

# 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*

## C/CAG Legislative Committee MEETING NOTICE

<b>Date:</b> Thursday, May 14, 2026  <b>Time:</b> 5:30 p.m.  <b>Location:</b> 455 County Center 1 <sup>st</sup> Floor, Room 101 Redwood City, CA 94063	<b>Join by Webinar:</b> <a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81858078521?pwd=kS1VuLvmYkkHQto3NdOJCUwp6y4NKf.1">https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81858078521?pwd=kS1VuLvmYkkHQto3NdOJCUwp6y4NKf.1</a>  <b>Webinar ID:</b> 818 5807 8521  <b>Password:</b> 051426  <b>Join by Phone:</b> (669) 900-6833
---	---

**\*\*\*IN-PERSON MEETING WITH REMOTE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION  
AVAILABLE \*\*\***

**Chair:** Adam Rak **Vice Chair:** Eddie Flores

**Members:** Andrea Pappajohn, Anders Fung, Elizabeth Lewis, Elmer Martínez Saballos, Gina Papan, Greg Wright, Lisa Gauthier, Michael Salazar (C/CAG Chair), Stacy Jimenez (C/CAG Vice Chair),

This meeting of the Legislative Committee will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public will be able to participate in the meeting remotely via the Zoom platform or in person at the location above. The Committee welcomes comments, including criticism, about the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the Board and committees. Speakers shall not disrupt, disturb, or otherwise impede the orderly conduct of a Committee meeting. For information regarding how to participate in the meeting, either in person or remotely, please refer to the instructions at the end of the agenda.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Meeting Agenda

No.	Item	Speaker	Pages
1.	Call to Order	Rak	
2.	Roll call	Petrofsky	
3.	Public comment on items not on the agenda.	Rak	
4.	Review and approve the Legislative Committee meeting minutes from the meeting held on April 9, 2026.	Action Petrofsky	4 - 8
5.	Review legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)	Possible Action Robinson/Antwih/Shaw Rak	9 - 31
6.	Adjournment	Rak	

**Next Meeting: June 11, 2026**

---

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact C/CAG staff:

**Acting Executive Director:** Kaki Cheung at [kcheung1@smcgov.org](mailto:kcheung1@smcgov.org)

**Senior Program Specialist:** Matt Petrofsky at [mpetrofsky@smcgov.org](mailto:mpetrofsky@smcgov.org)

**Clerk of the C/CAG Board:** Mima Crume (650) 599-1406

**PUBLIC NOTICING:** All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Courtyard, 555 County Center, Redwood City, 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 office of 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>. Please note that C/CAG's office is temporarily closed to the public; please contact Mima Crume at (650) 599-1406 or [mcrume@smcgov.org](mailto:mcrume@smcgov.org) to arrange for inspection of public records.

**ADA REQUESTS:** Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Matt Petrofsky at (650) 453-0696 or [mpetrofsky@smcgov.org](mailto:mpetrofsky@smcgov.org) by 10:00 a.m. on the day prior to the meeting date.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Members of the public may address the Board as follows:

**Written comments** should be emailed in advance of the meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. Your written comment should be emailed to [mpetrofsky@smcgov.org](mailto:mpetrofsky@smcgov.org).
2. Your email should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda.
3. Members of the public are limited to one comment per agenda item.
4. If your emailed comment is received at least 2 hours prior to the meeting, it will be provided to the C/CAG Board members, made publicly available on the C/CAG website along with the agenda. Emails received less than 2 hours before the meeting will be provided to the C/CAG Board members and included in the administrative record of the meeting as soon as practicable.

**Spoken comments** will be accepted during the meeting in person and through Zoom. Public comments will be taken first by speakers in person followed by via Zoom. Please read the following instructions carefully:

**\*In-person participation:**

1. Members of the public who wish to speak on matters not on the agenda will be given an opportunity to address the Committee during the agenda item titled "Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda." Members of the public who wish to speak on a matter on the agenda will have two minutes each to address the Committee on that agenda item unless a different time limit is established by the Chair. No speaker who has already spoken on an item will be entitled to speak to that item again. At the call of the Chair, public comments will be taken in-person and remote. Public comments will be taken first by speakers in person followed by via Zoom. If you have documents you wish to distribute to the Committee and include in the official record, please hand it to the C/CAG Staff who will distribute the information to the Committee members and staff.

**\*Remote participation:**

1. The C/CAG Board meeting may be accessed through Zoom at the online location indicated at the top of this agenda.
2. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting using an internet browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
3. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by your name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
4. When the C/CAG Clerk or Chair call for the item on which you wish to speak, click on "raise hand." The Clerk will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called on to speak. If calling in via phone, press \*9 to raise your hand and when called upon press \*6 to unmute.
5. When called, please limit your remarks to the time allotted.

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact C/CAG staff:

Acting Executive Director: Kaki Cheung at [kcheung1@smcgov.org](mailto:kcheung1@smcgov.org)

Clerk of the Board: Mima Crume (650) 599-1406 or [mcrume@smcgov.org](mailto:mcrume@smcgov.org)

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: May 14, 2026  
To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Legislative Committee  
From: Matt Petrofsky, Committee Staff  
Subject: Review and approve the Legislative Committee meeting minutes from the meeting held on April 9, 2026

(For further information contact Matt Petrofsky at [mpetrofsky@smcgov.org](mailto:mpetrofsky@smcgov.org))

---

### RECOMMENDATION

That the Legislative Committee review and approve the Legislative Committee meeting minutes from the meeting held on April 9, 2026.

### ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft C/CAG Legislative Committee Meeting Minutes, April 9, 2026

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

**Draft Meeting Minutes  
April 9, 2026 Meeting**

**Staff and Guests Attending:**C/CAG Staff:

Matt Petrofsky, Sean Charpentier, Mima Crume, Kaki Cheung, Susy Kalkin

Legislative Consultants:

Matt Robinson  
Lizzie Cootsona

Others Attending:

N/A

**1. Call to Order.**

Vice-chair Rak called the meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

**2. Roll call.**

C/CAG staff conducted roll call, seven members were present, representing a quorum. MTC Commissioner Gina Papan was also present.

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>In Person</b>	<b>Remote AB 2449</b>
Atherton	Elizabeth Lewis	X	
Burlingame	Andrea Pappajohn		
Foster City	Stacy Jimenez	X	
Millbrae	Anders Fung	X	
Pacifica	Greg Wright	X	
San Bruno	Michael Salazar	X	
San Carlos	Adam Rak (Vice-Chair)	X	
San Mateo County	Lisa Gauthier		
South SF	Eddie Flores	X	
MTC*	Gina Papan	X	

\*the MTC Commissioner seat is non-voting, and does not count towards quorum

**3. Public comment on items not on the agenda.**

No public comment on items not on the agenda.

