



*Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's*  
**Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

---

## **AGENDA**

**Note Start Time:**  
**Thursday, May 19, 2011**  
**1:00 p.m.**

***SCCRTC Conference Room***  
***1523 Pacific Ave.***  
***Santa Cruz, CA***

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Oral communications

*The Committee will receive oral communications during this time on items not on today's agenda. Presentations must be within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and may be limited in time at the discretion of the Chair. Committee members will not take action or respond immediately to any Oral Communications presented, but may choose to follow up at a later time, either individually, or on a subsequent Committee agenda.*

4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

*All items appearing on the consent agenda are considered to be minor or non-controversial and will be acted upon in one motion if no member of the Committee or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the Committee may raise questions, seek clarification or add directions to Consent Agenda items without removing the item from the Consent Agenda as long as no other committee member objects to the change.*

5. Approve Minutes of the March 17, 2011 ITAC meeting
6. Grant Funding Notices
  - a. Federal Discretionary Programs – Due to Caltrans by May 25, 2011
  - b. AB2766 – Due to MBUAPCD by 4:00p.m. Friday June 17, 2011
  - c. Federal Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) – Due to Caltrans by July 16, 2011

### **REGULAR AGENDA**

7. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents -  
Verbal updates from project sponsors

8. Project Initiation Documents for Highway Projects
  - a. Staff report
  - b. Caltrans PSR-PDS Guidance to Local Agencies
9. Project Status and Priority Projects
  - a. Staff report
  - b. RTIP Project updates - to be distributed at meeting
  - c. 2010 RTP project lists - to be distributed at meeting
10. Regional Transportation Plan Update, Complete Streets Component
  - a. Verbal staff report
11. State Legislative Update
  - a. Staff report
  - b. State Legislative Bill Tracking

**NEXT MEETING:** The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **June 16, 2011** at **1:00 PM** in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

#### ***HOW TO REACH US***

*Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215  
email: [info@sccrtc.org](mailto:info@sccrtc.org) / website: [www.sccrtc.org](http://www.sccrtc.org)*

#### ***AGENDAS ONLINE***

*To receive email notification when the Committee meeting agenda packets are posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3200 or email [rmoriconi@sccrtc.org](mailto:rmoriconi@sccrtc.org) to subscribe.*

#### ***ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES***

*The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs, or activities. This meeting location is an accessible facility. If you wish to attend this meeting and require special assistance in order to participate, please contact RTC staff at 460-3200 (CRS 800/735-2929) at least three working days in advance of this meeting to make arrangements. People with disabilities may request a copy of the agenda in an alternative format. As a courtesy to those person affected, Please attend the meeting smoke and scent-free.*

#### ***SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/ TRANSLATION SERVICES***

*Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de anticipo al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis. Please make advance arrangements at least three days in advance by calling (831) 460-3200).*

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\May2011\May11ITACagenda.doc



**Santa Cruz County  
Regional Transportation Commission  
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

---

**DRAFT MINUTES**

Thursday, March 17, 2011  
1:00 p.m.

SCCRTC Conference Room  
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

**ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Teresa Buika, UCSC  
Randy DeShazo, AMBAG  
Dan Herron, Caltrans District 5  
Steve Jesberg, City of Capitola Public Works and Community Development Proxy  
Michelle King, City of Santa Cruz Planning  
David Koch, City of Watsonville Public Works  
Maria Esther Rodriguez, City of Watsonville Community Development Proxy  
Russell Chen, County Planning Proxy  
Chris Schneider, City of Santa Cruz Public Works  
Steve Wiesner, County Public Works

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rachel Moriconi  
Grace Blakeslee

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Mark Dettle, City of Santa Cruz Public Works  
Steve Schnaar, People Power and Bike Church

1. Call to Order – Chair Chris Schneider called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.
2. Introductions – Self introductions were made
3. Oral communications – Rachel Moriconi reminded members that Bicycle Transportation Account grant applications are due Friday 3/18/11.
4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – A revised version of page 33 - Item 9 on Bicycle Licensing Ordinance Coordination was distributed.

**CONSENT AGENDA (Rodriguez/Jesberg) approved unanimously**

5. Approved minutes of the January 27, 2011 ITAC meeting.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

6. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents - Verbal updates from project sponsors

*City of Watsonville* – Maria Rodriguez reported that construction of the Green Valley Road project is wrapping up; the Freedom Blvd rehabilitation project is going out to bid in May; a Traffic Signal Synchronization project will move forward in coordination with the Freedom Blvd. project; the City

received a safety (HSIP) grant to add pedestrian countdown equipment at all signalized intersections; the City is using a Safe Routes to Schools grant to install sidewalks and traffic calming on Front Street and Holm Road; and the City is making crosswalk enhancements at three locations.

*County of Santa Cruz* – Steve Wiesner reported that vegetation removal is underway as part of the Graham Hill Road safety project, with additional construction work to begin after April 15; what could be the last Redevelopment Agency (RDA)-funded overlay is underway; a new sidewalk is being installed on Soquel near the City of Capitola; Soquel Ave/17<sup>th</sup> Ave curb, gutter, and sidewalk construction will be finalized within four weeks; construction on Eaton Street had been set for award, but is on hold pending finalization of the RDA project list; and the East Cliff path project was set to go to bid, but is on hold because of RDA-funding uncertainties.

*AMBAG* – Randy DeShazo reminded members that Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) information updates are due March 18. He announced that AMBAG is working with FHWA to host a model peer review meeting on March 28-29; Rachel Moriconi emailed information on the meeting to the ITAC. He also reported that the first formal Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) amendment was approved and that the next formal amendment will take place May 11. Project sponsors should inform Rachel Moriconi of any necessary amendments to federally-funded projects.

*UCSC* – Teresa Buika reported that UCSC is starting work on its federal New Freedoms grant project.

*City of Santa Cruz* – Chris Schneiter reported that the roundabout at Depot Park will be completed this spring; the West Cliff Drive rehabilitation project is out to bid, with construction scheduled to start in April/May; and the City is working on a Safe Routes to School project near Gault Elementary School.

*Caltrans*: Dan Herron reminded members that applications for Caltrans planning grants are due March 30. Detours around the Highway 1/Salinas Road Interchange project will start in April.

*SCCRTC* – Rachel Moriconi reported that the RTC is working on closing escrow for the Rail Line and an RTC board member requested that the RTC place an item on a future agenda to discuss the possibility of merging with Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD). Cory Caletti reported that the RTC is issuing a notice to proceed to RRM Design for work on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Master Plan. Data collection and stakeholder meeting will be starting soon.

## 7. Regional Transportation Plan Update: Overview and Work Plan

Grace Blakeslee provided an overview of plans for the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. The plan will address SB375 requirements, including coordination with the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) targets; a complete streets analysis/needs assessment for priority growth areas; and development of more quantifiable goals and policies focused on sustainability using STARS. She requested input on what other planning efforts are underway that should be included in the RTP.

Michelle King suggested that the RTP consider the objectives being developed for the City of Santa Cruz General Plan and Climate Action Plan, and noted that the General Plan EIR includes a lot of data that could be used. Randy DeShazo stated that AMBAG will be providing micro-grants to help local jurisdictions work on aligning the Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) and General Plans with the SCS. This includes identifying infill opportunities and will complement the complete streets analysis. Chris Schneiter requested that the RTC minimize the amount of information requested from local jurisdictions, given staffing shortfalls. Mark Dettle suggested that if guidelines

are established to prioritize projects that have the biggest benefit, then local agencies will be able to identify projects that meet those criteria up front, rather than using time consuming scoring criteria that may not result in the most beneficial projects being funded. Grace Blakeslee responded that it will be an iterative process with project sponsors to determine what information is need and to establish priorities. In response to a question from Dan Herron, Ms. Blakeslee stated that via STARS measures such as access, economic, and environmental sustainability would be looked at collectively for evaluating projects and the plan. Teresa Buika suggested that the RTP take into consideration information from the UCSC Sustainability Plan and Climate Action Plan. She noted that it will be important to include how the RTC is defining "sustainability". Randy DeShazo stated that the 0% per capita GHG target set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for the Monterey Bay Area is partially due to limited growth anticipated in the region, given constraints to building housing in coastal areas.

#### 8. Draft Monterey Bay Area Public Participation Plan (PPP)

Rachel Moriconi requested the ITAC review and comment on the Draft Monterey Bay Area Public Participation Plan. The plan has been updated based on SB375 and federal requirements. Comments are due to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) on March 30, 2011. She also requested that members provide suggestions for expanding public involvement in development of the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Dan Herron stated that it is important to get input from the Spanish-speaking populations. Randy DeShazo noted that agencies that receive federal transportation funds must follow the plan. Steve Wiesner stated that the plan should be consistent with what FHWA and Caltrans mandates agencies do when implementing projects. Those public participation requirements may be identified in the Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Master Agreements with Caltrans, and other grant agreements. Teresa Buika said that the plan goes beyond what is federally-mandated.

#### 9. Bicycle Licensing Ordinance Coordination

Cory Caletti provided information regarding bicycle licensing ordinances and requested that local jurisdictions consider establishing uniform practices. Bicycle licenses are not required in the unincorporated areas of the County or City of Scotts Valley. Bicycle licenses are required in the Cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, and Watsonville. The Bicycle Committee is asking those jurisdictions to eliminate the requirement, and instead make bicycle licensing voluntary. She provided information on some of the benefits and issues with bicycle licensing.

Members noted that bicycle license requirements are rarely enforced, that bicycle license requirements come from California Vehicle Code, and that if current licensing is not meeting needs it could maybe be modified, rather than eliminated, in order to make it a more robust program that has clear benefits.

Steve Schnaar, People Power and Bike Church, stated that the bicycle licensing requirements are being used by police to target certain people. He also reported that People Power is working with Santa Cruz police to focus on using serial numbers to find stolen bicycles.

Teresa Buika reported that TAPS staff and the UCSC Police Sergeant discussed their bicycle license requirements and that their priority is to use the program to help bicyclists. If it is not helping they would be willing to change it, especially since it is staff intensive to administer.

