

## MEETING OF THE

# LEGISLATIVE/COMMUNICATIONS AND MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION OF  
GOVERNMENTS**

### Main Office

818 West Seventh Street  
12th Floor  
Los Angeles, California  
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

[www.scag.ca.gov](http://www.scag.ca.gov)

### Officers

#### President

Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

#### First Vice President

Glen Becerra, Simi Valley

#### Second Vice President

Greg Pettis, Cathedral City

#### Immediate Past President

Larry McCallon, Highland

### Executive/Administration Committee Chair

Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

### Policy Committee Chairs

Community, Economic and  
Human Development  
Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake

Energy & Environment  
Margaret Clark, Rosemead

Transportation  
Paul Glaab, Laguna Niguel

**Tuesday, April 17, 2012**

**8:30 a.m. -10:00 a.m.**

**SCAG Offices**

**818 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor**

**Policy Committee Room B**

**Los Angeles, CA 90017**

**(213) 236-1800**

### Videoconference Available

**Riverside SCAG Office**

**3403 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 805**

**Riverside, CA 92501**

**San Bernardino SCAG Office**

**1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Suite 140**

**San Bernardino, CA 92418**

**Imperial County SCAG Office**

**1405 N. Imperial Avenue, Suite 1**

**El Centro, CA 92243**

### Teleconference Also Available

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Ruby Moreno at (213) 236-1840 or via email [moreno@scag.ca.gov](mailto:moreno@scag.ca.gov)

Agendas & Minutes for the Legislative/ Communications and Membership Committee are also available at:

[www.scag.ca.gov/committees](http://www.scag.ca.gov/committees)

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1993 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1928

# Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee

April 2012

*Judy Mitchell, District 40*

*Gene Daniels, District 24*

*Chair*

*Vice-Chair*

**Member**

Barrows, Bruce

Becerra, Glen

Carroll, Stan

Clark, Margaret

Daigle, Leslie

Finlay, Margaret

Glaab, Paul

Martinez, Michele

McCallon, Larry

Nelson, Shawn

O'Connor, Pam

Pettis, Greg

Viegas-Walker, Cheryl

**Representing**

District 23

District 46

District 31

District 32

District 15

District 35

District 12

District 16

District 7

Orange County

District 41

District 2

District 1

## **Teleconference Locations**

Hon. Margaret Clark  
San Gabriel Basin WQA  
1720 W. Cameron Avenue, #100  
West Covina, CA 91790

# LEGISLATIVE/COMMUNICATIONS & MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE AGENDA APRIL 17, 2012

---

*The Legislative/Communications & Membership Committee may consider and act upon any of the items listed on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as information or action items.*

## **CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

*(Hon. Judy Mitchell, Chair)*

## **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

*Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the agenda, or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Committee, must fill out and present a Public Comment Card to the Assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes, per speaker provided that the Chair has the discretion to reduce this time limit based upon the number of speakers. The Chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty (20) minutes.*

## **REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. Minutes of March 20, 2012 Meeting **Attachment 1**

### **ACTION ITEMS**

2. SCAG Sponsorship of Annual Events: **Attachment 7**

- a) 2012 21st Annual Western Riverside Council of Governments General Assembly, **June 21, 2012** (\$2,500);
- b) Coalition for America's Gateways and Trade Corridors Annual Conference **May 9, 2012**, (\$2,500);
- c) 2012 6th Annual Orange County Housing Summit, **May 31, 2012** (\$1,000);
- d) 2013 12th Annual New Partners for Smart Growth Event **February 7 - 9, 2013**, (in-kind sponsorship)

*(Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director)*

3. SB 1225 (Padilla): Intercity Rail Agreements (LOSSAN/Pacific Surfliner local control) **Attachment 9**  
*(Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director)*

4. AB 1778 (Williams): Local Transportation Funds **Attachment 22**  
*(Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director)*

# LEGISLATIVE/COMMUNICATIONS & MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE AGENDA APRIL 17, 2012

---

## INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 5. SCAG Sponsorship Policy-Update<br><i>(Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director)</i>     | Attachment 26 |
| 6. Report from SCAG General Assembly<br><i>(Sylvia Patsaouras, Interim Director)</i>      | Oral Report   |
| 7. Federal & State Legislative Update<br><i>(Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director)</i> | Attachment 32 |
| 8. Regional Services Update<br><i>(Sylvia Patsaouras, Interim Director)</i>               | Oral Update   |

## FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Any Committee member or staff desiring to place items on a future agenda may make such a request.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

## ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Legislative/Communications & Membership Committee is scheduled for 8:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 15, 2012 at the SCAG Los Angeles office.

**LEGISLATIVE/COMMUNICATIONS & MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE  
of the  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

**March 20, 2012  
Minutes**

**THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN AND/OR DISCUSSIONS BY THE LEGISLATIVE/COMMUNICATIONS & MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE. AUDIO OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES OFFICE.**

The Legislative/Communications & Membership Committee held its March 20, 2012 meeting at SCAG's downtown Los Angeles Office.

**Members Present**

Hon. Bruce Barrows, District 23 (**Teleconference**)  
Hon. Glen Becerra, District 46 (**Teleconference**)  
Hon. Stan Carroll, District 31 (**Teleconference**)  
Hon. Margaret Clark, District 32 (**Teleconference**)  
Hon. Gene Daniels, District 24  
Hon. Margaret Finlay, District 35 (**Teleconference**)  
Hon. Michele Martinez, District 16 (**Teleconference**)  
Hon. Larry McCallon, District 7 (**Teleconference**)  
Hon. Judy Mitchell, District 40  
Hon. Shawn Nelson, District 4 (**Teleconference**)  
Hon. Pam O'Connor, District 41 (**Teleconference**)  
Hon. Greg Pettis, District 2  
Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, District 1 (**Videoconference**)

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Councilmember Judy Mitchell at 8:30 a.m. There was a quorum.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no public comments.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. Minutes of January 17, 2012 Meeting

A motion was made (Daniels) to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion was **SECONDED** (Pettis) and **APPROVED** by roll call vote. (2 Abstentions: Mitchell and O'Connor)

**ACTION ITEMS**

**2. SCAG Sponsorship of Annual Events: City of Long Beach Pro/Walk Bike Conference (\$2,000); Council for Watershed Health's The Mediterranean City: A Conference on Climate Change Adaptation (\$2,000); Four Corner Coalition 2012 Economic Summit (\$1,000)**

Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director, summarized three proposed sponsorship requests for the total amount of \$5,000. At the prior LCMC meeting on February 21 2012, the Committee requested SCAG's sponsorship guidelines be added to the next meeting's agenda. Councilmember Becerra noted that SCAG ensure these public funds are spent appropriately.

Councilmember McCallon requested to vote on each sponsorship item separately, and the Committee concurred.

A motion was made (Mitchell) to recommend approval of City of Long Beach Pro/Walk Bike Conference for \$2,000. Motion was SECONDED (Pettis) and unanimously APPROVED by roll call vote.

A motion was made (Pettis) to recommend approval of the Council for Watershed Health's The Mediterranean City: A Conference on Climate Change Adaptation for \$2,000. Motion was SECONDED (Mitchell) and APPROVED by roll call vote (1 no vote: McCallon)

A motion was made (McCallon) to recommend approval for the Four Corner Coalition 2012 Economic Summit for \$1,000. Motion was SECONDED (Mitchell) and unanimously APPROVED by roll call vote.

**3. AB 1455 (Harkey): High Speed Rail Bond**

Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director, introduced AB 1455 which reduces the \$9.9 billion amount of general obligation debt authorized for high-speed rail purposes, but leaves intact the \$950 million provided by the bond for other related rail purposes. The bill's provisions are contrary to the action the Regional Council previously took to work with the Southern California agencies and the California High Speed Rail authority, to seek one billion dollars of unallocated Prop 1A money, and other funds, to improve and enhance the interregional rail service for LOSSAN and Metrolink. AB 1455 would eliminate those funds.

The Committee had questions and asked for clarification on AB 1455; specifically Councilmember Becerra asked if the author's intention is to kill the High Speed Rail Project (HSR). Ms. Neely noted the HSR project would be severely challenged based upon her belief that the monies will not be allocated by the legislature. Ms. Neely reported that HSR will be releasing a revised Business Plan that has reportedly significantly reduced the cost of the HSR project. Additionally, Ms. Neely noted that the state legislature's budget hearings will consider how much money will be allocated for the central valley, Northern California, and the Southern California MOU ready to go projects in the region.

A motion was made (Becerra) to recommend oppose AB 1455 (Harkey): High Speed Rail Bond unless amended. Motion was SECONDED (Clark). The motion generated discussion amongst the Committee.

Ms. Neely suggested that a more generous recommendation would be to say oppose, and work with author versus oppose unless amended. Ms. Neely noted passage of AB 1455 could be questionable if it would pass out of Committee or whether it would be signed by the Governor. This recommendation is consistent with the Regional Council's prior action to enter into an HSR Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) contract.