**4. Review and approve the Legislative Committee meeting minutes from the meeting held on March 12, 2026.**

The Committee voted on approval of the minutes of the March 12, 2026 meeting, with a motion from Member Salazar, seconded by Member Flores. A vote was taken, and the motion passed (7,0,0).

**5. Nominate and elect a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for the C/CAG Legislative Committee for 2026.**

For the position of Chair, Adam Rak was nominated by member Flores, seconded by member Wright. For the position of Vice Chair, member Flores was nominated by member Rak, seconded by member Lewis. No other nominations were made for either position. Votes were taken both positions, and the motions passed for (7,0,0) and (7,0,0)

**6. Review legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)**

C/CAG Executive Director Charpentier let the Committee know that:

- On March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2026, then CCAG Chair Adam Rak, Vice Chair Michael Salazar, incoming Vice Chair Stacy Jimenez, and MTC Commissioner Gina Papan went to Sacramento to meet with 5 legislators and key committee staff. At these meetings the team was able to advocate for CCAG positions, and learn about upcoming legislative priorities.
- State Senator Weiner's office was not considering pursuing revisions to SB79 through SB908, and would instead rely on the recently released HCD guidance. Also that the MTC recently released their maps of draft impact areas, and that CCAG would likely pursue a support position of related legislation AB2576, discussed later in the meeting.
- Of the three projects submitted for federal funding, one had been recommended by Congressman Mullen to move forward. That project being the \$1.8 million construction of green infrastructure on Fordham Ave in East Palo Alto, green infrastructure and complete streets infrastructure at around two schools in Daly City for both design and construction, and starting the planning and design of green infrastructure and complete streets along Grand Ave in South San Francisco. Meetings with Senator Padilla and Schiff's staff have also occurred.
- Comments had been taken regarding ebike legislation from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). Comments had been largely consistent with existing C/CAG positions, with a slight emphasis on manufacturer regulation over regulation/penalization of users.
- An amended support letter for the 1557 Papan bill had been submitted due to timing. A ratification of that letter was requested for later in the meeting.
- The State through CalEnviroScreen 5.0 was producing new Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) maps. This updated version eliminates several DACs in the county, both East Palo Alto, North Fair Oaks, and several of the others due to a lack of indicators that take into account regional differences in income and cost of living. There was a staff comment period. Several jurisdictions submitted comments. CCAG will likely look to submit a letter via the legislative delegation.

C/CAG Legislative Consultants Matt Robinson and Lizzie Cootsona from Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmeltzer & Lange (SYASL) provided an update to the Committee, based on their monthly report provided in the agenda packet.

A overview of the legislative year included:

- Passed - deadline for the introduction of new bills.
- Passed – deadline for spot bills amending.
- Almost 1,500 total bills are moving.
- Policy committees see bills through May
- May 14 – Appropriations Committee has the suspense file hearing

Legislation discussed included:

- AB2576 (Harabedian): institutes a one-year delay on SB79 implementation and adds a slight adjustment to city populations triggers.
  - Recommended is support with recommended amendments. Those amendments are the same as were in the 908 letter, except for the language on ferry's as there is no longer legislation (908) bringing ferry service under SB79 impacts.
- SB 1167 (Blakespear): sets clearer definitions for e-bikes versus e-motos. Supported by
  - Recommend support position
- AB 2346 (Wilson): moved out of the Transportation to the Judiciary committee
- AB 1557 (Papan): a definitional issue was noted. The bill would be heard on 4/13.
- AB 2595 (Papan): would allow for pilot programs banning ebikes based on age thresholds within jurisdictions that decide to enact them.
  - A support position had been taken at the previous Legislative Committee meeting. A further conversation would be had at the full Board meeting.
  - There is no hearing date for this bill yet.
  - Member Flores expressed concerns about the possibility for increased police interactions with minors, and noted a lack of ability for law enforcement to appropriately apply ages to children without IDs. Member Flores also asked if the bill would provide funding to establish educational programs.
  - Matt Robinson gave a summary of a conversation had with staff from the City of Carlsbad, which has a pilot program in place. Carlsbad did not intend for this law to be used as the basis for a stop. They intend for the law to be used as a deterrent and opportunity for education. Matt also noted the inability of the courts system to process minors, and clarified that the bill did not provide and funding.
- AB 2051 (Wicks): directs the Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), to convene an interagency Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group to provide recommendations to the administration and legislature to streamline and accelerate permitting for coastal resilience and sea level rise adaptation projects. This bill passed its first committee, and has no opposition at this time.
  - A support position was recommended.
- AB 2296 (Papan): revision of AB650 (vetoed). This bill works to improve the RHNA process by starting it 6 months earlier, requires HCD to provide clear and consistent feedback, and staggers housing element due dates with COGS.
  - A support position was recommended.
  - Member Rak asked about if the legislation limited the number of times the HCD could provide comment. SYASL said it should by enacting a limited time window for the HCD to provide comment in.
  - Member Jimenez asked if it would build in an appeals process. SYASL will find out more information and return with an answer at a later date.
- There was no public comment during any of the conversation. A summary of the bills and positions taken is below.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Motion</b>	<b>Seconded</b>	<b>Vote</b>
2576 (Harabedian)	Support, with requested amendments	Salazar	Rak	7, 0, 0
1167 (Blakespear)	Support	Lewis	Rak	7, 0, 0
AB 2051 (Wicks)	Support	Rak	Salazar	7, 0, 0
AB 2296 (Papan)	Support	Salazar	Flores	7, 0, 0
AB 1157 (Papan)	Ratify amended support letter	Lewis	Flores	7, 0, 0

Other questions and conversation included:

- Member Flores asked about Senate and Assembly Transportation Committees convening informational hearings on e-bike policies this summer to allow cities the opportunity to share about challenges. SYASL will follow up on this.
- Member Papan gave an update on SB 63:
  - MTC is required to conduct a two-phase financial efficiency review of the four regional agencies. MTC hired an independent consultant who issued an 85-page report. They will have a hearing on the 17th.
  - Primary findings include that transit agencies have undertaken numerous cost-saving and revenue-enhancing measures between 2020 and 2025: AC Transit (\$2 million in operating cost savings), BART (\$516 m), Caltrain (\$76 m), and SFMTA (\$302 m).
  - Caltrain passed a resolution to increase activity at their stations. MTC plans to pass a policy to encourage all operators to make their stations more active.
  - The report would be sent to Executive Director Charpentier to distribute.
- Executive Director Charpentier

Watch list bills:

- SB 1087: bill has been amended substantially recently, but core goals of the bill at this time are to modernize sustainable community strategy (SCS) requirements by:
  - Increasing the roll of the California Transportation Commission in establishing the targets for the region
  - delaying the requirements for SCS completion to every eight years instead of with the RTP cycle.
  - Include heavy and medium duty transportation into scoring calculations
  - Realigning some of the transportation funding programs
- SB 1361 (Durazo): Limited exemption for SB79 in County of Los Angeles.
- AB 1569 (Davies): ebike parking at schools, no updates from previous discussions. To remain watch until passes through Policy Committee
- AB2313 (Berman): would require the Public Utilities Commission to compel gas companies to provide an alternative program to replacing their gas lines, reinvesting that money into decarbonization instead. Policy committees upcoming.