## 10. State Legislative Update

Rachel Moriconi recommended that the ITAC review and provide input on the list of state legislative bills the RTC is tracking and inform staff of any additional bills the RTC should be monitoring. She also reported that the State Legislature approved reenactment of the gas tax swap, which allows continuation of some funding for transit, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Local Street and Road, and SHOPP projects. In response to a question from Steve Wiesner, she stated that with reenactment of the gas tax swap, HUTA funds should be protected under the provisions of Proposition 22. This was one of the reasons why Truck Weight Fees are being used to provide State General Fund relief for bond debt service.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m. The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **April 21, 2011** at **1:00 PM** in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

*Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi*

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\Mar2011\Mar11ITACminutes.doc



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Highway  
Administration**

# Memorandum

Subject **ACTION:** Solicitation For Candidate Projects for  
: Eleven Discretionary Programs

Date: May 6, 2011

From: /s/Original signed by  
Victor M. Mendez, Administrator

In Reply Refer To: HOA-1

To: Directors of Field Services  
Division Administrators

The purpose of this memorandum is to announce the FY 2011 solicitation for candidate projects for 11 discretionary grant programs. Listed below are the approximate amounts of funding available (including any carryover funding from previous years) for the 11 programs. The actual amount available for award in each program is subject to reduction pending final calculations of Federal-aid highway program funding distributions.

Ferry Boat - \$47 million  
Highways for LIFE - \$20 million  
Innovative Bridge Research and Deployment - \$4.5 million  
Interstate Maintenance - \$100 million  
National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation - \$9 million  
National Scenic Byways Program - \$43.5 million  
Public Lands Highways - \$98.5 million  
Rail Highway Crossing Elimination in High Speed Rail Corridors - \$21 million  
Transportation, Community and System Preservation - \$61 million  
Truck Parking Facilities - \$7.5 million

By this notice, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is soliciting applications for these 11 programs for FY 2011. Each program has its own eligibility requirements. A Web page with links to information about each program is available at <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/>.

Our goal is to put these funds to work as quickly as possible to provide needed transportation improvements and support economic growth. To that end, FHWA plans to advance these programs on an accelerated timeframe.

Eligible applicants will have until **Friday, June 3, 2011\***, to submit applications for the appropriate program(s), to their local FHWA Division Office.

---

\***Applications in California** must be submitted through Caltrans by May 25, 2011:

- TCSP: [Teresa.McWilliam@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Teresa.McWilliam@dot.ca.gov)
- National Scenic Byways: [dennis.cadd@dot.ca.gov](mailto:dennis.cadd@dot.ca.gov)
- Ferry Boat, Highways for Life, Interstate Maintenance, Innovative Bridge Research and Deployment, National Historic Covered Bridge, and Public Lands Highways:  
[Evelyn.Williams@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Evelyn.Williams@dot.ca.gov)



# MONTEREY BAY

Unified Air Pollution Control District  
Serving Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz counties

Air Pollution Control Officer  
Richard Stedman

24580 Silver Cloud Court • Monterey, California 93940 • 831/647-9411 • FAX 831/647-8501

March 7, 2011

To: Applicants for the FY12 AB2766 Grant Program  
Re: Application Packet  
From: Alan Romero/ Air Quality Planner

**DISTRICT BOARD MEMBERS**

CHAIR:  
Jane Parker  
Monterey County

VICE CHAIR:  
Jerry Muenzer  
San Benito  
County

-----  
Lou Calcagno  
Monterey County

Neal Coonerty  
Santa Cruz  
County

Steve McShane  
City of Salinas

Maggie Bilich  
City of San Juan  
Bautista

Sam Storey  
City of Capitola

Fred Ledesma  
City of Soledad

Carmelita Garcia  
City of Pacific  
Grove

Ellen Pirie  
Santa Cruz  
County

Simon Salinas  
Monterey County

On March 16, 2011, the District Board authorized this year's AB2766 Motor Vehicle Emission Reduction Grant Program. On September 21, 2011, the Board will award \$1.2 million with a maximum award of up to \$400,000 per eligible project. Eligible projects must reduce motor vehicle emissions and meet other criteria described in this packet. Only public agencies may apply for projects implemented in Monterey, San Benito and/or Santa Cruz Counties.

Projects must enable reduction in the net weighted total of ozone precursor emissions (ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>) and PM from vehicle sources. Although only public agencies may apply and receive funds, private entities may implement the projects under contract to these agencies. Applications are due at the District's Office **by 4:00 PM on June 17, 2011.**

District staff will hold three workshops for prospective applicants on applications, scoring, selection, Grant Acceptance Agreements, reimbursement and monitoring. The workshops are free and open to the public as follows:

***Thursday, April 21, 2011***

**Monterey:** 10-12 AM. MBUAPCD offices, 24580 Silver Cloud Court, Monterey.  
*Directions:* Take Hwy 68 to York Rd. just E. of Ryan Ranch, turn onto York, go one block, turn right onto Blue Larkspur Lane, go two blocks, turn left onto Silver Cloud Court to the second building on the left.

***Friday, April 22, 2011***

**Watsonville:** 10-12 AM. Watsonville Public Library, 275 Main Street, Suite 100, Watsonville. *Directions:* Take Hwy 1 to Riverside Rd., go east about one mile to Main St., turn left, then go about two blocks to the new City Plaza Building on the left.

***Monday, April 25, 2011***

**Hollister:** 10- 12 AM. The County Board of Supervisors' offices, 481 Fourth St., Hollister. From Hwy 101, take Hwy 156 East to Hollister, continue on Fourth St. to 481 on the right, in the second block before San Benito Street.

You may download digital versions in native or pdf format from the District website:

[www.mbuapcd.org/programs/grants-incentives/ab2766](http://www.mbuapcd.org/programs/grants-incentives/ab2766)

Please call Alan Romero at (831) 647-9418 x 241 if you have questions or need more information prior to submitting your application.





**ANNOUNCEMENT: Call for Cycle 3 Federal Safe Routes to School Projects**  
**Posted: April 15, 2011**  
**Application Submittal Deadline: July 15, 2011**

**What is the Federal Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program?**

A reimbursement funding program for reducing injuries and fatalities through capital (engineering) projects that improve safety for children in grades K-8 who walk or bicycle to school and through non-infrastructure projects that incorporate education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that are intended to change community behavior, attitudes, and social norms to increase the numbers of children walking and bicycling to school. Evaluation is a key component of the program and is required for both infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects.

**How much funding is available?**

\$42 M in federal funds is the targeted funding projected for this call based upon the total amount of programming capacity available in the current Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) to be adjusted if necessary due to a pending federal transportation act.

**How are projects selected?**

Caltrans Districts are apportioned funds based upon student enrollment. District review committees will score and rate applications using standardized evaluation forms furnished by Caltrans Headquarters. Once projects are selected and prioritized, Districts will submit their list to Caltrans Headquarters who will validate District selections and compile a statewide list of selected projects for Director approval. Districts will notify all applicants of the results.

**Who is eligible to apply?**

Any local or regional agency is eligible to apply for SRTS funds. The local or regional agency is the City/County/Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)/Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) who serves as the responsible agency and partner to a Project Sponsor such as the School District, County Public Health Agencies and other non-profit organizations. Federally-recognized Native American Tribes in which schools on tribal lands are benefited may also apply for SRTS funds.

**What types of projects are eligible?**

Capital projects must fall under the broad categories of pedestrian facilities, traffic calming measures, installation of traffic control devices, construction of bicycle facilities, and public outreach/education/enforcement. See guidelines for examples. Up to 10% of the construction cost can fund an education/encouragement/enforcement element in an infrastructure project. Stand alone non-infrastructure projects may include: conducting SRTS workshops, walkability audits, conducting student assemblies for pedestrian and bicycle safety, and developing walking school bus or bicycle train programs to name a few.

**Is there a local match required, and what is the maximum amount of funding that can be requested?**

There is no local match required. \$1,000,000 is the maximum amount that can be requested for an infrastructure project and \$500,000 for a non-infrastructure project.

**Where are the guidelines and applications posted, and how can I get more information?**

[www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm)

**Where do I send my application(s)?**

The application must be submitted by the on-line application process. In addition, two hard-copies(color preferred) must be sent to your Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) by the deadline. Applications post marked on the deadline are acceptable. DLAE information is available at: [www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/dlae.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/dlae.htm)

**TO:** Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)  
**FROM:** Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planner  
**REGARDING:** Project Initiation Documents for Highway Projects

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item is for information only.

---

## **BACKGROUND**

For projects on the state highway system, Project Initiation Documents (PIDs), typically a Project Study Report (PSR), are developed to identify scope, schedule, and estimated cost information to be used to inform funding decisions for highway projects. PIDs are required for State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects by legislation, by CTC resolution for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects, and for other highway projects based on Caltrans policy.

## **DISCUSSION**

In the past Caltrans prepared the PID for both Caltrans sponsored projects and for projects sponsored by other entities, solely at state expense. Caltrans would typically allocate the appropriate resources and complete the work for the PID's or provide Independent Quality Assurance (IQA) oversight for PIDs developed by local agencies. As part of the FY10/11 State Budget approved in October 2010, Governor Schwarzenegger significantly reduced the Caltrans budget for PID's via line-item veto. Governor Brown's January 2011 FY11/12 budget further assumed that local agencies would pay for preparation of and Caltrans oversight of non-SHOPP PIDs.

With the reduction in Caltrans' PID budget, Caltrans is working on agreements with local agencies to reimburse Caltrans for work on PIDs for non-SHOPP projects. While there are efforts being made by regions and the legislature to ensure sufficient funding in the State Budget for Caltrans to provide oversight for PIDs at the states own expense, Caltrans has established several committees focused on streamlining, and thereby reducing the cost to prepare, PIDs. As a first step, Caltrans recently issued a decision to make a streamlined PSR-PDS the standard for locally-sponsored highway projects ([Attachment 1](#)).

RTC staff participates in the Caltrans PID streamlining committee meetings and will continue to advocate that Caltrans minimize the amount of work required for PIDs on projects that will be funded by local agencies.