An amendment to the first motion was made (Becerra) to recommend oppose and work with author on AB 1455 (Harkey): High Speed Rail Bond. Motion was SECONDED (Carroll) and APPROVED by roll call vote (2 no votes: Clark, Nelson).

#### 4. AB 2405 (Blumenfield): Vehicles: High Occupancy Toll Lanes

Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director, briefed the Committee on AB 2405 (Blumenfield). This bill would diminish a local county transportation commission's authority to establish and manage fare policy on tolls for alternative fueled vehicles, which directly impacts managing traffic speed on toll lanes, by exempting tolls on these vehicles. The modeling projections of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) indicate significantly increased usage of alternative fuel vehicles in the future, which could substantially impact the efficiency of managed toll lanes. Ms. Neely stated the bill's provisions are contrary to the hot lane program the Regional Council is considering for adoption in the RTP. The Committee expressed significant concern with removing county transportation commissions' decision making authority with respect to HOT lane toll policy.

A motion was made (McCallon) to recommend oppose and work with author on AB 2405 (Blumenfield): Vehicles: High Occupancy Toll Lanes. Motion was SECONDED (Nelson) and unanimously APPROVED by roll call vote.

#### 5. Report from Washington DC Meetings from Committee Members

Councilmember Pettis reported on his experience attending the National League of Cities (NLC) Conference in Washington DC. He noted that the attendance was low for NLC standards, but the meetings were excellent. The councilmember also mentioned that the California Reception was also well attended by SCAG's partners at Coalition for America's Gateways and Trade Corridors, Congressional staff, and administration officials from the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA).

President Pam O'Connor briefly reported that while attending meetings in Washington DC, the Senate passed their version of the reauthorization bill. Councilmember O'Connor was also pleased with the great attendance at the California Reception.

## INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

### 6. AB 441 (Monning): State Planning: Voluntary Health and Health Equity Factors

Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director, reported to the Committee that AB 441 (Monning) was brought forth as a request by METRO to review and possibly take action on this bill. AB 441 simply requests that voluntary health equity factors, strategies, goals, and objectives be included in the regional transportation planning processes; while this legislation does not affect the current RTP, it could affect subsequent RTP's. Staff will continue to monitor and report back to the Committee.

### 7. Support of SB 659 (Padilla-Hernandez) and SB 654 (Steinberg) regarding Redevelopment Authority (RDA) Abolishment Legislation-Follow-Up from February Regional Council Meeting

Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director, briefed the Committee on this follow-up item, which was originally on the LCMC February meeting agenda, where approval was given in support of this bill. There was a request from Councilmember Nielsen for more information about the impact of amending this bill to address military bases. Ms. Neely reported that it is likely that the action the councilmember seeks under his proposed amendment would be eligible under the current bill. After consultation from SCAG's lobbyist, it may not be in the cities best interest to seek an amendment and call attention to the matter.

Chairwoman Mitchell agreed, and stated that staff monitors this bill.

### 8. State Legislative Matrix-Update

Chairwoman Mitchell stated her appreciation for the format and update of the Legislative Matrix that address SCAG's interests.

Councilmember Finlay had two questions: 1) the differences in AB 2224 (Smyth): Public Employees: Retirement bill and SB 1176 (Huff) Public Employees: Retirement bill. Ms. Neely responded that she would review both bills and report back; 2) SCAG's current position and status of SB 446 (Dutton) Transportation: Airports bill. Councilmember McCallon commented that SCAG has gone on record officially supporting SB 446.

In response to the Councilmember's questions, Ms. Neely reported that because there has not developed a city approved position of who would manage and operate the Ontario Airport among members of the Los Angeles City Council and Mayor Villaraigosa, SCAG has held off bringing forth this legislation to the Committee.

### 9. Comparison HR 7 & Map 21 Matrix-Update

Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director, briefed the Committee on recent actions by SCAG to send out an update to reflect that the Senate had passed the bill and the manager's amendment. Ms. Neely discussed two possible outcomes; the first being that should the House decide to take up the bill, there will most likely be a continuing resolution and possibly a short term extension

due to the expiration of the bill on March 31<sup>st</sup>. The second would be the adoption of the Senate bill, since the House bill, HR 7, did not have enough votes among Republicans to get it off the House floor.

Ms. Neely outlined SCAG's best interests in comparison of these two bills from a funding standpoint. The Senate version of the bill has a 95% return to source to the states, versus 94% on the House version. Currently, California gets a 92% return, and with the extra equity bonus California would receive several hundred million dollars extra a year. This version of the bill also highlights favoritism in funding towards policy programs that would address SCAG's policies on freight, NEPA delegation, and goods movement.

One concern that came to the attention of staff is a new precedent in the House bill that would allow the Governor to add projects to local county transportation commission programs without approval or concurrence of the MPO, any funding source, or any obligation to meet conformity tests. SCAG and regional partners are concerned about this provision and will work collaboratively to eliminate it in Conference Committee, should a bill containing this provision move that far in the legislative process.

### **FEDERAL AND STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Sharon Neely, Deputy Executive Director, reported on the Federal side that the Republican leadership announced, in terms of reconciliation on the budget deficit, a proposed 35% cut to transportation. If the highway trust fund became unbalanced, which is a prediction by 2013, alternative revenues would have to be found, or the 35% cut recommendation would be implemented. This announcement was made to different transportation industries, and SCAG will keep the Committee apprised of any new information.

### **REGIONAL SERVICES & PUBLIC AFFAIRS**

Sylvia Patsaouras, Interim Director, reported on the state of the General Assembly (GA). Mrs. Patsaouras thanked the General Assembly Host Committee for working diligently with SCAG to raise funding for the event. SCAG has currently raised \$130,000, and is trying to surpass their sponsorship goal of \$160,000 that was raised for the 2011 General Assembly. Mrs. Patsaouras also reported that the GA program is being finalized, and seven hundred (700) participants are expected. SCAG is looking forward to seeing everyone at the yearly event.

### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

None.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Regional Council Executive Board, along with SCAG's Executive Management staff will be traveling to Sacramento to attend the Air Resources Board (ARB) hearing on Thursday March 22, 2012.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The next regular meeting of the Legislative/Communications & Membership Committee is scheduled for 8:30 am, Tuesday, April 17, 2012 at the SCAG Los Angeles office.

---

Sharon Neely  
Deputy Executive Director  
Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs

# REPORT

**DATE:** April 17, 2012

**TO:** Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee

**FROM:** Sharon A. Neely, Deputy Executive Director, Policy, Strategy and Public Affairs, [neely@scag.ca.gov](mailto:neely@scag.ca.gov), (213)-236-1992

**SUBJECT:** SCAG Sponsorship of Annual Events – 1) 21<sup>st</sup> Annual Western Riverside Council of Governments General Assembly (\$2,500); 2) Coalition for America’s Gateways and Trade Corridors Annual Conference (\$2,500); 3) 6th Annual Orange County Housing Summit (\$1,000); 4) 12<sup>th</sup> Annual New Partners for Smart Growth Event (in-kind sponsorship).

## RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

*Approve \$6,000 in sponsorships for: 1) \$2,500 for sponsorship of the 21<sup>st</sup> Annual Western Riverside Council of Governments General Assembly on June 21, 2012; 2) up to \$2,500 sponsorship for the Coalition for America’s Gateways and Trade Corridors Annual Conference on May 9, 2012; 3) \$1,000 sponsorship of the 6th Annual Orange County Housing Summit on May 31, 2012; 4) and a non-monetary sponsorship for the Local Government Commission’s 12<sup>th</sup> Annual New Partners for Smart Growth Conference scheduled for February 7 - 9, 2013 in Kansas City, MO.*

## STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan, Goal (1) Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies.

## BACKGROUND:

### **Western Riverside Council of Governments 21<sup>th</sup> Annual General Assembly**

The Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) will host its 21<sup>th</sup> Annual General Assembly on Thursday, June 21, 2012 (6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.) at the Morongo Casino, Resort & Spa in Cabazon. This year’s conference will bring together experts from the academic, policy, business, public health and government sectors to review work accomplished in the County of Riverside, WRCOG’s 17 cities, and two regional water districts. The \$2,500 level Sponsorship entitles SCAG to 10 event tickets, table of ten for dinner and event presentation, sponsor plaque, logo printed in event program, and name listed on WRCOG website for one year. This annual conference is widely attended by national and Southern California leaders.

### **Coalition for America’s Gateways and Trade Corridors (CAGTC) Annual Conference**

SCAG is a founding member of CAGTC, and their annual meeting is scheduled for May 9, 2012 in Washington D.C. This meeting is attended by congressional members, their staff, and national

# REPORT

---

participation. The \$2,500 sponsorship will include a prominent role in the agenda, display of the SCAG logo on meeting materials and signage throughout the course of the events, special recognition as a sponsor in the Executive Director’s opening remarks, as well as a role in the meeting program including introducing a special guest or panel.

