Millbrae	Gina Papan		x	x			x	x						
Pacifica	Sue Vaterlaus		x	x			x	x						
Portola Valley	Maryann Moise Derwin (C/CAG Chair)		x	x			x	x						
Redwood City	Alicia Aguirre		x	x			N/A	N/A					N/A	
Redwood City	Shelly Masur		x	x			x	x						
San Bruno	Irene O'Connell (Leg Vice Chair)		x	x			x	x						
Sounth San Francisco	Richard Garbarino						x	x						
Woodside	Deborah Gordon (Leg Chair)		x	x			x							

 no meeting

## **C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

Date: December 13, 2018

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.

The legislature is still in recess will reconvene on January 7, 2019. This month's report from our legislative advocate is a recap of the November 6, 2018 elections.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. December 2018 Legislative update from Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih, Inc.
2. Full Legislative information is available for specific bills at <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>



SHAW / YODER / ANTWIH, *inc.*

LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY • ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

**November 27, 2018**

**To:** Board Members, City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

**From:** Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.

**Re: California's 2018 General Election Recap - Updated**

---

The country's midterm elections were held yesterday, November 6. The results of these elections, which are detailed below, are hugely significant to the transportation sector in California, as they determined the fate of Proposition 6 and determined which party will control the Office of the Governor, the California State Legislature, and numerous other statewide offices. The Secretary of State has until mid-December to certify the election results.

#### **Proposition 6**

With most of the votes counted, it appears that California voters have overwhelmingly rejected Proposition 6. We will continue to monitor the vote count and will provide you with the final vote count in our next board report.

Proposition 6 would have repealed \$5.2 billion in new transportation funding, enacted by Senate Bill 1 (Beall & Frazier) [Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017], designed to repair and maintain our state highways and local roads, improve our trade corridors, and support public transit & active transportation projects.

Additionally, Proposition 6 would have amended the State Constitution to require the Legislature to get voter approval for new or increased taxes on the sale, storage, use, or consumption of gasoline or diesel fuel, as well as for taxes paid for the privilege of operating a vehicle on public highways.

#### **Gubernatorial Race**

The race to succeed Governor Brown resulted in Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom and Republican businessman John Cox advancing from the June primary to the November General Election. As expected, Gavin Newsom defeated John Cox by a significant margin. Democrat Eleni Kounalakis will serve as Lieutenant Governor.

#### **US Senate**

In what ultimately became a tighter race than anticipated, California voters selected current US Senator Diane Feinstein to continue to represent the state over State Senator Kevin De Leon.



### **California State Legislative Races**

All California Assembly seats and half of California Senate seats were up for election or reelection this year. While Democrats were expected to keep their strong majority in both houses, their ability to regain a two-thirds supermajority in both houses was uncertain. However, based on last night's results, it looks as though Democrats will obtain the coveted supermajority in both the Senate and the Assembly. If things hold, the Senate would move to 29 Democrats and 11 Republicans and the Assembly would shift to 60 Democrats and 20 Republicans. However, if Senator Ricardo Lara wins the statewide race for Insurance Commissioner, the Senate will need to call a special election to fill his seat and the Senate will drop to 28 Democrats, still enough for a supermajority.

### **California Ballot Propositions**

Originally, 12 statewide propositions were put on the November 2018 ballot. However, Proposition 9 was removed by order of the California Supreme Court. Below is a complete list of the 11 statewide propositions that remained on the November 2018 ballot.

#### **Proposition 1. Authorizes Bonds to Fund Specified Housing Assistance Programs. Legislative Statute.**

Authorizes \$4 billion in general obligation bonds for existing affordable housing programs for low-income residents, veterans, farmworkers, manufactured and mobile homes, infill, and transit-oriented housing. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs to repay bonds averaging about \$170 million annually over the next 35 years.

**YES LEADS 55.5-44.5**

#### **Proposition 2. Authorizes Bonds to Fund Existing Housing Program for Individuals with Mental Illness. Legislative Statute.**

Amends Mental Health Services Act to fund No Place Like Home Program, which finances housing for individuals with mental illness. Ratifies existing law establishing the No Place Like Home Program. Fiscal Impact: Allows the state to use up to \$140 million per year of county mental health funds to repay up to \$2 billion in bonds. These bonds would fund housing for those with mental illness who are homeless.