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR  
P.O. BOX 942873, MS-49  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001  
PHONE (916) 654-5266  
FAX (916) 654-6608  
TTY 711  
www.dot.ca.gov



*Flex your power!  
Be energy efficient!*

April 19, 2011

Metropolitan Planning Organizations  
Regional Transportation Planning Agencies  
Local Transportation Commissions  
Local Agencies

Dear Executive Directors:

This letter represents the California Department of Transportation's (Department) interim guidance for the development of Project Initiation Documents (PID). Effective immediately, all PIDs developed for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and special funded projects will use the Project Study Report-Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) process, unless a Project Study Report (PSR) is requested by the project sponsor and authorized by the Department's District Director. This guidance supersedes existing PID guidance relating to the PSR-PDS development process pending amendment of the Project Development Procedures Manual.

The PSR-PDS is a streamlined PID document that does not require the same level of engineering detail as a PSR. The PSR-PDS identifies support costs needed to achieve project approval, a "ballpark" estimate of the construction cost, and allows programming of capital outlay support for Project Approval and Environmental Document (PAED) only. The PSR-PDS process will require a pre-PID meeting to appropriately develop the scope, cost, and schedule for transportation improvements, and establish performance measures to ensure expectations from pre-PID meetings are met. Streamlining the PID process by using the PSR-PDS will:

- Expedite the funding of projects through PAED.
- Clarify PID guidance for STIP and locally-funded projects.
- Identify potential project risks early.
- Use "ballpark" estimates.
- Eliminate redundancies.
- Improve communication between the Department and local agencies.

A PID committee comprised of Department headquarters divisions, district programs and functional units, and local and regional transportation agencies have been working in partnership to reduce costs and delays associated with the development of PIDs. The Department will work through the PID Committee over the next several months to amend existing PID guidance to streamline PID procedures and reflect the expanded use of the PSR-PDS process for all STIP and

Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Regional Planning Transportation Agencies  
April 19, 2011  
Page 2

special funded projects. The amended PID guidance on PSR-PDS development is expected to be completed July 1, 2011.

We will continue to work in partnership with you, through these demanding economic times, to improve mobility for all Californians. Please contact your local district office (attached) for questions or clarification.

Sincerely,

  
CINDY McKIM  
Director

Attachment:  
District Contact List

**TO:** Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)  
**FROM:** Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  
**RE:** Project Status and Priority Projects

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends that by July 1, 2011 the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC):

1. Provide status updates for projects currently programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP); and
  2. Inform staff of projects for your agencies and the region that are the highest priorities for implementation over the next five years.
- 

## **BACKGROUND**

The RTC regularly select projects to receive various state and federal funds via the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). This Fall the RTC will be developing the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), which will include updates to previously programmed projects, projects to receive Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, as well as the RTC's proposal to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, including Transportation Enhancement (TE), over the next several years.

The RTC adopted the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) at its June 17, 2010 meeting. The RTP includes an overview of transportation needs through 2035. Through development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), project sponsors, committee members, and the public identified nearly 500 projects totaling \$4.5 billion to address transportation needs over the next twenty-five years. However, only \$2.5 billion in funding is anticipated to be available to fund these projects in the same time period and the RTC has discretion over only \$200 million of those funds (approximately \$5-8 million/year).

Since transportation funding rarely keeps pace with transportation needs, project sponsors and funding agencies are continually confronted with the challenge of limiting the number of projects that move forward.

## DISCUSSION

At this meeting, staff will distribute the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) listings for currently programmed projects to project sponsors. Staff requests that project sponsors **provide updates on those projects by July 1, 2011.**

In addition to providing updates on currently programmed projects, **staff would like to compile a list of the transportation projects that are the most critical to pursue, construct, or otherwise implement in the next 5-10 years.**

While the RTP identifies general priorities and evaluation measures for the transportation system, the RTP does not prioritize specific projects. Confronted with severely limited funds available for transportation projects, staff requests that ITAC members inform RTC staff of their agencies' very highest priority projects for implementation over the next five years, including those projects that may have already been programmed to receive RTC-funding or that a project sponsor may request funding for from the RTC in the future. This list is advisory in nature only.

The lists should consider the wide range of multimodal needs of all users – including system preservation, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, highway, local road, and transportation demand management projects and programs. Staff will distribute project lists from the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to project sponsors at this meeting. For many jurisdictions, information on near term priorities is included in Capital Improvement Programs (CIP), short range planning documents, bicycle plans, or multiyear budgets. Staff requests that project sponsors send these lists to [rmoriconi@sccrtc.org](mailto:rmoriconi@sccrtc.org) by July 1, 2011.

As discussed at prior ITAC meetings, there are many ways to evaluate identified needs and determine what should be prioritized. We recognize that ranking projects based on prescribed criteria may not work for a diverse list of transportation projects. Oftentimes issues which make one project a high priority may not be comparable to other projects. However, in order to ensure that limited funds are used efficiently, project sponsors may wish to consider the attached (Attachment 1) sample list of measures previously identified by the RTC, ITAC, and others.

## SUMMARY

RTC staff is seeking updates on projects currently programmed for funding in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Given severe funding constraints facing the state, local agencies, and the region, staff is also asking the ITAC to assist in identifying multimodal transportation projects that are the most critical to pursue, construct, or otherwise implement in the next 5-10 years.

Attachment 1: Sample Issues Considered when Prioritizing Projects

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\May2011\ProjStatusPriorities.doc

## Attachment 1

### **SAMPLE ISSUES CONSIDERED WHEN PRIORITIZING PROJECTS**

Different criteria may be used for different types of projects or goals and criteria may include project benefits, as well as potential issues associated with a project (such as environmental impacts – including impacts on air quality/greenhouse gas emissions; safety; ongoing maintenance cost of new or expanded facilities). To address congestion – projects may be evaluated based on their ability to reduce delay, reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled (increased bus service, compact development, telecommuting, ridesharing, etc). To prioritize maintenance some entities look at the number of people using a facility, the cost of minor repairs to extend the useful life of a facility as compared to replacement or major rehabilitation costs, or other factors. Prioritization of pedestrian projects may be based on measures such as proximity to schools, senior housing or bus routes. Transit and paratransit projects may be based on increasing riders and farebox recovery ratios, reducing travel times, and other measures.

1. What are the desired outcomes/goals?
2. What criteria should be considered to determine which projects are most effective at addressing system needs?

#### **General**

- Number of people served (ADT, residents with access to facility/likely to use facility)
- Ongoing cost to maintain new/expanded facility
- Level of benefit to the region's transportation system
- Address multiple modes of transportation
- Improve safety (reduce fatalities and injuries)
- Improve mobility (reduce travel times, reduce congestion)
- Increase accessibility (increase travel options and opportunities)
- Improve reliability of the system (ensure on time trips and service)
- Increase productivity of the existing transportation system (increase throughput)
- Improve air quality/environment/global warming (reduce emissions)
- Preserve existing infrastructure or service
- Have limited risks to delivery (have sufficient funds, limited potential delays)
- Projects fully funded
- Projects whose sponsor is partnering with, or has agreed to employ the services of, a community conservation corps or the California Conservation Corps (collectively referred to as "corps") --- legislatively mandated highest priority for TE funds, per SB286
- Project timing/deliverability:
  - Projects that can be completed within three (3) years.
  - Timing of when projects can obligate funds (those ready for construction sooner, to be given priority).
  - Ability to meet state and federal deadlines.
- Level of economic benefit

- Facilitate improved goods movement
- Increase access to jobs
- Jobs created – during construction and ongoing
- Project in economically distressed areas (create jobs in those areas)

### **Mobility and accessibility**

- Increase walkability of neighborhoods between homes and services
- Reduce length of commutes
- Reduce travel times or delay
- Reduce travel time within key regional corridors.
- Reduce total person hours of delay and daily vehicle hours of delay.
- Increase non-SOV use/meet modal split goals
- Increase in the proportion of residents using transit.
- Increase access to bus stop, transit station or corridor.
- Reduce variability in travel time on state highways.
- Increase vehicle occupancy on highways during peak periods.
- Increase passengers per vehicle revenue mile (transit).
- Reduce emissions.
- Reduce number of Vehicle Miles Traveled per Household.
- Increase Transit On-Time Performance
- Increase Transit Ridership

### **Safety**

- Reduce Motor Vehicle Collisions
- Reduce Collisions Involving Bicycles and Pedestrians
- Reduce road rage

### **State of Repair**

- Repair Roadway Pavement
- Reduce Transit Service Calls

### **Bicycle Projects**

- Likely use (model to be developed by AMBAG for urban areas) -->:
  - ADT on adjacent roadway(s)
  - Density in area (potential users)
  - existing or future connectivity between the project and the surrounding bikeway network
  - socioeconomic data
  - network geometry and topography
  - existing and future bike, transit, and roadway networks.
  - Trip purposes served: to/ from homes and jobs; schools; shops; recreation and other trip purposes.
- Emissions reduced (based on reduced VMT, cold starts, etc)
- Safety
- Fills gap in system
- Use by k-12 students



### **Key issues considered by project sponsors**

- Safety/collision data
- Congestion hot spots
- Capacity needs
- Priorities identified in adopted plans (Bike Plan, Beach Area, UCSC/MST, etc)
- Geographic balance
- Demographics: Population being served
- Number of potential users
- Popularity of a program (for TDM)
- Identified needs
- Council, public feedback --- esp for streetscaping, sidewalks, etc
- A significant collision
- Timing of other projects (ability to consolidate/piggy back, even if one project might otherwise on it own be constructed several years later)
  - Ex. timed utility upgrades, new development, etc
- Requirements (from LRDP, EIR, development review, mitigation plans, etc)
- Financing
- Overall goals: Sustainability focus, reducing number of subsidies
- Public input via surveys, committees
- Age of facility/equipment--replacement needs
- Grant eligibility criteria (ID project that fits grant)
- System preservation, PMI
- Ability to complete project/deliverability/full funding
- Address environmental concerns
- Projects that yield greatest GHG emission reductions
- Review of existing program success
- Challenge to prioritize when huge backlog of needs (ex. large number of roads in bad condition)

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\May2011\ProjStatusPriorities.doc

**TO:** Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)  
**FROM:** Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planner  
**REGARDING:** State Legislative Update

---

### ***RECOMMENDATIONS***

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) provide input on possible RTC positions on state legislation and receive a verbal update on the Governor's May Revise proposal for the State Budget.