## **Orange County Housing Trust 6th Annual Summit**

The Orange County Housing Trust’s 6<sup>th</sup> Annual Orange County Housing Summit will be held on Thursday, May 31, 2012 (8:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.) at the University of California, Irvine Student Center. This year’s summit will cover topics such as the impact of new global economy on Orange County housing, workforce and municipalities, design strategies for downtown areas to support jobs, housing and economic development, and leadership and coalition building. The \$1,000 Public Sector Sponsorship entitles SCAG to 2 tickets to the event, along with recognition through the Housing Summit website, eBlasts, and collateral material.

## **New Partners for Smart Growth 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference**

The Local Government Commission (LGC) has invited SCAG to be a non-monetary sponsor of the 12th Annual New Partners for Smart Growth: Building Safe, Healthy and Livable Communities Conference to be held February 7 - 9, 2013 in Kansas City, MO. The conference will build on the first eleven conferences in this series, which collectively brought together an audience of nearly 12,000 people from across the U.S. and several other countries. SCAG's role as a co-sponsor would be to publicize the conference and give permission to use the agency's name and logo on the conference material and website.

### **FISCAL IMPACT:**

Up to \$6,000 (These funds are included in the approved FY12 budget).

**Reviewed by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Deputy Executive Director,  
Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs*

**Reviewed by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Chief Financial Officer*

# REPORT

**DATE:** April 17, 2012

**TO:** Legislative/Communications & Membership Committee

**FROM:** Sharon A. Neely, Deputy Executive Director, Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs, [neely@scag.ca.gov](mailto:neely@scag.ca.gov), (213)-236-1992

**SUBJECT:** SB 1225 (Padilla) – Intercity Rail Agreements (LOSSAN/Pacific Surfliner Local Control)

## RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Support.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

*This bill would authorize Caltrans to enter into an additional interagency transfer agreement with respect to the San Diego – Los Angeles – San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) intercity passenger rail corridor if the LOSSAN Agency, an existing joint powers agency, is reconstituted through an amended joint powers agreement approved by the governing boards of its members. This bill would require an interagency transfer agreement for the LOSSAN Corridor to cover the initial 5-year period after the transfer. The bill would require the secretary, if an agreement is not entered into by December 31, 2013, to report to the Governor and the Legislature by January 31, 2014*

## STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan, Goal 2: Obtain Regional Transportation infrastructure Funding and Promote Legislative Solutions for Regional Planning Priorities; Objective a) Identify and support legislative initiatives.

## BACKGROUND:

The 351- mile long LOSSAN Corridor is a rail corridor traversing six counties from San Diego to San Luis Obispo. Both passenger and freight rail operate in the corridor. Passenger service is currently provided by the North County Transit District, Metrolink, and Amtrak and is the second highest passenger usage in the nation.

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency was formed in 1989 to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the rail corridor. The LOSSAN agency is currently governed by a Board of Directors whose members are:

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)
- North County Transit District (NCTD)
- Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)
- San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
- San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)
- San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG)
- Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG)

# REPORT

- Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC)
- Amtrak (ex officio member)
- California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA – ex officio member)
- Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC – ex officio member)
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG – ex officio member)

Member agencies of the LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency and their Chief Executive Officer's have engaged in extensive discussions regarding the establishment of a local authority to oversee the state-supported intercity service. These agencies—using the successful Capitol Corridor as a model—have reached a consensus on the importance of locally governed management which will enhance the success of the Pacific Surfliner service, improve the customer experience, and create synergy among all the transportation providers in the region.

As introduced, SB 1225 would provide for the following:

- Authorizes Caltrans to enter into an interagency transfer agreement with LOSSAN Agency.
- Requires an interagency transfer agreement (ITA) for the LOSSAN Corridor to cover the initial 5-year period after the transfer. Would require the secretary, if an agreement is not entered into by December 31, 2013, to report to the Governor and the Legislature by January 31, 2014.
- Existing law states that the ITA may provide that any additional funds required to operate the passenger rail service during a fiscal year shall be provided by the joint powers board from jurisdictions that receive service. This bill would delete the provision requiring additional funds to be provided by the board, and would instead provide that those funds may be provided by the board.
- Provides that local resources shall not be available to offset any redirection, elimination, reduction, or reclassification of state resources for operating intercity rail services.
- Requires that the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing make a determination that a local authority would result in administrative to operating cost reductions and may authorize Caltrans to enter into an Interagency Transfer Agreement (ITA) to transfer those administrative functions;
- Requires the allocation of operation funds to the local authority on an annual basis;
- Requires that the level of service funded by the state shall in no case be less than the current number of intercity round trips operated in a corridor and serving the end points currently served by intercity rail corridor.

Formal supporters of the bill include LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency, Metro, OCTA, SBCAG, and VCTC. There is no opposition to the bill at this time. NCTD has not taken a formal position on the bill. At the LOSSAN Board of Directors meeting, NCTD voted to move the legislation forward, but stated they have concerns with the legislation and the future joint powers agreement. NCTD will continue to monitor the bill as it moves through the legislative process. Neither SANDAG nor MTS have taken a position on the bill.

Staff recommends support of the bill as the provisions are consistent with prior Regional Council action authorizing our participation in the Memorandum of Understanding with the CHSRA and Southern California Transportation Agencies.

### **Other Related Legislation**

The Los Angeles-Bakersfield-Fresno-Stockton-Sacramento-Oakland Intercity Passenger Rail Corridor (San Joaquin Corridor) also has a bill, AB 1779, introduced by Assemblymember Cathleen Galgiani (D-Tracy) on February 21, 2012, and last amended on March 29, 2012. AB 1779 would create a local authority for the

# REPORT

---

intercity rail services in the San Joaquin Corridor. AB 1779 is set to be heard by the Assembly Transportation Committee on April 16, 2012.

**ATTACHMENT:**

SB 1225 (Padilla): Amended in Senate April 9, 2012

**Reviewed by:**

---

*Deputy Executive Director,  
Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs*

AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 9, 2012

**SENATE BILL**

**No. 1225**

---

---

**Introduced by Senator Padilla**

February 23, 2012

---

---

~~An act to amend Sections 14070 and 14070.2 of the Government Code, relating to transportation. An act to amend Sections 14031.8, 14070.2, 14070.4, and 14070.6 of, and to repeal and add Article 5.2 (commencing with Section 14072) of Chapter 1 of Part 5 of Division 3 of Title 2 of, the Government Code, relating to transportation.~~

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1225, as amended, Padilla. Intercity rail agreements.

*Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to contract with Amtrak for intercity rail passenger services and provides funding for these services from the Public Transportation Account. Existing law, until December 31, 1996, authorized the department, subject to approval of the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, to enter into an interagency transfer agreement under which a joint powers board assumes responsibility for administering the state-funded intercity rail service in a particular corridor. Existing law, with respect to a transferred corridor, requires the board to demonstrate the ability to meet performance standards established by the secretary.*

*This bill would authorize the department, with the approval of the secretary, to enter into an additional interagency transfer agreement with respect to the LOSSAN Corridor, defined to mean the intercity passenger rail corridor between San Diego, Los Angeles, and San Luis Obispo, if the LOSSAN Agency, an existing joint powers agency, is reconstituted through an amended joint powers agreement approved by the governing boards of its members to enable that agency to enter*

*into an interagency transfer agreement with the secretary relative to the LOSSAN Corridor.*

*This bill would require an interagency transfer agreement for the LOSSAN Corridor to cover the initial 5-year period after the transfer. The bill would require the secretary, if an agreement is not entered into by December 31, 2013, to report to the Governor and the Legislature by January 31, 2014, as specified.*

*Existing law provides for the allocation of state funds by the secretary to a joint powers board under an interagency transfer agreement based on the annual business plan for the intercity rail corridor and subsequent appropriation of state funds. Existing law states that the interagency transfer agreement may provide that any additional funds required to operate the passenger rail service during a fiscal year shall be provided by the joint powers board from jurisdictions that receive service.*

*This bill would delete the provision requiring additional funds to be provided by the board, and would instead provide that those funds may be provided by the board. The bill, with respect to the LOSSAN Corridor, would provide that local resources shall not be available to offset any redirection, elimination, reduction, or reclassification of state resources for operating intercity rail services.*

*This bill would authorize the secretary to adopt new performance standards by December 31, 2014, for intercity rail services.*

*This bill would repeal now-obsolete provisions authorizing the Southern California Regional Rail Authority to be a party to an interagency transfer agreement for intercity rail services in specified counties.*

~~Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to contract with Amtrak for intercity rail passenger services and provides funding for these services from the Public Transportation Account. Existing law, until December 31, 1996, authorized the department, subject to approval of the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing, to enter into an interagency transfer agreement under which a joint powers board assumes responsibility for administering the state-funded intercity rail service in a particular corridor. Existing law, with respect to a transferred corridor, requires the board to demonstrate the ability to meet performance standards established by the secretary.~~

~~This bill, until December 31, 2013, would authorize the department and a joint powers board established for the purpose of assuming~~

~~responsibility for the Pacific Surfliner intercity rail corridor to enter into an agreement under similar terms and conditions.~~

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.  
State-mandated local program: no.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

1     *SECTION 1. This act shall be known and may be cited as the*  
2     *Intercity Passenger Rail Act of 2012.*