## **7. Adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:30.

**C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

Date: May 14, 2026

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Legislative Committee

From: Kaki Cheung, Acting Executive Director

Subject: Review legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)

(For further information, contact Matt Petrofsky at [mpetrofsky@smcgov.org](mailto:mpetrofsky@smcgov.org))

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

C/CAG staff recommend that the C/CAG Legislative Committee review the legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)

**FISCAL IMPACT**

N/A

**SOURCE OF FUNDS**

N/A

**BACKGROUND**

The C/CAG Legislative Committee receives monthly written reports and oral briefings from C/CAG's State legislative advocate, Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange (Consultant). Important legislative topics and any votes on positions taken or other actions recommended by the Legislative Committee to the C/CAG Board are reported to the full C/CAG Board through this item.

Key updates and any recommended positions are advanced to the C/CAG Board for consideration. The Consultant's full report (Attachment 1) provides updates on legislative timelines, the State Budget, leadership and committee changes, State grant programs, recent hearings, and bill activity relevant to C/CAG since the last Board meeting.

## DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

### **AB 2313 (Berman) – RECOMMENDED SUPPORT**

AB 2313 would require the California Public Utilities Commission to establish a program requiring gas utilities to offer residential customers financial incentives to transition away from gas service in lieu of replacing aging gas distribution lines. The program would apply to customers in areas where gas line replacement is planned or anticipated within the next five years, providing an alternative that may reduce infrastructure costs, support emissions reductions, and advance electrification goals. Recent amendments would sunset the program on January 1, 2035. The bill is currently in the Assembly Appropriations Committee. Staff recommends a support position, as the bill aligns with C/CAG's climate, sustainability, and cost-efficiency priorities.

### **E-Bike Legislation – New Tracking Matrix and Active Positions**

E-bike policy continues to be a prominent and fast-evolving issue at the State level, with at least nine active bills under consideration this legislative cycle.

A comprehensive E-Bike Bill Matrix summarizing each bill, key provisions, and C/CAG's adopted or recommended positions can be seen in Attachment 2. C/CAG has taken positions on several key e-bike bills including SB 1167, AB 1557, AB 2346, and AB 2595. No additional Board action is requested at this time.

### **Legislative Advocacy and Comment Letters**

#### **CalEnviroScreen (CES) 5.0 Comment Letter**

The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) recently released a draft of the CalEnviroScreen (CES) 5.0 tool, which uses environmental, health and socioeconomic data to designate California's Disadvantaged Communities (DACs). DAC designation is a key determinant of eligibility for a wide range of State funding programs, and communities not identified as DACs may face challenges in accessing these resources. While certain population-based indicators are adjusted to reflect regional differences, many remain unscaled. As a result, communities in high-cost regions such as San Mateo County may lose out on funding opportunities due to ineligibility, despite demonstrating significant need. CES 5.0 continues this approach. In response, C/CAG submitted a comment letter through its legislative delegation requesting that OEHHA refine its methodology by incorporating regionally scaled population-based indicators to more accurately capture local conditions.

The letter can be found as Attachment 3. [The County of San Mateo](#) and [the MTC](#) also submitted letters through the public comment period that may be of interest.

#### **AB130 Guidance Comment Letter**

Signed in 2025, Assembly Bill 130: Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Mitigation Program provides an additional option for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) projects to mitigate transportation impacts by helping to fund "location-efficient" affordable housing and related infrastructure projects. The Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) released [draft guidance](#) with a window for public comment that closed on May 8. C/CAG submitted a

comment letter recommending refinements to strengthen the connection between project impacts and mitigation investments. Specifically, C/CAG encouraged the State to prioritize, where feasible, mitigation projects that are both location-efficient and geographically proximate to the developments generating the impacts, before considering projects elsewhere in the region. This approach would help ensure that mitigation funds more directly offset project-generated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) while maintaining flexibility to invest regionally when necessary. That letter can be found as Attachment 4.

#### CARB Cap-and-Invest / GGRF Coalition Letter

C/CAG joined a coalition of regional transportation agencies and Metropolitan Planning Organizations expressing concerns regarding proposed changes to the State's Cap on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Market-Based Compliance Mechanisms, which could significantly reduce Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) revenues and impact funding availability for transportation, housing, and climate programs. The letter can be found as Attachment 5.

#### SB 79 (Wiener) and Related Legislation Update

As previously reported, SB 79 establishes increased residential density allowances near qualifying transit stops and has significant implications for local land use and transportation planning. Since the last update, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has released initial implementation guidance, and broader "clean-up" efforts have not advanced as anticipated. On May 1, C/CAG submitted a letter to Senator Becker and Assemblymembers Berman and Papan expressing our concerns, including impacts to local planning authority, coordination with transit investments (including BRT corridors), and economic considerations. That letter is included as Attachment 6. Legislative activity has instead shifted toward more targeted implementation measures.

One such proposal is **SB 1361 (Durazo)**, which was significantly amended in April. The bill would limit local agency actions related to SB 79 by prohibiting jurisdictions from reducing transit service levels, conditioning transit project approvals, or withholding support for transit funding applications based on the additional density or height allowed under SB 79. The bill is currently on the Senate Floor.

Staff will return to the Board if additional action or direction is warranted.

#### Submitted Federal and State Applications

##### Targeted Approach to Reducing PCBs (TARP) project

C/CAG was recently notified that it has successfully secured a \$3.8 million grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to support efforts to reduce Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs), a toxic industrial chemical, in San Mateo County. C/CAG will provide approximately \$1.27 million in local matching funds, resulting in the delivery of a project valued at more than \$5 million. Staff will be preparing letters of appreciation to legislative representatives in recognition of their support for this funding effort.

##### Integrated Green Stormwater Infrastructure Streets project

While it is still very early in this process, Congressman Mullin has requested \$1,880,000 for this project via the THUD Highway Infrastructure Program funds program from the House Appropriations Committee. A thank you letter was delivered to Congressman Mullin from the

C/CAG chair, see Attachment 7.

Staff are working with our federal advocate Ken Brown regarding additional federal funding requests.