---

### **BACKGROUND**

Each year the RTC adopts state and federal legislative programs identifying key legislative issues for the region and monitors transportation bills introduced by the legislature that may affect transportation in Santa Cruz County.

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **State Legislation**

A list of bills that the RTC and its Sacramento Legislative Assistants, JEA and Associates, have been tracking is included as [Attachment 1](#). The list includes preliminary staff recommended positions on these bills. On some bills the RTC may not take an official position, but may request that the author modify the bill to address concerns we may have with the bill. **Staff recommends that the ITAC provide input on these bills, including potential RTC positions, and inform staff of any additional bills that the RTC should monitor.** Staff is especially interested in receiving feedback from the committee on how these bills may impact your agencies, including AB1308: Highway Users Tax Account appropriation of funds; prevailing wage and hiring practice bills (AB 356, AB 987, AB 988, and SB 145); AB 427: transit safety bond funding; and AB 485, Infrastructure financing.

#### **State Budget Update**

This week, Governor Brown will release his "May Revise" for the State Budget. At this meeting, the ITAC will discuss possible impacts to transportation programs. In approving the preliminary FY11/12 budget earlier this year, the State Legislature made \$11 billion in cuts and reenacted the "gas tax swap" which replaced the sales tax on gasoline with a per gallon excise tax dedicated to local street and road, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) programs, and paying transportation bond debt service; and included a sales tax on diesel to fund transit.

With voter approval of Proposition 22 last year, ongoing transportation programs are expected to be relatively protected in this budget. However, the transportation community is eager to complete projects approved for Proposition 1B bond funds and pushing the Legislature to authorize the a summer bond sale for transportation projects. Given outstanding state budget deficits, the Governor has proposed to hold off on new bond sales until the fall, at the earliest. Two major local projects – the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project and the MetroBase Operations Facility – are currently on hold, pending the sale and allocation of Proposition 1B bonds.

It is anticipated that budget debates will focus on what revenue and deficit assumptions to use, reenactment of taxes set to expire this year, elimination or restructuring of Redevelopment Agencies (RDA), pension reform, and cuts to specific programs. The budget proposal put forward by Republican legislators last week includes cuts to welfare grants, adult day-care centers, and in-home assistance for the elderly and help for the disabled; a 10% cut to state workforce; 10% cut to state departments' operating and equipment budgets; and asking voters to temporarily shift \$2.4 billion from mental health and early childhood programs to shrink the deficit.

## **SUMMARY**

The RTC is monitoring several bills proposed by the state legislature and recommends that the ITAC provide input on possible positions on these bills.

### Attachment:

1. RTC State Legislative Bill Track

*\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\May2011\State&FedLegMay11.doc*



**Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission**  
**Legislative Bill Track: 5/13/2011**  
***“Positions” are RTC staff recommended positions***

**AB 49 (Gatto D) Development: expedited permit review.**

**Last Amended:** 3/24/2011

**Status:** 5/4/2011-In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.

**Summary:** The Permit Streamlining Act requires each state agency and local agency to compile one or more lists that specify in detail the information that will be required from any applicant for a development project, and requires a public agency that is the lead agency for a development project, or a public agency which is a responsible agency for a development project that has been approved by the lead agency, to approve or disapprove the project within applicable periods of time. The act also requires any state agency which is the lead agency for a development project to inform the applicant that the Office of Permit Assistance has been created to assist, and provide information to, developers relating to the permit approval process. This bill would require the office to provide information to developers explaining the permit approval process at the state and local levels, or assisting them in meeting statutory environmental quality requirements, as specified, and would prohibit the office or the state from incurring any liability as a result of the provision of this assistance. The bill would require the office to assist state and local agencies in streamlining the permit approval process, and an applicant in identifying any permit required by a state agency for the proposed project. The bill would authorize the office to call a conference of parties at the state level to resolve questions or mediate disputes arising from a permit application for a development project. The bill would require that the office be located exclusively in Sacramento, and to consist of no more than 4 personnel through 2013. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 105 (Committee on Budget) Transportation.**

**Last Amended:** 3/16/2011

**Status:** 3/24/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 6, Statutes of 2011

**Summary:** Existing law provides for payment of current general obligation bond debt service for specified voter-approved transportation bonds from gasoline excise tax revenue in the Highway Users Tax Account and revenue in the Public Transportation Account, and requires the Controller to make specified transfers of revenues in that regard to the Transportation Debt Service Fund. Existing law, pursuant to the Budget Act of 2010, provides for a loan of \$761,639,000 from gasoline excise tax revenue in the Highway Users Tax Account to the General Fund, to be repaid with interest by June 30, 2013. This bill, in fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, would require the Controller to transfer specified amounts of revenues deposited in the State Highway Account from vehicle weight fees to the Transportation Debt Service Fund to be used for reimbursement of the General Fund for payment of current general obligation bond debt service for specified voter-approved transportation bonds, in lieu of the previously authorized gasoline excise tax revenues and Public Transportation Account revenues. In subsequent years, the bill would require all vehicle weight fee revenues to be transferred for this purpose. The bill would make appropriations in this regard. The bill would require the Department of Finance to notify the Controller of the amount of debt service relating to expenditures for eligible mass transit guideway projects that may be paid from revenues restricted by Article XIX of the California Constitution. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Support

**AB 147 (Dickinson D) Subdivisions.**

**Last Amended:** 5/2/2011

**Status:** 5/5/2011-In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.

**Summary:** The Subdivision Map Act authorizes a local agency to require the payment of a fee as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing bridges or major thoroughfares if specified conditions are met. The Mitigation Fee Act authorizes a local

agency to charge a variety of fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions in connection with the approval of a development project, as defined. This bill would authorize a local ordinance to require payment of a fee subject to the Mitigation Fee Act, as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing transportation facilities, as defined.

**Position:** Possible Support

**[AB 286](#) ([Berryhill, Bill R](#)) State highways: Routes 108 and 120.**

**Last Amended:** 4/27/2011

**Status:** 5/12/2011-From committee: Do pass. (Ayes 16. Noes 0.) (May 11).

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #44 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY SECOND READING FILE

**Summary:** Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of the state highway system and associated property. Existing law generally provides for the department to dispose of property acquired by the state for highway purposes if the property is no longer needed for those purposes upon terms, standards, and conditions established by the California Transportation Commission. However, existing law, with respect to excess properties acquired for specified highway routes, requires the commission to allocate net proceeds from the sale of those properties to alternative transportation projects. This bill would , on and after July 1, 2013, require the proceeds from the sale of excess properties acquired by the department for improvements to State Highway Route 120 to be used for improvements to the State Highway Route 108 in Stanislaus County, the North County Corridor. The bill would require the department to deposit the sale proceeds in a special account in the Special Deposit Fund, and would require that interest earnings from funds in that special account accrue to the account. The bill would require the commission to program the funds in the special account to any phase of the North County Corridor, and, upon appropriation by the Legislature, would authorize the commission to allocate the funds to the Stanislaus Council of Governments or any agency designated by that entity to deliver the North County Corridor.

**Position:** Monitor

**[AB 343](#) ([Atkins D](#)) Redevelopment plans: environmental goals.**

**Status:** 5/12/2011-From committee: Do pass. (Ayes 6. Noes 3.) (May 11).

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #3 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY SECOND READING FILE

**Summary:** The Community Redevelopment Law authorizes the establishment of redevelopment agencies in communities in order to address the effects of blight, as defined, in those communities and requires those agencies to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and approve a redevelopment plan for each project area. Existing law requires, among other things, that each redevelopment plan be consistent with the community's general plan. This bill would require each redevelopment plan to consider and identify strategies for how redevelopment projects will help attain the climate, air quality, and energy conservation goals or applicable regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. This bill contains other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**[AB 345](#) ([Atkins D](#)) Vehicles: traffic control devices: consultation.**

**Last Amended:** 4/4/2011

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #150 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY THIRD READING FILE

**Summary:** Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to consult with local agencies before adopting rules and regulations prescribing uniform standards and specifications for official traffic control devices. This bill would additionally require the department to consult with groups representing users of streets, roads, and highways, as defined. The bill would require the department to ensure that an advisory committee or group organized for the purposes of advising the department regarding standards and specifications for official traffic control devices includes representatives from groups representing nonmotorizing interests of users of streets, roads, and highways.