3     *SEC. 2. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the*  
4     *following:*

5         *(1) An intercity rail passenger system, linking major urban*  
6         *centers and complemented by feeder bus services that provide*  
7         *access to outlying areas and destinations, is an important element*  
8         *of the state’s transportation system, and shall remain a state-funded*  
9         *program.*

10        *(2) The state has a continuing interest in the provision of*  
11        *cost-effective intercity rail passenger services and has a*  
12        *responsibility to coordinate intercity rail passenger services*  
13        *statewide.*

14        *(3) Since 1976, the state has invested over one billion eight*  
15        *hundred million dollars (\$1,800,000,000) in capital improvements*  
16        *and operating support for intercity rail passenger service and must*  
17        *ensure the protection of that investment.*

18        *(b) The Legislature, through the enactment of this act, intends*  
19        *all of the following:*

20            *(1) The Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing*  
21            *shall be responsible for the overall planning, coordination, and*  
22            *budgeting of the intercity passenger rail service.*

23            *(2) If the secretary determines that transferring responsibility*  
24            *for intercity rail service in a particular corridor or corridors to a*  
25            *statutorily created joint powers agency would result in*  
26            *administrative or operating cost reductions, the secretary may*  
27            *authorize the Department of Transportation to enter into an*  
28            *interagency transfer agreement to effect a transfer of those*  
29            *administrative functions.*

30            *(3) Any intercity rail corridor for which administrative*  
31            *responsibility has been transferred to a joint powers board through*  
32            *an interagency transfer agreement shall remain as a component*  
33            *of the statewide system of intercity rail corridors.*

1 (4) *The public interest requires expansion of the state intercity*  
2 *rail program in order to keep pace with the needs of an expanding*  
3 *population.*

4 (5) *For not less than a five-year period, the level of state funding*  
5 *for intercity rail service in each corridor should be maintained at*  
6 *a level equal to at least the current level of service in the corridor,*  
7 *thus providing fiscal stability that will allow appropriate planning*  
8 *and operation of these services.*

9 SEC. 3. *Section 14031.8 of the Government Code is amended*  
10 *to read:*

11 14031.8. (a) The Secretary of Business, Transportation and  
12 Housing shall establish, through an annual budget process, the  
13 level of state funding available for the operation of intercity  
14 passenger rail service in each corridor.

15 (b) Where applicable, operating funds shall be allocated by the  
16 secretary to the joint powers board in accordance with an  
17 interagency *transfer* agreement—~~which~~ *that* includes mutually  
18 agreed-upon rail services. Funds for the administration and  
19 marketing of services, as appropriate, shall also be transferred by  
20 the secretary to the joint powers board, subject to the terms of the  
21 interagency *transfer* agreement.

22 (c) The joint powers board or local or regional entities may, *but*  
23 *shall not be required to*, augment state-provided resources to  
24 expand intercity passenger rail services *using local resources*, or  
25 to address funding shortfalls in achieving agreed-upon performance  
26 standards.

27 (d) The department may provide any support services as may  
28 be mutually agreed upon by the board and the department.

29 (e) Operating costs shall be controlled by dealing with, at a  
30 minimum, the current Amtrak cost allocation formula, *which,*  
31 *beginning in federal fiscal year 2013–14, will be subject to Section*  
32 *209 of the federal Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement*  
33 *Act, and the ability to contract out to Amtrak or other rail operators*  
34 *as a part of federal legislation dealing with Amtrak reauthorization.*

35 (f) Not later than December 31, 1997, the secretary shall  
36 establish a set of uniform performance standards for all corridors  
37 and operators to control cost and improve efficiency. *To the extent*  
38 *necessary, as determined by the secretary, performance standards*  
39 *may be modified not later than December 31, 2014, relative to*

1 including the LOSSAN Corridor among the corridors subject to  
2 an interagency transfer agreement.

3 (g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, with  
4 regard to the LOSSAN Corridor, local resources described in  
5 subdivision (c) shall not be available for expenditure to offset any  
6 redirection, elimination, reduction, or reclassification of state  
7 resources for operating intercity rail services.

8 SEC. 4. Section 14070.2 of the Government Code is amended  
9 to read:

10 14070.2. (a) If authorized by the secretary, the department  
11 may, through an interagency *transfer* agreement, transfer to a joint  
12 powers board, and the board may assume, all responsibility for  
13 administering *state-funded intercity* passenger rail service in the  
14 corridor. Upon the date specified in the agreement, the board shall  
15 succeed to the department's powers and duties relative to that  
16 service, except that the department shall retain responsibility for  
17 developing budget requests for the service through the state budget  
18 process, which shall be developed in consultation with the board,  
19 and for coordinating service in the corridor with other *intercity*  
20 passenger rail services in the state.

21 (b) ~~The~~(1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2), the  
22 interagency *transfer* agreement shall be executed on or before  
23 December 31, 1996.

24 (2) With respect to the LOSSAN Corridor, if an interagency  
25 transfer agreement for that corridor is not entered into on or before  
26 December 31, 2013, the secretary shall provide a report to the  
27 Governor and the Legislature on or before January 31, 2014,  
28 explaining why an acceptable agreement has not been developed,  
29 with specific recommendations for developing an acceptable  
30 agreement.

31 (c) The secretary shall require the board to demonstrate the  
32 ability to meet the performance standards established by the  
33 secretary pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 14031.8.

34 SEC. 5. Section 14070.4 of the Government Code is amended  
35 to read:

36 14070.4. (a) An interagency transfer agreement between the  
37 department and a joint powers board, when approved by the  
38 secretary, shall do all of the following:

39 (1) Specify the date and conditions for the transfer of  
40 responsibilities and identify the annual level of funding and ensure

1 that the level of funding is consistent with and sufficient for the  
2 planned service improvements within the corridor. *For purposes*  
3 *of the LOSSAN Corridor, the interagency transfer agreement shall*  
4 *cover the initial five-year period after the transfer, but may be*  
5 *extended thereafter by mutual agreement.*

6 (2) Identify, for the initial year and subsequent years, the funds  
7 to be transferred to the board including state operating subsidies  
8 made available for intercity rail services in the corridor, and funds  
9 currently used by the department for administration and marketing  
10 of the corridor, with the amounts adjusted annually for inflation  
11 and in accordance with the business plan.

12 (3) Specify the level of service to be provided, the respective  
13 responsibilities of the board and the department, the methods that  
14 the department will use to assure the coordination of services with  
15 other rail passenger services in the state, and the methods that the  
16 department will use for the annual review of the business plan and  
17 annual proposals on funding and appropriations.

18 (4) Describe the terms for transferring to the joint exercise of  
19 powers agency car and locomotive train sets, and other equipment  
20 and property owned by the department and required for the intercity  
21 service in the corridor including, but not limited to, the number of  
22 units to be provided, liability coverage, maintenance and warranty  
23 responsibilities, and indemnification issues.

24 (5) Describe auditing responsibilities and process requirements,  
25 reimbursement and billing procedures, the responsibility for  
26 funding shortfalls, if any, during the course of each fiscal year, an  
27 operating contract oversight review process, performance standards  
28 and reporting procedures, the level of rail infrastructure  
29 maintenance, and other relevant monitoring procedures. The  
30 description shall contain an evaluation of the impact of any transfer  
31 of equipment on other intercity corridors. The agreement shall  
32 endeavor to minimize the impact and maximize the efficient use  
33 of the equipment, including continued joint use of equipment that  
34 is currently shared by one or more corridors.

35 (b) Use of the annual state funding allocation, as set forth in the  
36 interagency transfer agreement, shall be described in an annual  
37 business plan submitted by the board to the secretary for review  
38 and recommendation by April 1 of each year. The business plan,  
39 when approved by the secretary, shall be deemed accepted by the  
40 state. The budget proposal developed by the department for the

1 subsequent year shall be based upon the business plan approved  
2 by the secretary. The business plan shall be consistent with the  
3 interagency *transfer* agreement and shall include a report on the  
4 recent as well as historical performance of the corridor service, an  
5 overall operating plan including proposed service enhancement to  
6 increase ridership and provide for increased traveler demands in  
7 the corridor for the upcoming year, short-term and long-term  
8 ~~capital~~ *capital* improvement programs, funding requirements for  
9 the upcoming fiscal year, and an action plan with specific  
10 performance goals and objectives. The business plan shall  
11 document service improvements to provide the planned level of  
12 service, inclusion of operating plans to serve peak period work  
13 trips, and consideration of other service expansions and  
14 enhancements. *With respect to the LOSSAN Corridor, the initial*  
15 *business plan shall be consistent with the immediately previous*  
16 *State Rail Plan developed by the department pursuant to Section*  
17 *14036.* The *business* plan shall clearly delineate how funding and  
18 accounting for state-sponsored rail passenger services shall be  
19 separate from locally sponsored services in the corridor. Proposals  
20 to expand or modify passenger services shall be accompanied by  
21 the identification of all associated costs and ridership projections.  
22 The business plan shall establish, among other things: fares,  
23 operating strategies, capital improvements needed, and marketing  
24 and operational strategies designed to meet performance standards  
25 established in the interagency *transfer* agreement.