## **EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS**

The C/CAG Legislative Committee considers equity in its positions on legislation and has included equity language in the annual Legislative Priorities document for C/CAG Board review and approval. Decisions made in relation to transportation, housing, stormwater, and climate resilience have the potential to impact our most vulnerable communities in San Mateo County.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. C/CAG Legislative Update, May 1, 2026 from Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange
2. Matrix of E-Bike Bills
3. CalEnviroscreen (CES) 5.0 Comment Letter
4. AB130 Draft Guidance Comment Letter
5. CARB Cap-and-Invest / GGRF Coalition Letter
6. SB 79 Letter to Senator Becker and Assemblymembers Berman and Papan
7. Thank you letter to Congressman Mullin
8. For the relevant letters of support and project descriptions, see attachments for Agenda item #9 for the 5/14/26 C/CAG Board Meeting at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/board-of-directors-2/>)

Below are informational links:

- [Recent Joint ABAG MTC Legislation Committee Agendas](#)
- [California State Association of Counties \(CSAC\) bill positions and tracking](#)
- [California Associations of Councils of Government \(CALCOG\) bill tracking](#)
- Full Legislative search is available for specific bills at <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>
- [2026 California State Calendar of Legislative Deadlines](#)
- San Mateo County Delegation
  - [Legislation from Assemblymember Marc Berman](#)
  - [Legislation from Assemblymember Diane Papan](#)
  - [Legislation from Assemblymember Catherine Stefani](#)
  - [Legislation from Senator Josh Becker](#)
  - [Legislation from Senator Scott Wiener](#)
- Bill Tracker for C/CAG by SYASL: [C/CAG Bill Tracking](#)
- Current client roster for Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange - <https://syaslparters.com/clients/>



May 1, 2026

To: Board of Directors  
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

From: Matt Robinson, Andrew Antwih and Lizzie Guansona  
Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange

Re: **STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – May 2026**

---

***Legislative Update***

On March 26, the Legislature broke for Spring Recess and reconvened on April 6. Upon their return, policy committees and budget subcommittees in both houses continue to review legislation introduced in the session and the Governor’s budget proposals, with April 24 as the last day for policy committees to hear and report to fiscal committees fiscal bills introduced in their house; the last day for policy committees to hear and report to the Floor non-fiscal bills introduced in their house is May 1. On May 14, the pivotal suspense file hearing will take place, where all bills with a fiscal cost to the state over a certain threshold are either held or advanced, largely based on their fiscal impact on the state. All bills will then need to pass out of their house of origin by May 29.

Also on May 14, the Governor is expected to release the May Revise, the mid-year update to the proposed Fiscal Year 2026-27 budget. [A recent report](#) from the Legislative Analyst’s Office paints a bleak picture as we head into the next stage of the budget negotiations, stating that our state spending has grown at an unsustainable rate over the last six years and suggesting legislators will be forced to make difficult choices about raising taxes or making cuts to reduce out-year deficits.

For information about key legislative and budget deadlines for next year, please see the 2026 Legislative Calendar [here](#).

***CARB Releases Proposed Regulations to Cap-and-Invest Compliance Mechanisms***

On April 14, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) released its [Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for the California Cap on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Market-Based Compliance Mechanisms](#). The proposed amendments aim to implement the technical changes made to the Cap-and-Invest Program by [AB 1207 \(Irwin\) \[Chapter 117, Statutes of 2025\]](#), which largely focus on addressing industry leakage from California and the program's cost impacts to Californians.

The amendments propose, among other things, to significantly expand the number of free allowances provided to utility companies on the Cap-and-Invest auction market, in order to increase the size of the existing climate credit rebate returned annually to California's utility customers. Additionally, CARB is proposing sell allowances to fund a new manufacturing incentive for industry. This, in turn, would reduce the overall number of allowances that may be sold by CARB for and would result in a significant reduction in Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) revenues through at least 2030. Early assumptions predict this would reduce GGRF revenues *by half*, to approximately \$2 billion annually.

Given the changes to the GGRF Expenditure Plan approved last year in [SB 840 \(Limon\) \[Chapter 121, Statutes of 2026\]](#), this reduction would likely mean that, unless the regulations are further amended, or the new GGRF tiers reconsidered, the state will not have sufficient GGRF to fund Tier 3 programs (i.e. Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities). C/CAG has joined a coalition of transportation agencies, metropolitan planning organizations, and regional transportation planning agencies to express concerns to CARB regarding these proposed amendments.

### **CalEnviroScreen 5.0**

Earlier this year, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) released a draft of the last version of the [CalEnviroScreen](#) tool, which uses environmental, health, and socioeconomic information to designate California's Disadvantaged Communities (DACs). As with the prior versions of CalEnviroScreen, many of the assessed socio-economic indicators are not scaled to reflect local or regional differences and are instead based on state or federal averages. Not accounting for these regional differences leads to understatement of hardship in high-cost regions like San Mateo County and the wider Bay Area, where communities may, for example, have higher incomes than state averages but still face significant hardship due to increased costs of living. The result is that vulnerable communities in the Bay Area have historically been less likely to be designated as DACs and, therefore, less likely to qualify for funding from programs that rely on CalEnviroScreen scores. In light of these concerns, C/CAG has requested the San Mateo legislative delegation provide comments to this effect to OEHHA and has requested that OEHHA more widely incorporate regionally adjusted measures to better capture economic and other population-based vulnerabilities in high-cost regions.

### **Vehicle License Fee Shortfall**

On April 28, the [Assembly Budget Subcommittee #5 on State Administration](#) discussed the Vehicle License Fee (VLF) shortfall for San Mateo County and its cities, as well as the County's related request for \$157 million in this year's State Budget. As you likely know, San Mateo County has challenged the state budget action with litigation. The committee's staff recommends that "the Assembly not provide any new funding to any county for any new purpose until this litigation is settled." Despite this recommendation, there was a robust discussion led by Assemblymember Diane Papan and a significant showing of advocates from San Mateo at the hearing who spoke to how the cuts would impact critical county services. SYASL provided comments on behalf of C/CAG. Also in attendance were C/CAG Board Members: South San Francisco Councilmember Eddie Flores, Foster City

Councilmember Stacy Jimenez, and Pacifica Vice Mayor Greg Wright, amongst many other local elected officials.

---

### ***Bills with Positions***

#### **SB 1167 (Blakespear) E-bike Safety – SUPPORT**

First and foremost, this bill would clearly define what an electric bicycle is and thereby prevent motor vehicles, such as electric motorcycles, mopeds, and other motor vehicles, from being sold or marketed as e-bikes. This bill also: (1) requires manufacturer disclosure if the device is not an e-bike, (2) prohibits any two- or three-wheeled device with an electric motor capable of propelling the device faster than 20 mph from operating on public roads, (3) standardizes the location of e-bike labels, and (4) requires any incident report for an injury or crash of an e-bike to include the information from the label, or note that there was no label. ***This bill is set to be heard in Senate Appropriations Committee.***

#### **AB 1557 (Papan) Electric Bicycles – SUPPORT**

This bill clarifies the existing e-bike power restriction by specifying that the 750W limit on motors applies to maximum continuous output, closing the loophole that manufacturers have been using to build and distribute overly-powerful e-bikes that have put young people in danger. Recent amendments also lower the motor limits for class 1 and 2 e-bikes to 250W of continuous power, limit the speed of these devices to 16 mph, and prohibit persons under the age of 16 from operating a class 3 bicycle. ***This bill is in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.***