**Position:** Possible Support

**[AB 356](#) ([Hill D](#)) Public works projects: local hiring policies.**

**Last Amended:** 4/25/2011

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #4 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY SECOND READING FILE

**Summary:** Existing law authorizes state agencies to enter into public works projects, as defined, and imposes various requirements with respect to the contracting and bidding process. This bill would prohibit any local agency, as defined, from mandating that any portion or percentage of work on a public works project be performed by local residents or persons residing within particular geographic areas if any portion of that public works project will take place outside the geographical boundaries of the local agency. The bill would also require a local agency to fund any increase in cost of a public works project that is located entirely within the geographical boundaries of the local agency where the public works project is funded with state funds and the local agency implements a local resident hiring policy, as specified.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 381 (Alejo D) Department of Transportation.**

**Location:** 2/14/2011-A. PRINT

**Summary:** Existing law creates the Department of Transportation, within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, under the administration of the Director of Transportation, who is required to organize the department, as specified, with the approval of the Governor and the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. This bill would make a nonsubstantive, grammatical change to that provision.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 427 (John A. Pérez D) Transportation bond funds: transit system safety.**

**Last Amended:** 3/29/2011

**Status:** 5/12/2011-In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.

**Summary:** Existing law, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, authorizes the issuance of \$19.925 billion of general obligation bonds for specified purposes. Existing law requires the deposit of \$1 billion of the bond proceeds in the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account to be used, upon appropriation, for capital projects that provide increased protection against a security and safety threat, and for capital expenditures to increase the capacity of transit operators to develop disaster response transportation systems that can move people, goods, and emergency personnel and equipment in the aftermath of a disaster impairing that movement. Existing law designates the California Emergency Management Agency as the administrative agency for this account and requires the allocation of 60% of the funds in the account for capital expenditures to transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, and certain other transit-related agencies, as specified, and 15% of the funds for capital expenditures to specified intercity passenger rail systems and commuter rail systems. Existing law provides that operators that receive those funds for intercity passenger rail systems and commuter rail systems are not eligible for those funds designated for capital expenditures of transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, and other specified transit-related agencies. This bill would instead authorize operators that receive funds from the account for intercity passenger rail systems and commuter rail systems to also be eligible for funds designated for capital expenditures of transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, and other specified transit-related agencies. The bill would require an entity eligible to receive allocations of any of those funds to submit a document within a specified time to the California Emergency Management Agency that indicates the intent to use the funds and would, if the document is not submitted, authorize the California Emergency Management Agency to reallocate the funds. The bill would require the California Emergency Management Agency to notify a transportation planning agency if funds allocated to an entity within the region of the transportation planning agency are being reallocated and, if the transportation planning agency provides a document to the California Emergency Management Agency indicating its intent to distribute the funds to transit operators or rail operators, would require the funds to be allocated to the transportation planning agency. The bill would authorize the California Emergency Management Agency to allocate the funds on a competitive basis to an eligible entity in a different region of the state if the transportation planning agency does not receive an allocation to distribute funds to transit operators and rail operators, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 441 (Monning D) State planning.**

**Last Amended:** 3/24/2011

**Status:** 5/4/2011-In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.

**Summary:** Existing law requires certain transportation planning activities by the Department of Transportation and by designated regional transportation planning agencies, including development of a regional transportation plan. Existing law authorizes the California Transportation Commission, in cooperation with regional agencies, to prescribe study areas for analysis and evaluation and guidelines for the preparation of a regional transportation plan. This bill would require that commission to include health issues, as specified, in the guidelines promulgated by the commission for the preparation of regional transportation plans. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**[AB 484](#) ([Alejo D](#)) **Land use: natural resources: transfer of long-term management funds.****

**Last Amended:** 3/29/2011

**Status:** 5/11/2011-In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.

**Summary:** The Planning and Zoning Law authorizes a state or local public agency to authorize a nonprofit organization to hold title to, and manage an interest in, real property that the state or local public agency requires a property owner to transfer to the agency to mitigate any adverse impact upon natural resources caused by permitting the development of a project or facility, provided the nonprofit organization meets specified conditions. That law also authorizes an agency that, in the development of its own project, is required to transfer an interest in real property to mitigate an adverse impact upon natural resources, to transfer the interest to a nonprofit organization that meets the specified conditions. This bill would authorize funds set aside for the long-term management of any lands or easements conveyed to a nonprofit organization pursuant to the above provisions to also be conveyed to the nonprofit organization as specified. The bill would also require the nonprofit organization to hold, manage, invest, and disburse the funds in furtherance of managing and stewarding the land or easement for which the funds were set aside.

**Position:** Possible Support

**[AB 485](#) ([Ma D](#)) **Infrastructure financing.****

**Last Amended:** 5/5/2011

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #106 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY THIRD READING FILE

**Summary:** (1) The Transit Village Development Planning Act of 1994 authorizes a city or county to create a transit village plan for a transit village development district that addresses specified characteristics. Existing law authorizes the legislative body of the city or county to adopt an infrastructure financing plan, create an infrastructure financing district, and issue bonds for which only the district is liable, to finance specified public facilities, upon voter approval. This bill would eliminate the requirement of voter approval for the adoption of an infrastructure financing plan, the creation of an infrastructure financing district, and the issuance of bonds with respect to a transit village development district. The bill would require a city or county that uses infrastructure financing district bonds to finance its transit village development district to use at least 20% of the revenue from those bonds for the purposes of increasing, improving, and preserving the supply of lower and moderate-income housing; to require that those housing units remain available and occupied by moderate-, low-, very low, and extremely low income households for at least 55 years for rental units and 45 years for owner-occupied units; and to rehabilitate, develop, or construct for rental or sale to persons and families of low or moderate income an equal number of replacement dwellings to those removed or destroyed from the low- and moderate-income segment of the housing market as a result of the development of the district, as specified. The bill would set forth the findings and declarations of the Legislature, and the intent of the Legislature that the development of transit village development districts be environmentally conscious and sustainable, and that related construction meet or exceed the requirements of the California Green Building Standards Code. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Possible Support

**[AB 516](#) ([V. Manuel Pérez D](#)) **Safe routes to school.****

**Last Amended:** 4/13/2011

**Location:** 5/4/2011-A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE

**Summary:** Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the California Highway Patrol, to establish and administer a "Safe Routes to School" program for construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming projects, and to award grants to local agencies in that regard from available federal and state funds, based on the

results of a statewide competition. Existing law requires the department to rate proposals submitted by applicants using specified factors. One of the factors relates to consultation of and support for projects by school-based organizations, local traffic engineers, local elected officials, law enforcement agencies, school officials, and other relevant community stakeholders. This bill would delete that factor and instead substitute a factor relating to use of a specified public participation process, with involvement by the public, schools, parents, teachers, local agencies, the business community, key professionals, and others, which process identifies community priorities and ensures those priorities are reflected in the proposal, and secures support for the proposal by relevant community stakeholders. The bill would add another factor relating to benefit of a proposal to a low-income school , as defined , and would make other related changes .

**Position:** Support

**AB 567 (Valadao R) Transportation funds: capital improvement projects.**

**Introduced:** 2/16/2011

**Location:** 2/16/2011-A. PRINT

**Summary:** Existing law requires specified funds made available for transportation capital improvement projects to be programmed and expended for interregional and regional improvements, as specified. This bill would make nonsubstantive changes to these provisions.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 605 (Dickinson D) Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: transportation impacts.**

**Introduced:** 2/16/2011

**Status:** 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was NAT. RES. on 3/3/2011)

**Location:** 5/10/2011-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:** The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. This bill would require the Office of Planning and Research, in consultation with specified entities, to prepare and adopt guidelines that would, among other things, establish the percentage reduction in the projected trip generation and vehicle miles traveled for a project as compared to the average for trip generation and vehicle miles traveled for that project type that would assist a region in meeting the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the State Air Resources Board for the automobile and light truck sector for that region, and develop a list of mitigation measures that a project may incorporate to reduce the project's projected trip generation and vehicle miles traveled. The bill would provide that a project meeting or exceeding the percentage reduction in trip generation and vehicle miles traveled or a project that incorporates the listed mitigation measures sufficient to allow the project to meet the percentage reduction would not need to consider the transportation-related impact of the project in environmental documents prepared pursuant to CEQA. Because a lead agency would be required to determine whether a project would meet the percentage reduction established by the guidelines, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 638 (Skinner D) Fuel resources: State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission and State Air Resources Board.**

**Last Amended:** 4/13/2011

**Status:** 5/11/2011-In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.

**Summary:** Existing law requires the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (commission) and the State Air Resources Board (board) , in consultation with other state and local agencies the commission deems necessary, to develop and adopt recommendations for the Governor and Legislature on a California Strategy to Reduce Petroleum Dependence. Existing law also requires the commission, in partnership with the board, to develop and adopt a state plan to increase the use of alternative transportation fuels. This bill would require the commission and the board to,



among other things, adopt policies and regulations to attain the fuel consumption targets set forth in state plan to increase the use of alternative transportation fuels , coordinate the attainment of the targets with provisions regulating alternative fuels, and assess how future guidelines, regulations , and investments affect the attainment of the fuel consumption targets. The bill would require the commission and the board, on or before January 1, 2013, in consultation with other state and local agencies the commission and the board deem necessary, to update a specified economic analysis, develop a strategy for petroleum fuel use reduction and alternative fuel use in specified vehicles, and identify regulatory and statutory barriers to attaining the petroleum fuel consumption targets. The bill would require the commission and the board, commencing January 1, 2014, and triennially thereafter until January 1, 2024, to report to the Legislature on progress in reaching the fuel consumption targets.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 650 (Blumenfield D) Blue Ribbon Task Force on Public Transportation for the 21st Century.**

**Last Amended:** 3/31/2011

**Status:** 5/4/2011-In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.

**Summary:** Existing law establishes various boards and commissions within state government. Existing law establishes various transit districts and other local entities for development of public transit on a regional basis and makes various state revenues available to those entities for those purposes. Existing law declares that the fostering, continuance, and development of public transportation systems are a matter of statewide concern. The Public Transportation Account is designated as a trust fund and funds in the account shall be available to the Department of Transportation only for specified transportation planning and mass transportation purposes. This bill would establish the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Public Transportation for the 21st Century. The bill would require the task force to be comprised of 12 specified members and would require the Senate Committee on Rules and the Speaker of the Assembly to jointly appoint these members, including a chair, by March 31, 2012. The bill would require the task force to issue a written report that contains specified findings and recommendations relating to, among other things, the current state of California's transit system, the estimated cost of creating the needed system over various terms, and potential sources of funding to sustain the transit system's needs, and to submit the report by March 31, 2013, to the Governor, the Legislature, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the Senate Committee on Rules, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the transportation committees of the Legislature. The bill would require the task force , for purposes of collecting information for the written report, to consult with appropriate state agencies and departments and would require the task force to contract with consultants for preparation of the report. The bill would require the department to provide administrative staffing to the task force . The bill would appropriate \$750,000 from the Public Transportation Account to the department , as specified, to accomplish the purposes of these provisions.