26 (c) Based on the annual business plan and the subsequent  
27 appropriation by the Legislature, the secretary shall allocate state  
28 funds on an annual basis to the board. As provided in the  
29 interagency *transfer* agreement, any additional funds that are  
30 ~~required~~ *needed* to operate the passenger rail service during ~~the a~~  
31 fiscal year ~~shall~~ *may* be provided by the board from jurisdictions  
32 that receive service. In addition, the board may use any cost savings  
33 or farebox revenues to provide service improvements related to  
34 intercity service. In any event, the board shall report the fiscal  
35 results of the previous year's operations as part of the annual  
36 business plan.

37 (d) The level of service funded by the state shall in no case be  
38 less than the current number of intercity round trips operated in a  
39 corridor and serving the end points currently served by the intercity  
40 rail corridor. *For purposes of the LOSSAN Corridor, the level of*

1 *service funded by the state shall be no less than the level of service*  
2 *funded as of January 1, 2013.* Subject to Section 14035.2, the level  
3 of service funded by the state shall also include feeder bus service  
4 with substantially the same number of route miles as the current  
5 feeder system, to be operated in conjunction with the trains.  
6 However, the interagency *transfer* agreement shall not prohibit  
7 the joint powers board from reducing the number of feeder bus  
8 route miles if the joint powers board determines that a feeder bus  
9 route is not cost effective as provided in Section 14035.2.

10 (e) Nothing in this article shall be construed to preclude  
11 expansion of state-approved intercity rail service.

12 (f) *Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, with*  
13 *regard to the LOSSAN Corridor, local resources described in*  
14 *subdivision (c) shall not be available for expenditure to offset any*  
15 *redirection, elimination, reduction, or reclassification of state*  
16 *resources for operating intercity rail services.*

17 SEC. 6. *Section 14070.6 of the Government Code is amended*  
18 *to read:*

19 14070.6. The department and any entity that assumes  
20 administrative responsibility for *intercity* passenger rail services  
21 through an interagency transfer agreement, may, through a  
22 competitive solicitation process, contract with the National Railroad  
23 Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) or with organizations not  
24 precluded by state or federal law to provide *intercity* passenger  
25 rail services, and may contract with rail corporations and other rail  
26 operators for the use of tracks and other facilities and for the  
27 provision of *intercity* passenger services on terms and conditions  
28 as the parties may agree. The department is deemed to be a  
29 third-party beneficiary of the contract, and the contract shall not  
30 contain any provision or condition that would negatively impact  
31 on or conflict with any other contracts the department has regarding  
32 *intercity passenger* rail services. Any entity that succeeds the  
33 department as sponsor of state-supported *intercity* passenger rail  
34 services through an interagency transfer agreement, is deemed an  
35 agency of the state for all purposes related to *intercity* passenger  
36 rail services, including Section ~~1614~~ 5311 of Title 49 of the United  
37 States Code.

38 SEC. 7. *Article 5.2 (commencing with Section 14072) of*  
39 *Chapter 1 of Part 5 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government*  
40 *Code is repealed.*

1 SEC. 8. Article 5.2 (commencing with Section 14072) is added  
2 to Chapter 1 of Part 5 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government  
3 Code, to read:

4  
5  
6

Article 5.2. LOSSAN Corridor

7 14072. (a) The Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail  
8 Corridor Agency, also known as the LOSSAN Agency, is an existing  
9 joint powers authority established to provide an organization  
10 capable of implementing the recommendations contained in the  
11 State Rail Corridor Study Group’s June 1987 report entitled “Los  
12 Angeles-San Diego State Rail Corridor Study” and undertaking  
13 related efforts to improve intercity services and facilities in the  
14 corridor and to coordinate subcorridor commuter rail services  
15 with intercity services. The LOSSAN Agency is comprised of voting  
16 members, as specified in the joint powers agreement.

17 (b) “LOSSAN Corridor” means the San Diego-Los Angeles-San  
18 Luis Obispo intercity passenger rail corridor.

19 14072.2. This article shall be applicable only if the members  
20 of the LOSSAN Agency enter into an amended joint powers  
21 agreement to expand the authority of the agency to permit the  
22 administration of state-funded intercity passenger rail services on  
23 the LOSSAN corridor, and the LOSSAN Agency thereafter elects  
24 to become a party to an interagency transfer agreement pursuant  
25 to Article 5 (commencing with Section 14070). The amended joint  
26 powers agreement shall establish the terms and conditions for the  
27 joint powers agency and is subject to the approval of the governing  
28 board of each member agency of the LOSSAN Agency. Only the  
29 LOSSAN Agency operating under the amended joint powers  
30 agreement, and not the LOSSAN Agency existing on January 1,  
31 2013, may exercise jurisdiction over intercity rail services on the  
32 LOSSAN Corridor under an interagency transfer agreement.

33 SECTION 1. Section 14070 of the Government Code is  
34 amended to read:

35 14070. As used in this article, the following terms have the  
36 following meanings:

37 (a) (1) “Board” or “joint powers board” means the governing  
38 board of a joint exercise of powers agency established pursuant to  
39 Article 5.2 (commencing with Section 14072), Article 5.4  
40 (commencing with Section 14074), or Article 5.6 (commencing

1 with Section 14076) for the purpose of assuming administrative  
2 responsibility for intercity passenger rail service within the  
3 respective corridor.

4 (2) “Board” or “joint powers board” also means the governing  
5 board of a joint exercise of powers agency established for the  
6 purpose of assuming administrative responsibility for intercity  
7 passenger rail service within the Pacific Surfliner corridor.

8 (b) “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Business,  
9 Transportation and Housing Agency or successor agency.

10 SEC. 2. Section 14070.2 of the Government Code is amended  
11 to read:

12 14070.2. (a) If authorized by the secretary, the department  
13 may, through an interagency agreement, transfer to a joint powers  
14 board, and the board may assume, all responsibility for  
15 administering passenger rail service in a corridor. Upon the date  
16 specified in the agreement, the board shall succeed to the  
17 department’s powers and duties relative to that service, except that  
18 the department shall retain responsibility for developing budget  
19 requests for the service through the state budget process, which  
20 shall be developed in consultation with the board, and for  
21 coordinating service in the corridor with other passenger rail  
22 services in the state.

23 (b) (1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2), the  
24 interagency agreement shall be executed on or before December  
25 31, 1996.

26 (2) With respect to the Pacific Surfliner corridor, the interagency  
27 agreement shall be executed on or before December 31, 2013.

28 (e) The secretary shall require the board to demonstrate the  
29 ability to meet the performance standards established by the  
30 secretary pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 14031.8.

# REPORT

**DATE:** April 17, 2012

**TO:** Legislative, Communications and Membership Committee

**FROM:** Sharon A. Neely, Deputy Executive Director, Strategy, Policy and Public Affairs, [neely@scag.ca.gov](mailto:neely@scag.ca.gov), (213)-236-1992.

**SUBJECT:** AB 1778 (Williams): Local Transportation Funds

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Oppose

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

*AB 1778 would move up the date in existing law of July 1, 2014, by one year, to July 1, 2013, after which Local Transportation Fund (LTF) funds in Ventura County will be available only for public transportation and community transit services, and not for other purposes such as for local streets and roads.*

**STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This item supports SCAG Strategic Plan, Goal (2) Obtain Regional Transportation Infrastructure Funding and Promote Legislative Solutions for Regional Planning Priorities.

**BACKGROUND:**

Existing law earmarks 0.25% of the state sales tax for transit and directs the revenue to the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) in each county. It vests regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs) with responsibility to allocate LTF funds, generally to cities, counties, and transit districts by population.

Existing law authorizes the use of LTF funds for a wide variety of transportation programs and also authorizes rural counties (population under 500,000) to use their LTF funds for purposes other than public transportation and community transit services, such as local streets and roads under certain conditions. The law provides that before funds can be used for local streets and roads, the RTPA in a rural county must hold public hearings and make a finding that all reasonable transit needs have been met.

Additionally, current law also generally requires each county with a population of less than 500,000 as of the 1970 federal census but more than 500,000 as of the 2000 (or subsequent) federal census to use its LTF funds for transit. For counties that would be impacted by this change from rural to urban due to population growth since 1970, the requirement to use LTF funds for public transportation and community transit services will not become operative until July 1, 2014. Existing law also provides for these counties, except Ventura County, that the requirement to use LTF funds for public transportation and community transit services applies to urbanized areas of a county, not the necessarily the entire county. LTF funds can be used in non-urbanized areas in these counties for local streets and roads, provided that there are no unmet

# REPORT

---

transit needs in the area. For Ventura County, current law provides that the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) may submit to the legislative policy committees a report analyzing options for organizing public mass transportation services in Ventura County and expending LTF revenues. VCTC may also submit a legislative proposal to implement a plan based on recommendations of the report. If VCTC does not secure legislation to implement its proposed plan by the end of the 2011-12 legislative session, its LTF revenues would be available solely for public transportation or community transit services, even in the county's rural areas, beginning July 1, 2014.