#### **AB 2002 (Solache) Regional Early Action Planning – SUPPORT**

This bill codifies the Regional Early Action Planning grant program (REAP 1.0) to support future RHNA implementation and local planning. If funded by the legislature through a one-time allocation, the bill proposes distributing funding on a population basis to support regional governments' Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) responsibilities. ***This bill is on the Suspense File in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.***

#### **AB 2051 (Wicks) Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group – SUPPORT**

This bill directs the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), in consultation with the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), to convene an interagency Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group to identify administrative actions and legislative recommendations to streamline and accelerate permitting for coastal resilience and sea level rise adaptation projects. ***This bill is on the Suspense File in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.***

#### **AB 2296 (Papan) RHNA Timelines – SUPPORT**

This bill would make changes to the timelines provided in state law for the development of various aspects of a local jurisdiction's housing element, including related to the formation of and review of subregional entities' share of RHNA, approval of a housing element by HCD, and efforts by local jurisdictions to resolve issues with HCD. ***This bill is in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.***

**AB 2346 (Wilson) Safer E-Bikes, Safer Communities Act – SUPPORT**

This bill puts forward various changes recommended by the Mineta Transportation Institute. Firstly, it requires all e-bikes being sold in California to be equipped with speedometers and integrated lights, beginning January 1, 2029. Secondly, it requires that manufacturers and retailers selling e-bikes in California provide consumers with a summary of e-bike laws. Finally, it allows local jurisdictions to impose various speed limits on bicycle paths, multi-use, or paths with appropriate signage; sets a statewide speed limit of 10 mph when riding on a sidewalk; and sets a clear statewide speed limit of 15 mph for any minor under 16 years old on a highway or a bicycle path. ***This bill is in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.***

**AB 2595 (Papan) San Mateo Electric Bicycle Safety Pilot Program – SUPPORT**

This bill establishes the San Mateo Electric Bicycle Safety Pilot Program and would, until January 1, 2031, authorize a local authority within the County of San Mateo, or the County of San Mateo in unincorporated areas, to adopt an ordinance or resolution that would prohibit a person under 12 years of age from operating a class 1 or 2 electric bicycle. For the first 60 days following the adoption of an ordinance or resolution for this purpose, the bill would make a violation of the ordinance or resolution punishable by a warning notice. After 60 days, the bill would make a violation of the ordinance or resolution punishable by a fine of \$25. ***This bill is on the Assembly Floor.***

---

***Bills with Recommended Positions***

**AB 2313 (Berman) Home Energy Choice Act – RECOMMEND SUPPORT**

This bill, the Home Energy Choice Act, would require the Public Utilities Commission, in a new or existing proceeding, to solicit proposals for, and require each gas corporation to offer, a Gas Distribution Service Line Replacement Alternatives Program, on or before January 1, 2028, to provide certain residential gas customers served by a gas distribution service line, planned or forecasted for replacement over the next 5 years, or prioritized for replacement by the commission, with a monetary incentive to deploy gas distribution service line replacement alternatives, and cease gas service to avoid the gas distribution service line replacement. Recent amendments would sunset this program on January 1, 2035. ***This bill is in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.***

---

### ***Other Bills of Interest***

#### **SB 1087 (Cabaldon) Sustainable Communities Strategy Modernization Bill – WATCH**

This bill is co-sponsored by MTC-ABAG and seeks to modernize SB 375, the 2008 law that established the sustainable communities strategies regional planning framework. This bill makes numerous changes to existing Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) guidelines and requirements, including how greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) reduction targets are set, the timeline for updating the plans, and how GHG reduction strategies are evaluated. It also extends GHG reduction targets to 2045. ***This bill is set to be heard in the Senate Appropriations Committee.***

#### **SB 1361 (Durazo) SB 79 Implementation: Transit-Oriented Developments – WATCH**

This bill was heavily amended in April and now prohibits a local government with an existing or planned TOD stop from doing any of the following with respect to SB 79: (1) Requesting the transit provider to reduce service provided to the stop so that SB 79 requirements do not apply, (2) Conditioning an approval or review of a transit project on the impacts of the additional height or density required by SB 79, or (3) Withholding support of an application for federal funding of a transit project on the basis of the additional height or density required by SB 79. ***This bill is on the Senate Floor.***

#### **AB 1569 (Davies) Electric Bicycle Pupil Safety Program – WATCH**

This bill requires the State Department of Education and the California Highway Patrol to develop a standardized electric bicycle safety and training program for pupils in grades 7 to 12. Additionally, it would authorize the collaboration between the agencies, local law enforcement, and local governments to ensure proper implementation of the program. ***This bill is in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.***

#### **AB 2322 (Papan) Municipal Separate Sewer System Definitional Changes – WATCH**

This bill establishes a definition for "commercial, industrial, or institutional site" (CII site), for the purposes of issuing permits for the discharge of stormwater from municipal separate sewer systems (MS4s). According to the author, each of California's 12 MS4 permits defines "CII site" differently, which leads to an uneven regulatory environment, enforcement barriers, and gaps in environmental protection. Under the bill, a CII site is defined as a privately owned parcel or contiguous parcels of land that are commercial, industrial, or institutional based on county tax assessor land use codes. For mixed-use parcels, only the commercial, industrial, or institutional portion is subject to CII obligations. Residential facilities of any type — including those within mixed-use developments — are explicitly excluded. ***This bill is on the Assembly Floor.***

#### **AB 2576 (Harabedian) SB 79 Implementation: Historic Sites Exclusion – WATCH**

This bill was significantly amended and no longer delays implementation by a year for SB 79 (Wiener). Now, this bill expands the historic sites exclusion in SB 79 (Wiener) to include

contributing sites within a historic district and parcels individually listed as a historical resource in the State Historic Resources Inventory designated before January 1, 2025. C/CAG previously had a Support Request Amendments position on this bill. ***This bill is on the Assembly Floor.***