**Position:** Possible Support

**AB 710 (Skinner D) Local planning: infill and transit-oriented development.**

**Last Amended:** 4/25/2011

**Calendar:** 5/18/2011 9 a.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY APPROPRIATIONS, FUENTES, CHAIR

**Summary:** The Planning and Zoning Law requires specified regional transportation planning agencies to prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, and requires the regional transportation plan to include, among other things, a sustainable communities strategy, for the purpose of using local planning to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This bill would state the findings and declarations of the Legislature with respect to parking requirements and infill and transit-oriented development, and would state the intent of the Legislature to reduce unnecessary government regulation and to reduce the cost of development by eliminating excessive minimum parking requirements for infill and transit-oriented development. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Possible Support

**AB 796 (Blumenfield D) Financial assistance.**

**Last Amended:** 5/11/2011

**Status:** 5/12/2011-Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

**Summary:** The California Alternative Energy and Advanced Transportation Financing Act requires the California Alternative Energy and Advanced Transportation Financing Authority (CAEATFA), in consultation with the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, to establish criteria for selecting projects related to renewable energy and alternative transportation technologies that would receive financial assistance, including loans, loan loss reserves, interest rate reductions, insurance, guarantees, and other credit enhancement or liquidity facilities, from the authority. This bill would require the CAEATFA to establish the Clean Energy and Jobs Incentive Program to provide financial assistance in the form of loan loss reserves to a participating financial institution providing loans to California-based entities for the development and expansion of manufacturing facilities or the installation of eligible technologies, as defined. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 819 (Wieckowski D) Bikeways.**

**Introduced:** 2/17/2011

**Last Amended:** 3/31/2011

**Status:** 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was TRANS. on 4/4/2011)

**Location:** 5/10/2011-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:**

Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in cooperation with county and city governments, to establish minimum safety design criteria for the planning and construction of bikeways, and authorizes cities, counties, and local agencies to establish bikeways. Existing law defines 3 classes of bikeways for its purposes. This bill would include a class IV bikeway among the bikeways subject to the above provisions and would define a class IV bikeway to include a segregated bike lane which provides exclusive use of bicycles on streets, as specified.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 890 (Olsen R) Environment: CEQA exemption: roadway improvement.**

**Last Amended:** 3/29/2011

**Status:** 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was NAT. RES. on 5/3/2011)

**Location:** 5/10/2011-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:** The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. This bill would additionally exempt a roadway improvement project or activity that is undertaken by a city, county, or city and county. Because a lead agency would be required to determine whether a project falls within the above exemption, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 892 (Carter D) Department of Transportation: environmental review process: federal pilot program.**

**Last Amended:** 5/10/2011

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #207 ASSM CONSENT CALENDAR-2nd LEGISLATIVE DAY ASSEMBLY MEASURES

**Summary:** Existing law gives the Department of Transportation full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing federal law requires the United States Secretary of Transportation to carry out a surface transportation project delivery pilot program, under which the participating states assume certain responsibilities for environmental review and clearance of transportation projects that would otherwise be the responsibility of the federal government. Existing law requires the department to submit a report to the Legislature regarding state and federal environmental review. Existing law requires the report to be submitted no later than January 1, 2009, and again, no later than January 1, 2011. This bill would, instead, require the report to be submitted no later than January 1, 2015, and again, no later than January 1, 2018. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Possible Support

**AB 957 (Committee on Transportation) Transportation omnibus bill.**

**Last Amended:** 4/13/2011

**Status:** 5/12/2011-In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.

**Summary:** Existing law, the Sacramento Regional Transit District Act, creates the Sacramento Regional Transit District, with specified powers and duties relative to providing transit services in the Sacramento region. Existing law provides that the district is comprised of specified cities and unincorporated territories in the Counties of Sacramento and Yolo. Existing law sets forth provisions for transition from the Sacramento Transit Authority to the district and also sets forth provisions applicable to the establishment of the first board of the district. This bill would provide that the district includes the Cities of Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, and West Sacramento. The bill would delete obsolete provisions relating to the transition from the authority to the district and establishment of the district's first board. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:**

**AB 987 (Grove R) Public works: prevailing wages.**

**Status:** 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was L. & E. on 3/10/2011)

**Location:** 5/10/2011-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:** Existing law defines the term "public works" for purposes of requirements regarding the payment of prevailing wages, the regulation of working hours, and the securing of workers' compensation for public works projects. Existing law further requires that, except as specified, not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem wages be paid to workers employed on public works projects, and imposes misdemeanor penalties for a violation of this requirement. Existing law exempts certain projects from the prevailing wage requirements, including public works projects of less than \$1,000. This bill would specify that workers must be employed directly at the site of the work to be deemed employed upon public work. The bill would exempt from the prevailing wage requirements public projects of less than \$100,000. The bill would also exempt from the prevailing wage requirements the governing board of a school district with regard to the construction, reconstruction, or rehabilitation of school facilities, any fabrication or prefabrication work done at a permanent offsite facilities of a contractor, a public work project of a local agency that adopts a resolution or ordinance, as specified, workers employed on a hospital seismic retrofitting project. The bill would also exempt from the definition of "public works," for purposes of the prevailing wage requirements, work performed during the design and preconstruction phases of construction, including inspection and land surveying work and would delete provisions of existing law specifying that "public works" includes the hauling of refuse from a public works site to an outside disposal location. This bill would delete from existing law exclusions from the requirements of public works and prevailing wage laws for work done on certain private development projects, affordable housing units for low- or moderate-income persons, privately-owned residential projects, qualified residential rental projects, single-family residential projects, and low-income housing projects. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 988 (Grove R) Prevailing wages.**

**Status:** 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was L. & E. on 3/10/2011)

**Location:** 5/10/2011-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:** Existing law defines the term "public works" for purposes of requirements regarding the payment of prevailing wages, the regulation of working hours, and the securing of workers' compensation for public works projects. Existing law further requires that, except as specified, not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem wages, determined by the Director of Industrial Relations as specified, be paid to workers employed on public works projects, and imposes misdemeanor penalties for certain violations of this requirement. This bill would revise the manner in which the director determines the rate of general prevailing wages, including deleting the requirement that he or she consider the applicable wage rates established by collective bargaining agreements and the rates that may have been predetermined for federal public works, and deleting the requirement that the director consider further data from labor organizations and employers or employer associations and concerns where the rates do not constitute the rates actually paid in the locality. The bill would also revise the methodology that the director is required to use in determining the general prevailing rate of per diem wages in the locality in which the public work is to be performed, including deleting certain requirement, and

requiring the director to conduct a survey of the wages paid for work performed in each locality in which the public work is to be performed. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 995 (Cedillo D) Environmental quality: CEQA: public assistance and information program: recommendations: review of transit-oriented development.**

**Status:** 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was NAT. RES. on 3/10/2011)

**Location:** 5/10/2011-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:** The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment, or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA requires the Office of Planning and Research, using existing resources, to implement a public assistance and information program that includes the establishment of a public education and training program, a data base to assist in the preparation of environmental documents, and a central repository for the collection, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of specified CEQA notices. CEQA further requires that, commencing January 1, 2003, copies of any documents submitted in electronic form to the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to those provisions be furnished by the office to the California State Library. This bill would additionally require the Office of Planning and Research, not later than July 1, 2012, to prepare and submit to the Legislature a report containing recommendations for expedited environmental review for transit-oriented development.

**Position:**

**AB 1097 (Skinner D) Transit projects: domestic content.**

**Introduced:** 2/18/2011

**Last Amended:** 4/25/2011

**Status:** 5/12/2011-From committee: Do pass. Ordered to consent calendar. (Ayes 16. Noes 0.) (May 11).

**Location:** 5/12/2011-A. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Calendar:**

5/16/2011 #69 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY SECOND READING FILE

**Summary:**

Existing law creates the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency with various departments of state government that report to the agency secretary. Existing law provides various sources of funding for transit projects. This bill would require the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing to specifically authorize a state or local agency receiving federal funds for transit purposes to provide a bidding preference to a bidder if the bidder meets or exceeds Buy America requirements applicable to federally funded transit projects.

**Position:** Monitor

**AB 1134 (Bonilla D) Department of Transportation: project study reports.**

**Last Amended:** 3/21/2011

**Status:** 5/4/2011-In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.

**Location:** 5/5/2011-A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE

**Summary:** Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, counties, and cities, to carry out long-term state highway planning. Existing law authorizes the department, to the extent that it does not jeopardize the delivery of projects in the adopted state transportation improvement program, to prepare a project studies report for capacity-increasing state highway projects. Existing law requires the department to review project studies reports performed by an entity other than the department. Existing law authorizes a local entity to request the department to prepare a project studies report for a capacity-increasing state highway project that is being proposed for inclusion in a future state transportation improvement program. If the department determines that it cannot complete the report in a timely fashion, existing law authorizes the requesting entity to prepare the report. Existing law makes specified guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission applicable to project studies reports commenced after October 1, 1991. This bill would instead authorize the department to prepare project study reports for any project on the state highway system. The bill would require project study reports to

include specified project-related factors, including, among other things, cost estimates, schedule, and other information deemed necessary to form a sound basis for commitment of future state funding and project delivery. The bill would require an entity performing a project study report to reimburse the department for the cost of reviewing and approving a report for projects that are not in an adopted regional transportation plan, a voter-approved county sales tax measure expenditure plan, or another voter-approved transportation program. The bill would authorize a local entity to request the department to prepare a project study report for a state highway project that is being proposed for inclusion in a future state transportation improvement program or for funding from a regional or local funding source and would authorize the local entity to prepare the report at its own expense if the department determines that it cannot complete the report. The bill would require open and continuous communication between the department, a local entity requesting a project study report, and the regional transportation planning agency or county transportation commission. The bill would require the department, in consultation with representatives of cities, counties, regional transportation planning agencies, and county congestion management agencies, to prepare draft revised guidelines for the preparation of project study reports, as specified, and would require the department to submit the draft revised guidelines to the California Transportation Commission by July 1, 2012. The bill would require the California Transportation Commission to adopt final guidelines by October 1, 2012, and would make the guidelines applicable to project study reports upon adoption of the guidelines.