According to the author, VCTC had two years to submit the plan and failed to do so. Consequently, the author has introduced this bill to move up the date by one year after which all of the county's LTF will have to be used for public transportation and community transit services. The author asserts that Ventura County is an urban county (its population is over 800,000) and that many transit-dependent people are not being served because of the current diversion of these funds. A copy of the fact sheet prepared by the author's office is attached to this report.

VCTC, which opposes the bill, notes first that the reporting requirement under the law is permissive, not mandatory; yet it has been working since September 2010 on a comprehensive Regional Transit Study to review various options to potentially reorganize public transportation services in Ventura County. The commission is expected to adopt a final report at its April 13, 2012, meeting. Thus, VCTC asserts the bill's mandates are premature and that the recommendations of the study, prepared by local stakeholders most familiar with the transit and transportation needs of the community, be permitted to implement under state law. A copy of the VCTC letter in opposition to the bill is attached to this report.

The bill is referred to the Assembly Transportation Committee and there is no scheduled hearing to date. There is one on record support organization to the bill: Ormond Beach Observers; on record opposition comes from is the Ventura County Transportation Commission and the City of Simi Valley.

Staff recommends that the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee forward an 'Oppose' position recommendation to the Regional Council, because its provisions completely remove local RTPA flexibility to most effectively utilize LTF funds for the comprehensive transportation and transit needs of a growing county comprised both urban and rural communities.

**Reviewed by:**

---

*Deputy Executive Director,  
Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs*

## **AB 1778 (Williams)**

### **Ventura County Transportation Commission: Local Transportation Funds**

#### **SUMMARY**

---

Assembly Bill 1778 requires the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) to submit to the Legislature by January 31, 2013, a report on the reorganization of transit services and expenditure of local transportation funds. The bill stipulates that local transportation funds in Ventura County would be available solely for transit purposes beginning July 1, 2013, rather than July 1, 2014 which is current law, unless a legislative proposal in the report is enacted and implemented by June 30, 2013.

#### **BACKGROUND**

---

The Legislature enacted the Transportation Development Act (TDA), SB 325, Chapter 1400, Statutes of 1971, in order to ensure "the efficient and orderly movement of people and goods in the urban areas of the state." The TDA authorized the boards of supervisors in each county to impose a ¼-percent local sales tax for transportation purposes. All counties imposed the tax in 1972. To this end, revenues from the tax must be used for public transit purposes in counties with a population greater than 500,000 as of the 1970 census. Counties with a population under 500,000 as of 1970 may use the revenues for transit and for local streets and roads if they make the finding that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to be met.

In 2009, SB 716 (Wolk) updated the census numbers in SB 325 by requiring each county with a population of more than 500,000 as of the *2000 and any future federal census* to use its Local Transportation Funds (LTF) funds for transit. SB 716 also provided that the VCTC "may submit" to the appropriate legislative policy committees a report analyzing options for organizing public mass transportation services in Ventura County and expending LTF revenues.

SB 716 additionally stipulated that if VCTC does not secure legislation to implement their proposed plan by the end of the 2011-12 legislative session, its LTF revenues would roll over for the exclusive use of public transportation or community transit services beginning July 1, 2014.

While the language in SB 716 says "may submit," there is a deadline for receipt of this report (Dec 31, 2011) and a deadline by which the LTF funds will roll over for exclusive use by transit (July 1, 2014) if a report was not enacted by the Legislature.

Practically, this indicates that the VCTC should submit a report. To date, no report has been received. Therefore,

there appears to be no need to wait until July 1, 2014 for LTF funds to roll over. As such, AB 1778 moves this deadline up a calendar year.

#### **NEED FOR THE BILL**

---

The VCTC had two years to complete their countywide transit plan and shows no signs of completing a plan that's consistent with the provisions of SB 716: a plan for mass public transit in the County of Ventura.

This bill would move the timeline by which LTF funds must be used exclusively for transit purposes up from July 1, 2014 to July 1, 2013. This early roll over of LTF funds can be avoided if the report is delivered by January 30, 2013 and is enacted and implemented by June 30, 2013.

The efficient and orderly movement of people and goods in urban counties is of paramount importance. Ventura County is an urban county with a population well over 500,000. Many transit dependent people in Ventura County are not being served because of the current diversion of these funds. They are in need of a comprehensive countywide transit plan consistent with the provisions of SB 716.

#### **SUPPORT**

---

- None on File

#### **OPPOSITION**

---

- Ventura County Transportation Commission

#### **FOR MORE INFORMATION**

---

Tatum Holland  
Office of Assemblymember Das Williams  
(916) 319-2035  
[tatum.holland@asm.ca.gov](mailto:tatum.holland@asm.ca.gov)



## Ventura County Transportation Commission

March 5, 2012

The Honorable Das G. Williams  
Assemblymember  
California State Assembly  
State Capitol  
10 & L Streets  
Sacramento, California 95814

**RE: AB 1778 – Oppose – Unless Amended**

Dear Assemblymember Williams:

The Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) at its March 2, 2012 meeting thoroughly reviewed Assembly Bill 1778 and after a lengthy discussion adopted an "Oppose – Unless Amended" position on your measure.

As you may know, the Commission, its Steering Committee, staff and consultants have been working diligently since September, 2010 on a comprehensive Regional Transit Study to review various options to potentially reorganize public transportation services in Ventura County. At the March meeting, the Commission received a status report from the Consultant team supporting the work of the Transit Study Steering Committee as to the progress of the study and remaining issues to be addressed. At this time, it is the Commission's intent to adopt a final report for submittal to the Legislature at our next regularly scheduled meeting on April 13, 2012. It is for that reason that the Commission feels AB 1778 (as introduced on February 21, 2012) is premature at this time, and request that your measure be amended to reflect the final recommendations that will be submitted in the VCTC Regional Transit Study.

In closing, we would like to bring to your attention some unfortunate factual errors which appeared in the Fact Sheet on AB 1778. As you know, SB 716 (Chapter 609, 2009 Statutes) authorizes (not require) the VCTC to submit a "...report analyzing options for organizing public mass transportation services in the county, for the expenditures of revenues deposited in the local transportation fund, and a recommended legislative proposal for implementing the plan..." SB 716 provides that VCTC "may submit" a report, which is our intent. References that the Commission is either not going to submit the report/plan or that we are, "now out of compliance with current law" is not accurate with the direction of the Commission or provisions of SB 716. Any additional time it has taken to finalize the report we feel is warranted for all stakeholders to provide their input and recommendations.

We appreciate your consideration of our position and welcome further opportunities to meet and discuss with you and your staff our efforts on the Regional Transit Study.

Sincerely,

Darren M. Kettle  
Executive Director

cc: Members, Assembly Transportation Committee  
Ms. Janet Dawson, Principle Consultant, Assembly Transportation Committee  
Mr. Gregson Porteous, Consultant, Assembly Republican Caucus  
Capital Representation Group, Inc.  
Commissioners, Ventura County Transportation Commission

# REPORT

**DATE:** April 17, 2012

**TO:** Legislative/Communications & Membership Committee

**FROM:** Sharon A. Neely, Deputy Executive Director, Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs,  
[neely@scag.ca.gov](mailto:neely@scag.ca.gov), (213)-236-1992

**SUBJECT:** SCAG Sponsorship Policy

---

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Information Only – Discussion

***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:***

*There has been discussion at recent Legislative/Communications & Memberships Committee meetings regarding the criterion that SCAG utilizes in the evaluation of sponsorship requests. SCAG staff follows a specific set of guidelines, which were outlined in a staff report to the Legislative/Communications & Memberships Committee at its meeting on October 20, 2009 (attached).*

**STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan, Goal (1) Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective b) Develop external communications and media strategy to promote partnerships, build consensus and foster inclusiveness in the decision making process.

**BACKGROUND:**

At the Legislative/Communications & Memberships Committee meeting on February 21, 2012, a question was raised as to whether or not SCAG staff utilized any set of guidelines in the evaluation of sponsorship requests. SCAG staff noted that there are existing guidelines for sponsorship requests, and that those guidelines would be provided to the Committee at a future meeting for review, as well as to discuss and determine, if necessary, if additional criterion should be added.

SCAG staff, at present, utilizes the guidelines outlined below in the evaluation of sponsorship requests:

Sponsorship requests shall include the following:

1. The dollar amount of the sponsorship shall be added to the line item on the agenda and not just in the accompanying report.
2. When calculating sponsorship cost, it is important to also consider the total cost of participation, especially when it involves out-of-town travel and lodging. Therefore, total cost should include the amount of sponsorship (direct cost), and the cost of staff participation including travel and lodging (indirect cost), and other miscellaneous expenses associated with booth set-up and printed materials.

# REPORT

3. At a minimum, financial support for an event or program should yield promotional and educational value to the agency. Sponsorship should entail the greatest possible visibility for the agency, resulting in increased outreach to fulfill SCAG's public input and participation mandates.
4. Sponsorship, to the extent possible, should also provide networking opportunities for our Board Members through complimentary tickets, speaking opportunities, or serving on an honorary host committee in order to strengthen the public's awareness of SCAG and its work on behalf of the region.