***For a full list of bills we are tracking for C/CAG, please click [here](#).***

Proposed California Electric Bicycle Bills									
Bill Number	Brief Description	Current Location	Speed Limit	Age Limit	Implementation Timeline	E-Bike Classification	Manufacturer Requirements (Technology Mandates)	Labeling Requirements	Seller Requirements
<b>Manufacturer/Seller Requirements</b>									
<a href="#">AB 2284</a> (Dixon)	Public list of non-compliant e-bikes & e-bike products <i>Statewide</i>	DEAD	N/A	N/A	On or before, June 1, 2027	Class 1, Class 2, Class 3	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Rules of the Road</b>									
<a href="#">AB 1569</a> (Davies) WATCH	Requires the State Department of Education and Department of Highway Patrol to develop a standardized e-bike safety program for students in grades 7 - 12. <i>Statewide</i>	Asm Appropriations	N/A	N/A	On or before March 1, 2028	Class 1, Class 2, Class 3	N/A	N/A	N/A
<a href="#">AB 1614</a> (Dixon)	No "piggybacking" on bikes and e-bikes on a Class 1 bikeway. <i>Statewide</i>	Asm Floor	N/A	N/A	Effective January 1, 2027	Class 1, Class 2, Class 3	N/A	N/A	N/A
<a href="#">AB 1942</a> (Bauer-Kahan)	License plates for class 2 & 3 e-bikes <i>Statewide</i>	Asm Appropriations	N/A	N/A	Effective January 1, 2027	Class 2, Class 3	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Local Pilots</b>									
<a href="#">SB 956</a> (Choi)	Authorizes Orange County to establish a pilot program to require the display of a special license plate on e-bikes <i>Orange County</i>	DEAD	N/A	N/A	Until January 1, 2032	Class 1, Class 2, Class 3	N/A	N/A	N/A
<a href="#">AB 2595</a> (Papan) SUPPORT	San Mateo Electric Bicycle Safety Pilot Program - would allow localities to prohibit kids under 12 from operating class 1 or 2 ebikes <i>San Mateo County</i>	Asm Floor	N/A	12 years of age (subject to local ordinance)	Until January 1, 2031	Class 1, Class 2	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Kitchen Sink</b>									
<a href="#">SB 1167</a> (Blakespear) SUPPORT	Distinguishes e-bikes from mopeds or "e-motos"; establishes requirements for labeling and advertising; establishes new operational and safety requirements <i>Statewide</i>	Sen Appropriations	Reinforces existing thresholds for e-bikes (≤20 mph motor-only; ≤28 mph pedal assist)	N/A	Effective January 1, 2027	Class 3	Requires Class 3 vehicles are equipped with lamp-type turn signals; prohibits production of misclassified devices	Extensive permanent labeling (manufacturer, classification, speed, wattage)	Must comply with labeling + disclosure rules; unlawful to sell non-compliant or mislabeled devices
<a href="#">AB 1557</a> (Papan) SUPPORT	Limits e-bike definition to "not capable of exceeding 750 watts of peak power", sets a speed limit of 16 mph for Class 1 & 2 e-bikes, and prevents persons 16 years or younger from operating a Class 3 e-bike. <i>Statewide</i>	Asm Appropriations	16 mph (Class 1 & 2)	Prohibits persons under 16 years of age from operating a bike > 250w	Effective January 1, 2027	Class 1, Class 2, Class 3	Prohibits a motor capable of exceeding 750 watts of peak power.  Prohibits a manufacturer from equipping any device labeled as a Class 1 or 2 e-bike with a motor capable of exceeding 250 watts of peak power.	N/A	Prohibits the sale or advertisement of non-compliant bikes
<a href="#">AB 2346</a> (Wilson) SUPPORT	Speedometer/front & rear lamp requirements; Written description of e-bike laws for customers; Allows various speed limits to be imposed <i>Statewide</i>	Asm Appropriations	Bicycle Path: 15 or 20 mph (set by local authority)  Multiuse trail: 10, 15, or 20 mph (set by local authority)  Sidewalk: 10 mph  under 16 capped at 15 mph	Prohibits persons under 16 from riding e-bike at a speed greater than 15 mph on highway or bicycle path	Effective January 1, 2027	Class 1, Class 2	Class 1 & 2 e-bikes are required to have a speedometer All e-bikes required to have a front lamp, and rear lamp.	Requires permanent labels (classification, speed, wattage; specific formatting like font size)	Must provide written disclosures at sale (classification, speed, wattage, age limits, helmet rules + legal warning on modifications)



*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 28, 2026

The Honorable Josh Becker  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 6520  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Diane Papan  
California State Assembly  
1021 O Street, Suite 4220  
Sacramento, CA 94249

**RE: CONCERNS WITH DRAFT CALENVIROSCREEN 5.0**

Dear Senator Becker and Assemblymember Papan:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), I write to bring your attention to the Draft version of CalEnviroScreen 5.0. C/CAG has concerns with the latest version of CalEnviroScreen, which is again disadvantaging San Mateo County communities due to its failure to recognize local and regional considerations when determining scores/model inputs for "poverty."

CalEnviroScreen is the mapping tool put forth by the State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) that uses environmental, health, and socioeconomic information to designate California's Disadvantaged Communities (DACs). Once defined and established, DACs become eligible for investments from a wide variety of state programs, and many state funding programs are required to allocate defined shares of revenues to DACs (e.g. Cap and Invest). Conversely, communities not defined as DACs lose eligibility or priority. Currently, OEHHA is updating CalEnviroScreen from version 4.0 to version 5.0.

As with the prior versions of CalEnviroScreen, many of the assessed socio-economic indicators (including the indicator "Socioeconomic Factor – Poverty") are not scaled to reflect local or regional differences and are instead based on state or federal averages. Not accounting for these regional differences leads to understatements of hardship in high-cost regions like San Mateo County and the wider Bay Area, where communities may, for example, have higher incomes than state averages but still face significant hardship due to increased costs of living. The result is that vulnerable communities in the Bay Area have historically been less likely to be designated as DACs and therefore, less likely to qualify for funding from programs that rely on CalEnviroScreen scores.

To note, not all factors in the CalEnviroScreen 5.0 update lack regional scaling. The

"Socioeconomic Factors – Housing Burden" indicator utilizes scaled HUD Area Median Family Income data, which does account for regional variances in costs of living. The use of a regionally adjusted methodology for Housing Burden but not for Poverty creates a methodological inconsistency. C/CAG respectfully recommends that OEHHA more widely incorporate regionally adjusted measures to better capture economic and other population based vulnerabilities in high-cost regions, improve consistency across the indicators used in CalEnviroScreen, and ensure that Bay Area communities in need are not deemed in-eligible for State funding.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our comments. We appreciate the CalEnviroScreen tool and OEHHA's continued efforts to improve it. We respectfully request that you consider providing comments to OEHHA consistent with our comments. If needed, we can prepare a comment letter for your consideration. If you have any questions, please contact the C/CAG Acting Executive Director Kaki Cheung at [kcheung1@smcgov.org](mailto:kcheung1@smcgov.org).

Sincerely,



Michael Salazar, Chair

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

**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*

May 7, 2026

Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI)  
Attn: VMT Program  
1400 10th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: Public Comment AB 130 Statewide VMT Mitigation Program Guidance**

To the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation,

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), I write to provide comment on the draft AB 130 Statewide VMT Mitigation Program Guidance. C/CAG requests the inclusion of additional prioritization guidance to ensure a clear nexus between project impacts and mitigation outcomes, particularly with respect to the geographic relationship between TDIF-contributing and TDIP-receiving projects.