**Position:** Possible Support

**[AB 1229](#) (Feuer D) Transportation: financing: federal highway grant anticipation notes.**

**Last Amended:** 5/4/2011

**Calendar:** 5/18/2011 9 a.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY APPROPRIATIONS, FUENTES, CHAIR

**Summary:** Existing law continuously appropriates the amounts specified in the annual Budget Act as having been deposited in the State Highway Account from federal transportation funds, and pledged by the California Transportation Commission, to the Treasurer for the purposes of issuing federal highway grant anticipation notes, commonly known as GARVEE bonds, to fund transportation projects selected by the commission. Existing law prohibits the Treasurer from authorizing the issuance of the notes if the annual repayment obligations of all outstanding notes in any fiscal year would exceed 15% of the total amount of federal transportation funds deposited in the account for any consecutive 12-month period within the preceding 24 months. This bill would authorize a transportation planning agency, for purposes of funding transportation projects from notes secured by federal transportation funds, to commit up to 50% of its share of apportionments of specified federal transportation funds that are apportioned to transportation planning agencies. A transportation planning agency electing to commit these federal funds to debt service on the notes would be required to inform the Department of Transportation, the commission, and the Treasurer .

**Position:** Monitor

**[AB 1287](#) (Buchanan D) Local government: audits.**

**Status:** 3/21/2011-Referred to Com. on L. GOV.

**Summary:** Existing law requires school districts to comply with General Accounting Office standards for financial and compliance audits, as specified, and prohibits an independent auditor from engaging in financial compliance audits unless, within 3 years of commencing the first of the audits, and every 3 years thereafter, the auditor completes a quality control review in accordance with General Accounting Office standards. This bill would require local agencies, defined to include cities, counties, a city and county, special districts, authorities, or public agencies, to comply with General Accounting Office standards for financial and compliance audits and would prohibit an independent auditor from engaging in financial compliance audits unless, within 3 years of commencing the first of the audits, and every 3 years thereafter, the auditor completes a quality control review in accordance with General Accounting Office standards.

**Position:** Monitor

**[AB 1308](#) (Miller R) Highway Users Tax Account: appropriation of funds.**

**Status:** 5/4/2011-In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.

**Summary:** Article XIX of the California Constitution requires revenues from state excise taxes on motor vehicle fuels for use in motor vehicles upon public streets and highways, over and above the cost of collection and any refunds authorized by law, to be used for various street and highway purposes and for certain mass transit guideway purposes. Existing law requires state excise fuel tax revenues to be deposited in various accounts and to be allocated, in part, for various

purposes, including the cost of collection and authorized refunds. Existing law requires the balance of these funds remaining after authorized deductions to be transferred to and deposited monthly in the Highway Users Tax Account in the Transportation Tax Fund. Existing law provides for formula apportionment of specified revenues in the Highway Users Tax Account to cities and counties for the transportation purposes authorized by Article XIX of the California Constitution, and requires other portions of those revenues to be transferred to and deposited in the State Highway Account in the State Transportation Fund. Existing law provides that the money in the Highway Users Tax Account is appropriated for the above-described transportation purposes, but also generally provides that the money in the State Highway Account may not be expended until appropriated by the Legislature. This bill, in any year in which the Budget Act has not been enacted by July 1, would provide that all moneys in the Highway Users Tax Account in the Transportation Tax Fund, except as specified, are continuously appropriated and may be encumbered for certain purposes until the Budget Act is enacted. The bill would thereby make an appropriation. The bill would authorize the Controller to make estimates in order to implement these provisions.

**Position:** Support

**AB 1354 (Huber D) Public works: progress payments: notice: retention proceeds.**

**Last Amended:** 4/26/2011

**Status:** 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was B.,P. & C.P. on 4/27/2011)

**Location:** 5/10/2011-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:** Existing law requires that, for private and public works of improvement, and in a public works contract, a prime contractor or subcontractor pay to any subcontractor, not later than 10 days after receipt of each progress payment, unless otherwise agreed to in writing, the respective amount allowed the contractor on account of the work performed by the subcontractors, to the extent of each contractor's interest therein, as prescribed. This bill would, instead, require that those amounts be paid not later than 7 days after receipt of each progress payment. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**ABX18 (Ma D) Transportation bond funds.**

**Status:** 12/7/2010-From printer.

**Summary:** Existing law, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, authorizes the issuance of general obligation bonds for various transportation purposes. Existing law requires that \$1,000,000,000 of those funds be deposited in the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account, administered by the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA), for capital projects that provide increased protection against a security and safety threat, and for capital expenditures to increase the capacity of transit operators to develop disaster response transportation systems, as specified. Existing law requires 25% of the available funds to be allocated to certain regional public waterborne transit agencies. Existing law requires entities receiving funds from the account to expend those funds within 3 fiscal years of the fiscal year in which the funds were allocated and requires that funds remaining unexpended after those 3 years revert to Cal EMA for reallocation in subsequent fiscal years. This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute. This bill contains other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**ABX19 (Chesbro D) Taxation: vehicle license fees.**

**Status:** 1/3/2011-Read first time.

**Summary:** The Vehicle License Fee Law, in lieu of any ad valorem property tax upon vehicles, imposes an annual license fee for any vehicle subject to registration in this state in the amount of 1% of the market value of that vehicle, as provided, for a specified amount of time. Existing law also, until June 30, 2011, imposes an additional tax equal to 0.15% of the market value of specified vehicles, as determined by the Department of Motor Vehicles, to the vehicle license fee, to be deposited in the General Fund and transferred to the Local Safety and Protection Account, a continuously appropriated fund. This bill would repeal the provision relating to the sunset date and repeal of the additional 0.15% tax, thereby depositing additional moneys into a continuously appropriated fund. This bill contains other related provisions.

**Position:** Monitor

**ACA 4 (Blumenfield D) Local government financing: voter approval.**

**Status:** 5/11/2011-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.

**Calendar:** 6/15/2011 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 447 ASSEMBLY LOCAL GOVERNMENT, SMYTH, Chair

**Summary:** The California Constitution prohibits the ad valorem tax rate on real property from exceeding 1% of the full cash value of the property, subject to certain exceptions. This measure would create an additional exception to the 1% limit for a rate imposed by a city, county, city and county, or special district, as defined, to service bonded indebtedness incurred to fund specified public improvements and facilities, or buildings used primarily to provide sheriff, police, or fire protection services, that is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, city and county, or special district, as applicable. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Support

**AJR 5 (Lowenthal, Bonnie D) Transportation revenues.**

**Last Amended:** 3/29/2011

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #121 SENATE ASSEMBLY BILLS-THIRD READING FILE

**Summary:** This measure would request the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and enact legislation to conduct a study regarding the feasibility of the collection process for a transportation revenue source based on vehicle miles traveled, in order to facilitate the creation of a reliable and steady transportation funding mechanism for the maintenance and improvement of surface transportation infrastructure.

**Position:** Support

**SB 28 (Simitian D) Vehicles: electronic wireless communications devices: prohibitions.**

**Last Amended:** 4/14/2011

**Location:** 5/2/2011-A. TRANS.

**Summary:** Existing law requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to examine applicants for specific driver's licenses and requires that the examination include, among other things, a test of the applicant's knowledge and understanding of the provisions of the Vehicle Code governing the operation of vehicles upon the highways. This bill would require the department to include a test of the applicant's understanding of the distractions and dangers of handheld cell phone use and text messaging while operating a motor vehicle. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 29 (Simitian D) Vehicles: automated traffic enforcement systems.**

**Last Amended:** 5/11/2011

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #63 SENATE SENATE BILLS-THIRD READING FILE

**Summary:** Existing law authorizes the limit line, intersection, or other places where a driver is required to stop to be equipped with an automated enforcement system, as defined, if the system meets certain requirements. Existing law authorizes a governmental agency to contract out the operation of the system under certain circumstances, except for specified activities, that include, among other things, establishing guidelines for selection of location. A violation of the Vehicle Code is a crime. This bill would require that those requirements include identifying the system by signs posted within 200 feet of an intersection where a system is operating. The bill would require that automated traffic enforcement systems installed as of January 1, 2012, be identified no later than January 1, 2013. The bill would require the governmental agency that operates an automated traffic enforcement system to develop uniform guidelines for specified purposes and to establish procedures to ensure compliance with those guidelines. The bill would require, for systems installed as of January 1, 2012, that a governmental agency that operates an automated traffic enforcement system establish those guidelines by January 1, 2013. The bill would require the governmental agency to adopt a finding of fact establishing the need for the system at a specific location for reasons related to safety for those systems installed after January 1, 2012. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 81 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) Transportation.**

**Last Amended:** 3/14/2011

**Location:** 3/14/2011-A. BUDGET

**Summary:** Existing law provides for payment of current general obligation bond debt service for specified voter-approved transportation bonds from gasoline excise tax revenue in the Highway Users Tax Account and revenue in the Public Transportation Account, and requires the Controller to make specified transfers of revenues in that regard to the Transportation Debt Service Fund. Existing law, pursuant to the Budget Act of 2010, provides for a loan of \$761,639,000 from gasoline excise tax revenue in the Highway Users Tax Account to the General Fund, to be repaid with interest by June 30, 2013. This bill, in fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, would require the Controller to transfer specified amounts of revenues deposited in the State Highway Account from vehicle weight fees to the Transportation Debt Service Fund to be used for reimbursement of the General Fund for payment of current general obligation bond debt service for specified voter-approved transportation bonds, in lieu of the previously authorized gasoline excise tax revenues and Public Transportation Account revenues. In subsequent years, the bill would require all vehicle weight fee revenues to be transferred for this purpose. The bill would make appropriations in this regard. The bill would require the Department of Finance to notify the Controller of the amount of debt service relating to expenditures for eligible mass transit guideway projects that may be paid from revenues restricted by Article XIX of the California Constitution. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**[SB 126](#) ([Steinberg D](#)) California Transportation Commission: guidelines.**

**Status:** 5/11/2011-Read second time. Ordered to third reading.

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #56 SENATE SENATE BILLS-THIRD READING FILE

**Summary:** Existing law generally provides for programming and allocation of state and federal funds available for transportation capital improvement projects by the California Transportation Commission, pursuant to various requirements. Existing law authorizes the commission, in certain cases, to adopt guidelines relative to its programming and allocation policies and procedures. This bill would establish specified procedures that the commission would be required to utilize when it adopts guidelines, except as specified, and would exempt the adoption of those guidelines from the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. This bill contains other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**[SB 145](#) ([Wyland R](#)) Public works: prevailing wage rates.**

**Location:** 2/10/2011-S. RLS.

**Summary:** Existing law requires, except for public works projects of \$1,000 or less, that workers employed on public works be paid not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for work of a similar character in the locality that the public work is performed, and not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for holiday and overtime work fixed, as prescribed. Existing law requires the Director of Industrial Relations to determine the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for work of a similar character in the locality in which the public work is to be performed, and the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for holiday and overtime work. Existing law requires the body awarding a contract for public work to obtain from the Director of Industrial Relations the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for work of a similar character in the locality in which the public work is to be performed, and the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for holiday and overtime work. This bill would make technical, nonsubstantive changes to the provisions relating to the prevailing rate of per diem wages.