**PASSED 62.8-37.2**

#### **Proposition 3. Authorizes Bonds to Fund Projects for Water Supply And Quality, Watershed, Fish, Wildlife, Water Conveyance, And Groundwater Sustainability And Storage. Initiative Statute.**

Authorizes \$8.877 billion in state general obligation bonds for various infrastructure projects. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs to repay bonds averaging \$430 million per year over 40 years. Local government savings for water-related projects, likely averaging a couple hundred million dollars annually over the next few decades.

**NO LEADS 48.5-51.5**

#### **Proposition 4. Providing Children's Health Care. Initiative Statute**

Authorizes \$1.5 billion in bonds, to be repaid from state's General Fund, to fund grants for construction, expansion, renovation, and equipping of qualifying children's hospitals. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs to repay bonds averaging about \$80 million annually over the next 35 years.

**PASSED 62-38**

**Proposition 5. Changes Requirements for Certain Property Owners to Transfer Their Property Tax Base to Replacement Property. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.**

Removes certain transfer requirements for homeowners over 55, severely disabled homeowners, and contaminated or disaster-destroyed property. Fiscal Impact: Schools and local governments each would lose over \$100 million in annual property taxes early on, growing to about \$1 billion per year. Similar increase in state costs to backfill school property tax losses.

**FAILED 40.5-59.5**

**Proposition 6. Eliminates Certain Road Repair And Transportation Funding. Requires Certain Fuel Taxes And Vehicle Fees Be Approved By The Electorate. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.**

Repeals a 2017 transportation law's taxes and fees designated for road repairs and public transportation. Fiscal Impact: Reduced ongoing revenues of \$5.2 billion from state fuel and vehicle taxes that mainly would have paid for highway and road maintenance and repairs, as well as transit programs.

**NO LEADS 43.2-56.8**

**Proposition 7. Conforms California Daylight Saving Time to Federal Law. Allows Legislature to Change Daylight Saving Time Period. Legislative Statute.**

Gives Legislature ability to change daylight saving time period by two-thirds vote, if changes are consistent with federal law. Fiscal Impact: This measure has no direct fiscal effect because changes to daylight saving time would depend on future actions by the Legislature and potentially the federal government.

**PASSED 60-40**

**Proposition 8. Regulates Amounts Outpatient Kidney Dialysis Clinics Charge For Dialysis Treatment. Initiative Statute.**

Requires rebates and penalties if charges exceed limit. Requires annual reporting to the state. Prohibits clinics from refusing to treat patients based on payment source. Fiscal Impact: Overall annual effect on state and local governments ranging from net positive impact in the low tens of millions of dollars to net negative impact in the tens of millions of dollars.

**FAILED 39.6-60.4**

**Proposition 10. Expands Local Governments' Authority to Enact Rent Control On Residential Property. Initiative Statute.**

Repeals state law that currently restricts the scope of rent control policies that cities and other local jurisdictions may impose on residential property. Fiscal Impact: Potential net reduction in state and local revenues of tens of millions of dollars per year in the long term. Depending on actions by local communities, revenue losses could be less or considerably more.

**FAILED 39.9-60.1**

**Proposition 11. Requires Private-Sector Emergency Ambulance Employees to Remain On-Call During Work Breaks. Eliminates Certain Employer Liability. Initiative Statute.**

Law entitling hourly employees to breaks without being on-call would not apply to private-sector ambulance employees. Fiscal Impact: Likely fiscal benefit to local governments (in the form of lower costs and higher revenues), potentially in the tens of millions of dollars each year.

**PASSED 60-40**

**Proposition 12. Establishes New Standards For Confinement Of Specified Farm Animals; Bans Sale Of Noncomplying Products. Initiative Statute.**

Establishes minimum requirements for confining certain farm animals. Prohibits sales of meat and egg products from animals confined in noncomplying manner. Fiscal Impact: Potential decrease in state income tax revenues from farm businesses, likely not more than several million dollars annually. State costs up to \$10 million annually to enforce the measure.

**PASSED 62.2-37.8**

## **C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

Date: December 13, 2018  
To: C/CAG Legislative Committee  
From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director  
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Annual C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2019

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

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Legislative Committee review and recommend approval of the Annual C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2019.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Many of the policies listed in the attached document have the potential to increase or decrease the fiscal resources available to C/CAG member agencies.

### **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

New legislation

### **BACKGROUND**

Each year, the C/CAG Board adopts a set of legislative policies to provide direction to its Legislative Committee, staff, and legislative advocates. In the past, the C/CAG Board established policies that:

- Clearly defined a policy framework at the beginning of the Legislative Session.
- Identified specific policies to be accomplished during this session by C/CAG's legislative advocates.
- Limited the activities of C/CAG to areas where we can have the greatest impact.