C/CAG recognizes that the proposed program is designed to collect and distribute funds at a regional scale, and that the availability of eligible projects may ultimately be the key determining factor in where investments occur. C/CAG also acknowledges the importance of locational efficiency as a primary factor in project prioritization and is not recommending any change to that framework. Rather, C/CAG recommends that the guidance includes additional direction to, where feasible, further prioritize projects that are both location-efficient and situated proximally to the impact-generating project, before considering projects elsewhere within the broader region. Our "region" is made up of the nine counties in the Bay Area and therefore, under the proposed guidance, funding could be contributed by a project in San Mateo County and then expended on a project in Solano County, which is approximately 40-50 miles away, resulting in little benefit for the residents of San Mateo County.


Section 3.2 ("Proximity Radius") provides a useful framework for determining eligibility of projects in adjacent regions. C/CAG encourages the application of a similar approach for projects within the same regions to prioritize more localized investments. This would help ensure that mitigation investments are deployed as close as practicable to the impact-generating project, while maintaining flexibility to fund projects across the region when necessary.

Deploying mitigation investments in closer geographic proximity will help ensure that funded projects meaningfully offset project-generated VMT and support implementation within existing regional and county-level planning efforts.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our comments. We appreciate this work and for providing a forum for feedback. If you have any questions, please contact the C/CAG Acting Executive Director Kaki Cheung at [kcheung1@smcgov.org](mailto:kcheung1@smcgov.org).

Best Regards,

**Kaki  
Cheung**

 Digitally signed by Kaki Cheung  
DN: cn=Kaki Cheung, o=C/CAG,  
email=kcheung1@smcgov.org,  
c=US  
Date: 2026.05.07 13:37:55 -07'00'

Kaki Cheung  
C/CAG Acting Executive Director



April 30, 2026

Lauren Sanchez, Chair  
California Air Resources Board  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for the California Cap on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Market-Based Compliance Mechanisms – Significant Concerns**

Chair Sanchez:

We, the undersigned transit agencies, metropolitan planning organizations, and regional transportation planning agencies, write to you today to voice our **significant concerns** with the *Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for the California Cap on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Market-Based Compliance Mechanisms (Proposed Amendments)*, released by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) on April 14, 2026. The Proposed Amendments are expected to be considered by CARB at its May 28-29, 2026, monthly meeting.

In 2025, we supported the efforts of the Newsom Administration and Legislature to extend the Cap-and-Trade program beyond 2030. We supported the proposed early action on the extension, as long-time partners to the state in combatting climate change and addressing air quality issues and because we understood that such action was critical to stabilizing the market and continuing investment from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) in key climate programs. As the effort gained traction, we called on the state to maintain ongoing investment from the GGRF in the Affordable

Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP), and Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP), noting that these investments reduce greenhouse gas emissions, deliver air quality benefits and travel costs savings, and create jobs (in manufacturing, construction, maintenance, and operations). In our advocacy, we further argued that, as housing and transportation are the two largest household expenses, the state should consider investment in these programs to be part of the solution to California's affordability crisis. We were pleased to see that, consistent with our advocacy, the enacted legislation maintained continuous appropriations from the GGRF for the AHSC, TIRCP, and LCTOP while also committing – for the first time – ongoing funding for air quality initiatives in AB 617 communities.

Today, however, we voice our concerns with the Proposed Amendments' impact to the GGRF, which we believe will, in the upcoming fiscal years, zero out hard-fought annual funding for the AHSC, TIRCP, and LCTOP. More specifically, we estimate that we and the constituencies we serve will lose up to \$1.65 billion in GGRF annually – funding we have relied on for over a decade, without any plan from the state to backfill these losses. To date, these programs have invested a combined \$6.2 billion in projects and services that delivered generational projects, like affordable transit-oriented housing developments, major transit and rail capital projects and zero-emission transit vehicles as well as quality of life improvements, like transit service expansions and discounted transit passes. Most of this investment benefited California's priority populations, with 89% of total AHSC funding and 94% of total TIRCP and LCTOP funding being directed to disadvantaged and low-income communities.

As we understand it, CARB advanced this proposal in the Proposed Amendments in response to calls from some legislators and stakeholders to further address the affordability crisis faced by Californians. In objecting to the proposal, we want to be clear: we agree that the Proposed Amendments should, as called for by AB 1207, address affordability; we believe the Proposed Amendments must apply a broader definition of affordability. To the constituencies we represent and/or serve, addressing affordability requires continued state investment that supports good paying, life-sustaining jobs and means access to affordable housing and transit options, travel timing savings that buy Californians more time with family and friends, and personal health unburdened by the harms of air pollution. Unfortunately, the Proposed Amendments fail on these fronts and regress on the state's efforts to deliver more affordable housing units, more accessible and affordable public transit, and better air quality for our vulnerable communities by gutting key climate programs. **We call on the state to revisit the proposal and maintain robust funding in the GGRF for the AHSC, TIRCP, and LCTOP.**

We know that CARB is balancing numerous objectives with the Proposed Amendments and is working to enact a final regulation that furthers the state's climate and air quality goals while also confronting the challenges faced by regulated industries and everyday Californians. We ask that, as CARB advances the Proposed Amendments, that you consider the importance of the GGRF-funded programs and their role in addressing affordability and incorporate this more expansive understanding in the final regulation.

Sincerely,

Salvador Llamas  
General Manager / CEO  
**Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District**

Rob Padgett  
Managing Director  
**Capitol Corridor**

Bill Churchill  
General Manager  
**Central Contra Costa Transit Authority  
(County Connection)**

Kaki Cheung  
Acting Executive Director  
**City/County Association of Governments  
of San Mateo County (C/CAG)**

Claude McFerguson  
Director of Transportation  
**City of Commerce Transit**

Anuj Gupta  
Director  
**City of Santa Monica Department of  
Transportation**

Dee Dee Cavanaugh  
Mayor  
**City of Simi Valley**

Jaime Wright  
Public Works Manager – Transit Services  
Department of Public Works  
**County of Placer**

Rashidi Barnes  
Chief Executive Officer  
**Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority  
(Tri Delta Transit)**

Doran J. Barnes  
CEO  
**Foothill Transit**

Gregory A. Barfield  
Director  
**Fresno Area Express**

Vanessa Rauschenberger  
General Manager  
**Gold Coast Transit District**

Denis J. Mulligan  
General Manager  
**Golden Gate Bridge, Highway &  
Transportation District**

Arthur V. Sohikian  
Executive Director  
**High Desert Corridor JPA**

Stephanie Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer  
**Los Angeles County Metropolitan  
Transportation Authority**

Christy Wegener  
Executive Director  
**Livermore/Amador Valley Transit  
Authority**

Kenneth A. McDonald  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
**Long Beach Transit**

Robert Betts  
General Manager  
**Marin Transit**

Andrew B. Fremier  
Executive Director  
**Metropolitan Transportation Commission**

Carl Sedoryk  
General Manager / CEO  
**Monterey-Salinas Transit**

Danielle Schmitz  
Executive Director  
**Napa Valley Transportation Authority**

Erin Rogers  
CEO and General Manager  
**Omnitrans**

Michelle Bouchard  
Executive Director  
**Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board  
(Caltrain)**