## **Staff Report Template for Sponsorships:**

1. Name of the organization making the request.
2. History of SCAG's involvement/partnership with the requesting organization.
3. Document whether event advances SCAG's mission and core values.
4. Document the benefits to SCAG for participating/sponsoring.
  - Raises public awareness of SCAG's activities on behalf of the region.
  - Provides opportunity for Regional Council members to showcase agency and interact with elected officials from member cities that are not on the Regional Council.
  - Provides networking opportunity for Regional Council Members (i.e. complimentary tickets; speaking opportunity; serving on host committee).
5. Document whether financial support for the event/program yields promotional and educational value to the agency.
6. Document whether participation would result in increased outreach to fulfill SCAG's public input and participation mandates.
7. Ensure agenda subject includes sponsorship amount.
8. Ensure costs are budgeted and so noted.

In addition, the Executive Administration Committee recently requested that SCAG staff provide information on the amount spent on sponsorships broken down by county.

# REPORT

---

**ATTACHMENT:**

- SCAG Sponsorship Policy Staff Report for October 20, 2009 Legislative/Communications & Membership Committee Meeting
- Sponsorship Allocation Table by County

**Reviewed by:**

---

*Deputy Executive Director,  
Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs*

# REPORT

**DATE:** October 20, 2009

**TO:** Legislative/Communications & Membership Committee

**FROM:** Sharon Neely, Director of Legislation, [neely@scag.ca.gov](mailto:neely@scag.ca.gov), (213) 236-1992

**SUBJECT:** SCAG Sponsorship Policy

---

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Discussion and Potential Support.

***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:***

*Based on recent discussions about the level of information, timing, and benefits of participating in sponsorships, below are key parameters for considering sponsorship requests made to SCAG.*

**STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This item supports Goal 1, Objective (b) of the SCAG Strategic Plan: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Develop external communications and media strategy to promote partnerships, build consensus and foster inclusiveness in the decision making process.

**BACKGROUND:**

At the Regional Council Executive Committee meeting in September, there was discussion about the level of information, timing, and benefits of participating in sponsorships. The Legislative/Communications & Membership Committee discussed key parameters for considering sponsorship requests made to SCAG. The below information is based on the discussion that took place during the meeting.

Sponsorship partnerships have occurred on a case-by-case basis. Beginning with the November agenda, requests shall include the following:

1. The dollar amount of the sponsorship shall be added to the line item on the agenda and not just in the accompanying report.
2. When calculating sponsorship cost, it is important to also consider the total cost of participation, especially when it involves out of town travel and lodging. Therefore, total cost should include the amount of sponsorship (direct cost), and the cost of staff participation including travel and lodging (indirect cost), and other miscellaneous expenses associated with booth set-up and printed materials.
3. At a minimum, financial support for an event or program should yield promotional and educational value to the agency. Sponsorship should entail the greatest possible visibility for the agency, resulting in increased outreach to fulfill SCAG's public input and participation mandates.
4. Sponsorship, to the extent possible, should also provide networking opportunities for our Board Members through complimentary tickets, speaking opportunities, or serving on an honorary host

# REPORT

## Staff Report Template for Sponsorships:

1. Name of the organization making the request.
2. History of SCAG's involvement/partnership with the requesting organization.
3. Document whether event advances SCAG's mission and core values.
4. Document the benefits to SCAG for participating/sponsoring.
  - Raises public awareness of SCAG's activities on behalf of the region.
  - Provides opportunity for Regional Council (RC) members to showcase agency and interact with elected officials from member cities that are not on the RC.
  - Provides networking opportunity for RC Members (i.e. complimentary tickets; speaking opportunity; serving on host committee).
5. Document whether financial support for the event/program yields promotional and educational value to the agency.
6. Document whether participation would result in increased outreach to fulfill SCAG's public input and participation mandates.
7. Ensure agenda subject includes sponsorship amount.
8. Ensure costs are budgeted and so noted.

## Conclusion

SCAG has a positive record of supporting regional events in the communities throughout Southern California. While we would like to support as many of the worthy endeavors as possible, given the agency's budgetary constraints, SCAG RC must consider all requests and ensure that our limited resources are being utilized for activities that are consistent with our overall mission and core values.

In addition to monetary sponsorship, SCAG has a long history of providing technical expertise and assistance to community organizations within its jurisdiction. SCAG will continue to provide that important service as much as practicable. SCAG will give every request due consideration and will make every effort to provide funding, when available, if it meets agency guidelines.

Reviewed by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Department Director*

<b>SPONSORSHIP ALLOCATION BY COUNTY (as of April 17, 2012)</b>	
<b>IMPERIAL</b>	
None	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>LOS ANGELES</b>	
Council for Watershed Health's The Mediterranean City: A Conference on Climate Change Adaptation, June 25, 2012 - Los Ang	\$2,000
Four Corner Coalition 2012 Economic Summit, May 16, 2012 - Diamond Bar	\$1,000
UCLA Lewis Center and Institute of Transportation Studies Land-Use Environment Connection Symposium - Lake Arrowhead	\$10,000
University of California, Los Angeles 2012 Complete Streets for California Conference - Los Angeles	\$1,250
USC School of Planning & Development Executive Education Program - Los Angeles	\$10,000
Valley Mobility Summit - San Fernando Valley	\$2,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$26,250</b>
<b>ORANGE</b>	
Association of California Cities, Orange County 2012 Board of Directors Installation Ceremony - City of Dana Point	\$1,000
City of Long Beach Pro Walk/Pro Bike Conference, September 10, 2012 - City of Long Beach	\$2,000
2013 Annual Orange County Housing Summit - City of Irvine	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>
<b>RIVERSIDE</b>	
2012 Annual Western Riverside Council of Governments General Assembly	\$2,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,500</b>
<b>SAN BERNARDINO</b>	
Building Industry Association in So Cal - City of Pomona	\$1,000
Cal State University San Bernardino Leonard Transportation Center 2011 Southern California Transportation & Logistics Summit - City of San Bernardino	\$1,250
ULI "Retrofitting TOD in Suburbia" Conference - City of Ontario	\$250
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,500</b>
<b>VENTURA</b>	
None	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>OTHER</b>	
California Transportation Commission Reception - City of Burbank	\$500
Coalition for America's Gateways and Trade Corridors Annual Conference - Washington DC	\$2,500
CORO Southern CA Executive Fellows Program	\$5,000
Metrans National Urban Freight Conference - Los Angeles	\$3,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$11,000</b>
<b>TOTAL for FY 11 - 12 (Current Date)</b>	<b>\$45,250</b>

\* Sponsorship requests that do not require any financial contribution are not included.