The adoption of a list of policies will maximize the impact of having legislative advocates represent C/CAG in Sacramento and will also significantly reduce the amount of C/CAG staff time needed to support the program.

Recommendations from the Legislative Committee on December 13, 2018 will be presented verbally to the Board. If substantial modifications are requested from the committee a subsequent draft will be presented again at the next committee and corresponding Board meeting.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Draft C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2019

## C/CAG LEGISLATIVE POLICIES FOR ~~2018~~2019

### ***Policy #1 -***

***Protect against the diversion of local revenues and promote equitable distribution of state/regional resources and revenues.***

- 1.1 Support League, CSAC, and other initiatives to protect local revenues.
- 1.2 Provide incentives and tools to local government to promote economic vitality ~~and to alleviate blighted conditions.~~
- 1.3 Support appropriate new funding or the reinstatement of state funding for economic development and affordable housing, including the use of tax-increment financing or “Redevelopment 2.0.”
- 1.4 Pursue and support efforts that direct state and regional funds equitably to ensure a return to source.

### ***Policy #2 -***

***Protect against increased local costs resulting from State action without 100% State reimbursement for the resulting costs.***

- 2.1 Support State actions that take into consideration the fiscal impact to local jurisdictions, by ensuring that adequate funding is made available by the State, for delegated re-alignment responsibilities and by ensuring that all State mandates are 100% reimbursed.
- 2.2 Oppose State actions that delegate responsibilities to local jurisdictions without full reimbursement for resulting costs.

### ***Policy #3 -***

***Support actions that help to meet municipal stormwater permit requirements and secure stable funding to pay for current and future regulatory mandates.***

- 3.1 Primary focus on securing additional revenue sources for both C/CAG and its member agencies for funding state- and federally mandated stormwater compliance efforts.
  - a. Advocate for funding for implementing the San Mateo County Stormwater Resource Plan and local Green Infrastructure Plans to support long-term reductions in bacteria, trash, mercury, ~~and PCBs~~, and other pollutants discharging to the Bay and Ocean and to reduce flooding, recharge groundwater, adapt to a changing climate, and enhance communities.
  - b. Advocate for inclusion of water quality and stormwater management as a priority for funding in new sources of revenues (e.g. water bonds) and protect against a geographically unbalanced North-South allocation of resources.
  - c. Track and advocate for resources for stormwater management in State and Federal grant and loan programs.

- d. Support efforts to identify regulatory requirements that are unfunded state mandates and ensure provision of state funding for such requirements.
  - e. Pursue and support efforts that address stormwater issues at statewide or regional levels and thereby reduce the cost share for C/CAG and its member agencies and limit the need to implement such efforts locally.
  - e.f. Advocate for better integration between parallel statewide efforts to manage stormwater for water quality improvement, long-term climate change adaptation, and groundwater recharge.
- 3.2 Support efforts to secure statewide legislation mandating abatement of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in building materials prior to demolition of relevant structures, in accordance with requirements in the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board's Municipal Regional Permit.
  - 3.3 Pursue and support efforts that control pollutants at the source and extend producer responsibility, especially in regard to trash and litter control.
  - 3.4 Support efforts to place the burden/ accountability of reporting, managing, and meeting municipal stormwater requirements on the responsible source rather than the cities or county, such as properties that are known pollutant hot spots and third party utility purveyors.
  - 3.5 Advocate for integrated, prioritized, and achievable stormwater regulations that protect water quality and beneficial uses and account for limitations on municipal funding.
  - 3.6 Pursue and support pesticide regulations that protect water quality and reduce pesticide toxicity.
  - 3.7 Support legislative efforts to provide additional funding for stormwater projects into San Mateo County.

***Policy #4 -  
Advocate and support an integrated approach to funding.***

- 4.1 Advocate for ~~an appropriate and effective~~ integrated approaches to both funding and project types for statewide and regional infrastructure efforts including stormwater management, transportation, and affordable housing.
- 4.2 Advocate for efforts that ~~breakdown funding silos and~~ provide flexibility in funding sources to enable a holistic approach to fund programs and projects.

***Policy #5 -  
Support lowering the 2/3rd super majority vote for local special purpose taxes and fees.***

- 5.1 Support constitutional amendments that reduce the vote requirements for special taxes and fees.