**Position:**

**[SB 186](#) ([Kehoe D](#)) The Controller.**

**Last Amended:** 4/6/2011

**Location:** 4/11/2011-S. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE

**Summary:** Existing law authorizes the Controller to appoint a qualified accountant to make an investigation and to obtain the information required for the annual report of financial transactions. This bill would authorize the Controller to exercise discretionary authority to perform an audit or investigation of any county, city, special district, joint powers authority, or redevelopment agency, if the Controller has reason to believe, supported by documentation, that the local agency is not complying with the financial requirements in state law, grant agreements, local charters, or local ordinances. This bill



would require the Controller to prepare a report of the results of the audit or investigation and to file a copy with the local legislative body.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 214 (Wolk D) Infrastructure financing districts: voter approval: repeal.**

**Last Amended:** 4/25/2011

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 #26 SENATE SENATE BILLS-THIRD READING FILE

**Summary:** Existing law authorizes a legislative body, as defined, to create an infrastructure financing district, adopt an infrastructure financing plan, and issue bonds, for which only the district is liable, to finance specified public facilities, upon voter approval. This bill would eliminate the requirement of voter approval and authorize the legislative body to create the district, adopt the plan, and issue the bonds by resolutions. The bill would authorize a district to finance specified actions and projects and prohibit the district from providing financial assistance to a vehicle dealer or big box retailer, as defined. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 223 (Leno D) Voter-approved local assessment: vehicles.**

**Status:** 5/9/2011-Placed on APPR. suspense file.

**Summary:** Existing law authorizes certain counties to impose a local vehicle license fee not exceeding \$10 per vehicle, as provided, for the privilege of operating specified vehicles on public roads in the county. Existing law requires a county imposing this fee to contract with the Department of Motor Vehicles to collect and administer the fee, as specified. This bill would authorize counties and the City and County of San Francisco to impose a voter-approved local assessment for specified vehicles if certain conditions, including approval by local voters, are met. The bill would require the county or the city and county to contract with the department to collect and administer the assessment, as provided. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Support

**SB 226 (Simitian D) Land use planning.**

**Status:** 4/28/2011-Referred to Coms. on NAT. RES. and L. GOV.

**Summary:** The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project, as defined, that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment, as defined, or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA requires a lead agency to call a scoping meeting for a project of statewide, regional, or areawide significance, and requires the lead agency to provide notice of at least one of those scoping meetings to specified entities, including a county or city that borders on a county or city within which the project is located, unless otherwise designated annually by agreement between the lead agency and county or city. This bill would authorize the referral of a proposed action to adopt or substantially amend a general plan to a city or county within or abutting the area covered by the proposal by a planning agency prior to action by a legislative body to adopt or amend the general plan to be conducted concurrently with the scoping meeting. The city or county would be authorized to submit specified comments at the scoping meeting. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Possible Support

**SB 392 (Gaines R) Transportation: California Transportation Commission.**

**Location:** 2/24/2011-S. RLS.

**Summary:** Existing law establishes the California Transportation Commission and authorizes the commission to alter or change the location of any state highway if, in the opinion of the commission, the alteration is for the best interest of the state. This bill would make a nonsubstantive change to these provisions.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 468 (Kehoe D) Department of Transportation: capacity-increasing state highway projects: coastal zone.**

**Last Amended:** 4/26/2011

**Calendar:** 5/23/2011 11 a.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) SENATE APPROPRIATIONS, KEHOE, Chair

**Summary:** Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing law imposes various requirements for the development and implementation of transportation projects. This bill would impose additional requirements on the department with respect to proposed capacity-increasing state highway projects that would widen the existing paved highway in the coastal zone, including requiring the department to collaborate with local agencies, the California Coastal Commission, countywide or regional transportation planning agencies, and other affected local, state, and federal agencies to ensure that multimodal transportation options are evaluated and included in project design. The bill would, for these projects, require the department to suspend a notice of determination relating to environmental impact, issued between January 1, 2011, and January 1, 2012, until it is determined that environmental documents for the projects satisfy the requirements of the bill. The bill would also make legislative findings and declarations.

**Position:** Oppose\_Unless\_Amended

**SB 545 (Anderson R) Transportation.**

**Status:** 3/3/2011-Referred to Com. on RLS.

**Summary:** Existing law creates various transportation programs to develop and implement improvements to transportation systems. This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation enabling the state to examine efficiency in administering solutions to California's transportation needs.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 582 (Emmerson R) Commute benefit policies.**

**Last Amended:** 5/5/2011

**Status:** 5/9/2011-Do pass as amended.

**Summary:** Existing law requires transportation planning agencies to undertake various transportation planning activities, including preparation of a regional transportation plan. Existing law requires transportation planning agencies that are designated under federal law as metropolitan planning organizations to include a sustainable communities strategy as part of the regional transportation plan for their region. Existing law creates air quality management districts and air pollution control districts with various responsibilities relative to reduction of air pollution. This bill, beginning on January 1, 2013, subject to certain exceptions, would authorize a metropolitan planning organization jointly with the local air quality management district or air pollution control district to adopt a commute benefit ordinance that requires covered employers operating within the common area of the organization and district with a specified number of covered employees to offer those employees certain commute benefits. The bill would require that the ordinance specify certain matters, including any consequences for noncompliance, and would impose a specified reporting requirement. The bill would impose a requirement for all metropolitan planning organizations within the region served by a specified air district to jointly elect to adopt the ordinance together with the district. The bill would exclude from its provisions an air district with a trip reduction regulation initially adopted prior to the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments as long as it continues to have a regulation that allows trip reduction as a method of compliance. The bill would make its provisions inoperative on January 1, 2017.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 693 (Dutton R) Public contracts: local agencies.**

**Last Amended:** 4/13/2011

**Status:** 5/2/2011-Set, second hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.

**Summary:** Existing law sets forth requirements for the solicitation and evaluation of bids and the awarding of contracts by public entities for the erection, construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of any public structure, building, road, or other public improvement. Existing law also authorizes specified state agencies, cities, and counties to implement alternative procedures for the awarding of contracts on a design-build basis. Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation and regional transportation agencies to enter into public-private partnerships for transportation projects under certain conditions. Existing law authorizes the department to delegate to any city or county any part of its powers and jurisdiction, except the power of approval, with respect to any portion of any state highway within the city or county,

and to withdraw the delegation. This bill would specify that the delegation authority includes the authority to utilize private-public partnership agreements for transportation projects.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 851 (Anderson R) Transportation.**

**Status:** 3/10/2011-Referred to Com. on RLS.

**Summary:** Existing law provides the Department of Transportation with full possession and control of all state highways and authorizes the department to lay out and construct all state highways, as specified. This bill would state intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would address the need for highway construction.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 907 (Evans D) Master Plan for Infrastructure Financing and Development Commission.**

**Last Amended:** 5/3/2011

**Calendar:** 5/16/2011 10 a.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) SENATE APPROPRIATIONS, KEHOE, Chair

**Summary:** The California Constitution regulates the issuance of debt by the state and requires that debt in excess of \$300,000 for which the state will be generally obligated be submitted to, and approved by, the voters. This bill would create the Master Plan for Infrastructure Financing and Development Commission, consisting of specified members, and would require the commission to prepare and submit a strategy and plan for infrastructure development in California that meets certain criteria to the Legislature and the Governor by December 1, 2013. This bill would provide that the commission would dissolve 30 days after submission of its final report. This bill would repeal these provisions upon the dissolution of the commission. The bill would provide that these provisions become operative only if the funds required to support the commission are appropriated and made available in the annual Budget Act.

**Position:** Monitor

**SB 910 (Lowenthal D) Vehicles: bicycles: passing distance.**

**Last Amended:** 5/10/2011

**Calendar:** 5/23/2011 11 a.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) SENATE APPROPRIATIONS, KEHOE, Chair

**Summary:** Under existing law, a driver of a vehicle overtaking another vehicle or a bicycle proceeding in the same direction is required to pass to the left at a safe distance without interfering with the safe operation of the overtaken vehicle or bicycle, subject to certain limitations and exceptions. A violation of this provision is an infraction punishable by a fine not exceeding \$100 for a first conviction, and up to a \$250 fine for a 3rd and subsequent conviction occurring within one year of 2 or more prior infractions. This bill would recast this provision as to overtaking a bicycle by requiring the driver of a motor vehicle overtaking a bicycle that is proceeding in the same direction to pass at a safe distance, at a minimum clearance of 3 feet, or at a speed not exceeding 15 miles per hour faster than the bicycle, without interfering with the safe operation of the overtaken bicycle. The bill would make a violation of this provision an infraction punishable by a \$35 fine. The bill would also require the imposition of a \$220 fine on a driver if a collision occurs between a motor vehicle and a bicyclist causing bodily harm to the bicyclist, and the driver is found to be in violation of the above provisions. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Position:** Monitor