Henry Li  
General Manager / CEO  
**Sacramento Regional Transit District**

Sharon Cooney  
Chief Executive Officer  
**San Diego Metropolitan Transit System**

Rodd Lee  
Assistant General Manager, External Affairs  
**San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit  
District**

Seamus Murphy  
Executive Director  
**SF Bay Ferry / Water Emergency  
Transportation Authority**

Julie Kirschbaum  
Director of Transportation  
**San Francisco Municipal Transportation  
Agency**

Peter Rodgers  
Executive Director  
**San Luis Obispo Council of  
Governments**

April Chan  
General Manager / CEO  
**San Mateo County Transit District**

Jerry Estrada  
General Manager  
**Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit  
District**

Carolyn M. Gonot  
General Manager / CEO  
**Santa Clara Valley Transportation  
Authority**

Corey Aldridge  
Chief Executive Officer  
**Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District**

Beth Kranda  
Executive Director  
**Solano County Transit**

Emily Betts  
Transit Manager  
**Sonoma County Transit**

James R. Cameron  
Executive Director  
**Sonoma County Transportation and  
Climate Authorities**

Eddy Cumins  
General Manager  
**Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART)**

Darren Kettle  
Chief Executive Officer  
**Southern California Regional Rail  
Authority (Metrolink)**

Mona Babauta  
CEO/General Manager  
**SunLine Transit Agency**

Todd A. Muck  
Executive Director  
**Transportation Agency for Monterey  
County**

Kevin Sheridan  
Executive Director / CEO  
**Tri-Valley – San Joaquin Valley Regional  
Rail Authority (Valley Link)**

Martin Erickson  
Executive Director  
**Ventura County Transportation  
Commission**

Rob Thompson  
General Manager  
**Western Contra Costa Transit Authority  
(WestCAT)**

cc: Members and Staff, California State Legislature  
Members, California Air Resources Board  
Jamie Callahan, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of Governor Gavin Newsom  
Trey Reffett, Deputy Cabinet Secretary, Office of Governor Gavin Newsom  
Sarah Swig, Deputy Cabinet Secretary and Senior Advisor, Office of Governor Gavin Newsom  
Steve Cliff, Executive Officer, California Air Resources Board  
Rajinder Sahota, Deputy Executive Officer, California Air Resources Board  
Toks Omishakin, Secretary, California State Transportation Agency  
Erin Curtis, Executive Director, Strategic Growth Council



*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*

May 1, 2026

The Honorable Josh Becker  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 6520  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Diane Papan  
California State Assembly  
1021 O Street, Suite 4220  
Sacramento, CA 94249

The Honorable Marc Berman  
California State Assembly  
1021 O Street, Suite 8130  
Sacramento, CA 94249

**RE: SB 79 (WIENER): IMPLEMENTATION CONCERNS**

Dear Senator Becker and Assemblymembers Berman and Papan:

Thank you again for meeting with us in Sacramento in March of this year. As you know, the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) represents all 21 jurisdictions in San Mateo County and advocates for all those who live, work, and play within its borders. Supporting feasible and achievable compact development along major transit routes is important to helping us achieve our mobility goals.

Despite significant progress towards these goals, as we discussed when we met with you, C/CAG has concerns with the application of SB 79. These concerns are more pressing in light of the fact that there is no longer active cleanup legislation proposing to delay SB 79 implementation. C/CAG understands the importance of and supports the need for transit-oriented development, but would like to advocate for the following changes to ensure that its development does not come with undue administrative burden, nor at the expense of future transit, nor at the risk of local downtown cores.

**First**, cities need more time to adjust and adequate time to update their plans, if necessary. We support the League of California Cities' request for a time extension for the implementation of SB 79 so that it complies with the initiation of

the next RHNA cycle. Additional time will give cities the ability to potentially adjust their local plans to comply with SB 79 or enact local alternative plans as authorized under the law. A July 2026 effective date does not give cities any time to budget for planning changes, much less to analyze and implement them.

**Second**, the inclusion of bus rapid transit stations presents significant implementation challenges due to the flexible and evolving nature of BRT service and planning. Unlike rail or other fixed transit, BRT routes, station locations, and infrastructure are often adjusted over time as projects advance through planning, environmental review and design. As a result, it may be impractical to base long-term housing or land use planning on conceptual BRT stations that have not yet been finalized. Additionally, current law applies SB 79 to bus rapid transit projects that are included in the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (MTC's Plan Bay Area) or other local planning documents, regardless of whether the project has secured committed funding, completed environmental clearance, or advanced to construction. Applying SB 79 development provisions to conceptual bus rapid transit stations prior to final design and project approval may create unintended implementation challenges that could hinder the successful delivery of regionally significant transit projects and associated transit service improvements.

**Third**, the potential impact on and displacement of small businesses is a concern. Small businesses provide necessary jobs, services, and goods for our cities. Furthermore, thriving ground floor retail is necessary for the creation of a walkable downtown. Ground floor retail improves the quality of life for the residents and creates support for the higher densities. Active ground-floor commercial uses support walkability, activate transit corridors, and contribute to successful transit-oriented communities by providing daily goods and services within walking distance of transit. In addition to the SB 79 local ordinance or transit-oriented development alternative plans, state law should include language that clarifies that SB 79 does not preclude cities from requiring ground floor retail in their high-density mixed-use developments.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Please contact Kaki Cheung, C/CAG Acting Executive Director, at [kcheung1@smcgov.org](mailto:kcheung1@smcgov.org) if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Michael Salazar, Chair

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

**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*

May 1, 2026

The Honorable Kevin Mullin  
United States Representative  
1404 Longworth House Building  
Washington, DC 20515

**Re: C/CAG Budget Request Priorities**

Dear Congressman Mullin:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG), I want to thank you for requesting THUD Highway Infrastructure Program funds from the House Appropriations Committee to advance C/CAG's proposed Integrated Green Infrastructure Streets projects. While also supporting C/CAG's sustainable transportation, climate resilience and water quality improvement programs, these projects will provide much needed investments for the cities of East Palo Alto, Daly City, and South San Francisco to make meaningful infrastructure upgrades in these priority communities.

This critical funding builds on prior investments you helped us secure, and will advance two of the three proposed projects into construction phase and will initiate planning and design work for the next priority project from C/CAG's Sustainable Streets Master Plan. Importantly, this funding positions the local agencies to deliver fiscally efficient projects that provide multiple public benefits through strategic and phased capital investments. Additionally, all three projects will result in needed infrastructure near schools in historically underserved communities, where climate change impacts will also likely fall disproportionately on overburdened residents. We applaud your ongoing support and commitment to ensure a healthy and resilient future for San Mateo County, with a focus on prioritizing the most at-risk communities first.

Again, thank you for your partnership with C/CAG on this important Community Project Funding request. We appreciate all that you do on behalf of the residents of San Mateo County.

Best Regards,



Michael Salazar, Chair  
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County