5.2 Oppose bills that impose restrictions on the expenditures, thereby reducing flexibility, for special tax category.

~~5.3 Support modification or elimination of the Proposition 26 two-thirds requirements.~~

***Policy #6-  
Protect and support transportation funding.***

6.1 Support ~~ACA 5 and other~~ efforts that protect transportation revenues from being pledged, transferred, or used for non-transportation purposes.

6.2 ~~Oppose the repeal of SB 1 (The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017) and s~~Support the implementation of SB 1 programs.

6.3 Monitor and engage in the implementation of the SB 1077 “Road User Charge.”

6.4 Support revisions in the Peninsula Joint Powers Agreement that provide equitable funding among the Caltrain partners.

6.5 Support a dedicated funding source for the operation of Caltrain and monitor the implementation of High Speed Rail.

6.6 Support efforts to secure the appropriation and allocation of “cap and trade” revenues to support San Mateo County needs.

6.7 Support or sponsor efforts that finance and/ or facilitate operational improvements on the US 101 corridor.

6.8 Support alternative contracting methods, such as Public Private Partnerships, that could result in project cost savings.

~~6.8 Support the development of an expenditure plan for a potential countywide sales tax measure to fund transportation in San Mateo County.~~

~~6.9 Support the development of a new bridge toll program (Regional Measure 3) and ensure an appropriate share of new revenues is available for projects in San Mateo County.~~

***Policy #7 -  
Advocate for revenue solutions to address State budget issues that are also beneficial to Cities/  
Counties***

7.1 Support measures to ensure that local governments receive appropriate revenues to service local communities.

7.2 Support measures and policies that encourage and facilitate public private partnerships.

***Policy #8 -***

***Support reasonable climate protection action, Greenhouse Gas reduction, and energy conservation legislation***

- 8.1 Support incentive approaches toward implementing AB 32, SB 32 and AB 398.
- 8.2 Oppose climate legislation that would conflict with or override projects approved by the voters.
- 8.3 Support funding for both transportation and housing investments, which support the implementation of SB 375, so that housing funds are not competing with transportation funds.
- 8.4 Monitor the regulatory process for implementing SB 743 and impacts the new regulations may have on congestion management plans.
- 8.5 Alert the Board on legislation that would require recording of vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as part of vehicle registration.
- 8.6 Support local government partnerships to foster energy conservation, as well as the generation and use of renewable and/ or clean energy sources (wind, solar, etc.).
- 8.7 Support efforts to improve the disadvantage community screening tools used by the state on the allocation of “cap and trade” and other state funding programs to ensure that San Mateo county needs are reflected.

***Policy #9 -***

***Protection of water user rights***

- 9.1 Support the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Association (BAWSCA) efforts in the protection of water user rights for San Mateo County users.

***Policy #10 –***

***Other***

- 10.1 Support/sponsor legislation that identifies revenue to fund airport/land use compatibility plans.

10.2 Monitor legislation that impacts local housing and land use authority.

- 10.23 Support efforts that will engage the business community in mitigating industry impacts associated with stormwater, transportation congestion, affordable housing, greenhouse gas emissions, and energy consumption.

10.4 Support legislative efforts to create a unified voice in San Mateo County and to manage integrated water issues including sea level rise, flooding, coastal erosion, and stormwater vulnerabilities.



## **C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

Date: December 13, 2018  
To: C/CAG Legislative Committee  
From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director  
Subject: Review and approval of the 2019 C/CAG Legislative Committee calendar.

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

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee review and approve the 2019 C/CAG Legislative Committee calendar.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

None

### **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

N/A

### **BACKGROUND**

The C/CAG Legislative Committee generally meets just before the C/CAG Board meeting. The C/CAG Board does will meet in August therefore no meeting is planned for August. The Legislative session generally is scheduled to start in January, after New Year's, and close at the end of August. It is proposed to hold no Legislative Committee meetings in October and November.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed 2019 Legislative meeting calendar

**C/CAG Legislative Committee  
2019 Calendar**

**City / County Association of Governments  
of San Mateo County (C/CAG)**

Time: 5:30 p. m. to 6:30 p.m.

Location: 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium  
San Mateo County Transit District  
1250 San Carlos Avenue  
San Carlos

January 10

February 14

March 14

April 11 – Alternate room location

May 9

June 13

July 11

August – No meeting is scheduled

September 12

October – No meeting is scheduled

November – No meeting is scheduled

December 12

---

NOTE: This schedule is subject to change should significant issues arise or develop over the course of the year.