2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>					
<i>Air Quality/ GHG Reduction Strategies</i>	AB 343	<b>Redevelopment Plans: Environmental Goals</b> <b>Author:</b> Atkins (D) Amends the Community Redevelopment Laws which authorize the establishment of redevelopment agencies in certain communities in order to address the effects of blight, requires transportation plans, and greenhouse emissions reduction strategies. Requires each redevelopment plan be consistent with the regional sustainable communities strategy or alternative planning strategy adopted by the metropolitan planning organization or council of government.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Passed Assembly (53-25) on 5/23/2011. Referred to Senate Governance & Finance and Environmental Quality Committees. No hearing scheduled. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	N/A
CEQA	AB 890	<b>Environment: CEQA Exemption: Roadway Improvement</b> <b>Authors:</b> Olsen (R) and Berryhill T (R) This bill would , until January 1, 2026, make a project or an activity to repair, maintain, or make minor alterations to an existing roadway exempt from CEQA if the project or activity is initiated by a city or county to improve public safety, does not cross a waterway, and involves negligible or no expansion of existing use.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	In Committee on Natural Resources: Failed passage (0-3), reconsideration granted on 05/02/2011. In Assembly: Passed (54-9) to Senate on 01/26/2012. To Senate Committee on Environment Quality on 02/16/2012. <b>Pending</b>	N/A
<i>Environmental Quality</i>	AB 1444	<del><b>Environmental Quality: Public Rail Transit Projects</b> <b>Author:</b> Feuer (D) States the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to provide the benefits provided by the Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act of 2011 for new public rail transit infrastructure projects.</del>  <del>—Amended—</del>  <b>Record of Proceedings</b> <b>Author:</b> Feuer (D) Amends the California Environmental Quality Act. Requires a lead agency, at the request of a project applicant to bear the costs incurred by the agency to prepare a record of proceedings currently with the preparation, and adoption or certification, of the environmental document. Requires that, in an action or proceeding filed challenging the lead agency's action pursuant to the act, the court to schedule a hearing within 30 days of the filing of the statement of issues regarding the record of proceedings.	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Introduced on 01/04/2012. To Assembly Committee on Natural Resources on 03/29/2012. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Natural Resources on 03/29/2012. No hearing scheduled. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>	AB 1532	<b>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006</b> <b>Author:</b> Perez (D) Amends the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit. Authorizes the State Air Resources Board to include use of market-based compliance mechanisms and a schedule of fees. Creates the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Account within the Air Pollution Control Fund.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced on 01/23/2012. Referred to Natural Resources on 02/02/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/23/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
<i>CEQA: Exemption</i>	AB 1665	<p><b>California Environmental Quality Act: Exemption</b>  <b>Author:</b> Galgiani (D)                      Amends the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Specifies that a certain exemption for a railroad grade separation project is for the elimination of an existing at-grade crossing. Exempts from the CEQA actions or activities taken by the Public utilities Commission under its authority to regulate railroad crossings.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/14/2012. Referred to Natural Resources on 02/23/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/16/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>CEQA: Judicial Review</i>	AB 2163	<p><b>California Environmental Quality Act: Judicial Review</b>  <b>Author:</b> Knight (R)                      Relates to the Environmental Quality Act. Extends indefinitely the use of the alternative method for the preparation of the record of proceedings and the alternative judicial review procedures. Expands projects that would be eligible for those alternative processes to include certain commercial development projects, residential development projects, and projects of cultivated development.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/23/2012. To Assembly Committees on Natural Resources and Judiciary on 03/19/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/16/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>CEQA: Exemption</i>	AB 2245	<p><b>Environmental Quality: Exemption: Bikeways</b>  <b>Author:</b> Smyth (R)                      Exempts, under the California Environmental Quality Act, a Class II bikeway project undertaken by a city, county, or a city and county within an existing road right-of-way.</p>	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/24/2012. To Assembly Committee on Natural Resources on 03/15/2012. Hearing scheduled for 05/07/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Global Warming Solutions Act</i>	AB 2404	<p><b>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006</b>  <b>Author:</b> Fuentes (D)                      Creates the Local Emission Reduction Fund pursuant to the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requiring moneys collected under the market-based compliance mechanisms be deposited in that fund. Provides that the moneys in that fund shall be available for award to specified local entities for specified purposes by the State Air Resources Board.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/24/2012. To Assembly Committee on Natural Resources on 03/22/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/23/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Air Quality</i>	AB 2412	<p><b>Air Quality Improvement Program</b>  <b>Author:</b> Swanson (D)                      Relates to the Air Quality Improvement Program that authorizes the funding of air quality improvements projects related to fuel and vehicle technologies and requires the State Air Resources Board to submit a biennial report to evaluate the implementation of the program. Requires the evaluation report to be an annual report instead of biennial.</p>	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/24/2012. To Assembly Committee on Transportation on 03/29/2012. Read second time and amended, re-referred to Transportation on 03/29/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/23/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Environmental Quality</i>	AB 2577	<p><b>Environmental Quality: Public Comments</b>  <b>Author:</b> Galgiani                      Specifies that the lead agency certifying the completion of an environmental impact report, under the California Environmental Quality Act, does not have a duty to consider, evaluate, or respond to comments received after the expiration of the public review period. Provides these comments are not a part of the record of proceedings for the Environmental Impact Report, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration.</p>	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/24/2012. To Assembly Committee on Natural Resources on 03/19/2012. Hearing scheduled for 05/07/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
<i>Environmental Quality</i>	SB 52	<p><b>Environmental Quality: Jobs &amp; Economic Improvement</b>  <b>Author:</b> Steinberg (D)                      Amends the Environmental Quality Act. Requires that a project result in a specified minimum financial investment that is spent on planning, design, and construction of the project. Requires a lead agency to place the highest priority on feasible measure that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions on the site and in the neighboring communities of the project site. Relates to judicial review of an environmental impact report. Relates to the Judicial Council's reporting requirements.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	In Senate: Do pass (32-4) to Assembly on 01/31/2012. No Committee assignment yet. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>CEQA: Judicial Review</i>	SB 1214	<p><b>California Environmental Quality Act: Judicial Review</b>  <b>Author:</b> Cannella (R)                      Establishes judicial review procedures for challenging a lead agency action on the ground of noncompliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Requires a judicial proceeding challenging a project, except for a high-speed rail project, located in a distressed county, to be filed with the Court of Appeal with geographic jurisdiction over the project.</p>	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/22/2012. Referred to Committees on Environmental Quality and Judiciary on 03/01/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/16/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>CEQA</i>	SB 1354	<p><b>California Environmental Quality Act: Project</b>  <b>Author:</b> Dutton (R)                      Makes a technical nonsubstantive change to the California Environmental Quality Act regarding an environmental impact report on a project 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.</p>	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/24/2012. Referred to Committee on Rules on 03/08/2012. No hearing scheduled. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>CEQA: Bicycle Transportation Plan</i>	SB 1380	<p><del><b>Environmental Quality: Environmental Impact Report</b>  <b>Author:</b> Rubio                      Requires a public agency to disclose in an EIR the environmental standards established by specified statutes and the regulation, plans, policies, and permitting programs promulgated, adopted, or issued pursuant to those statutes that are applicable to the project.</del></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>—Amended—</b></p> <p><b>Environmental Quality: CEQA: Bicycle Transportation Plan</b>                      Enacts the State Public Health and Environmental Standards Act. Requires documentation prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act for a bicycle transportation plan to disclose applicable laws. Prohibits a cause of action from being brought in a judicial proceeding alleging noncompliance with the act related to specified environmental laws.</p>	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/24/2012. Referred to Committee on Environmental Quality on 03/08/2012. Read second time and amended, referred to Environmental Quality on 04/10/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/30/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>CEQA: Litigation</i>	SB 1512	<p><b>California Environmental Quality Act: Litigation</b>  <b>Author:</b> Cannella (R)                      Makes technical, nonsubstantive changes to a provision requiring that the California Environmental Quality Act to establish a streamlined judicial review process for projects certified by the Governor as a leadership project.</p>	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/24/2012. To Senate Committee on Rules on 03/22/2012. No hearing scheduled. <b>Pending</b>	

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
<b>FINANCE</b>					
<i>Community Development</i>	AB 232	<p><b>Community Development Block Program: Funds</b>  <b>Authors:</b> V. Manuel Perez (D)</p> <p>Existing law requires the Department of Housing and Community Development to allocate funds under the federal Community Development Block Grant Program to cities and counties. Existing law requires the department to determine, and announce in the applicable Notice of Funding Availability, the maximum amount of grant funds that may be used for economic development projects and programs, housing for persons and families of low or moderate income or for purposes directly related to the provision or improvement of housing opportunities for these persons and families, and for cities and counties that apply on behalf of certain Indian tribes. Existing law requires the department to develop and use certain eligibility criteria and requirements for certain economic development fund applications. This bill would make changes to the eligibility criteria and requirements developed and used by the department. The bill would also make conforming changes.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced 02/02/2011. Referred to Assembly Committee on Jobs, Economic Development, & the Economy. From Committee: Do pass to Appropriations (6-0) on 01/10/2012. From Appropriations Committee: Do pass (17-0) on 01/19/2012. To Consent Calendar on 01/23/2012. In Assembly: Passed (75-0) to Senate on 01/26/2012. To Senate Committee on Transportation & Housing on 02/16/2012. <b>Pending</b>	Watch
<i>Economic Incentives</i>  <i>Transportation Technology</i>	AB 796	<p><b>Capital Access Loan Program: Clean Energy and Jobs</b>  <b>Author:</b> Blumenfield (D)</p> <p>Relates to the Capital Access Loan Program that provides loans for small businesses through financial institutions, and requires the State Pollution Control Financing Authority to create a loss reserve account for each financial institution in order to provide protection against loss that would require matching moneys from institutions. Increases the maximum institution contribution under specified conditions. Relates to matching contributions. Authorizes the Clean Energy Economy and Jobs Incentive Program.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Passed Assembly 62-14, to Senate on 06/01/2011. Referred to Senate Committees on Governance & Finance and Environmental Quality. From Governance & Finance: Do pass (9-0) to Environmental Quality on 06/29/2011. From Environmental Quality: Do pass (6-1) to Appropriations on 07/06/2011. In Appropriations: To Suspense File on 08/15/2011. Withdrawn from Appropriations and re-referred to Committee on Rules on 09/06/2011. In Senate, read second time and amended; re-referred to Rules on 02/27/2012. Re-referred to Senate Committees on Governance & Finance and Energy, Utilities & Communications on 03/22/2012. No hearing scheduled. <b>Pending</b>	N/A
<i>Economic Incentives: Renewable Technologies</i>	AB 1302	<p><b>Distributed Generation</b>  <b>Author:</b> Williams (D)</p> <p>Requires each large electrical corporation and local publicly owned electrical utility to provide maps and other information identifying and designating zones within their service territories that are optimal for deployment of distributed generation to the specified entities. Requires the development of guidelines for those utilities in that process. Requires priority to be given for distributed</p>	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	From Committee on Utilities & Commerce: Do pass as amended (9-2) to Appropriations on 05/04/2011. Do pass Appropriations Committee, 05/27/2011; Passed Assembly floor (49-25), 06/02/2011. Referred to Senate. To Senate Committee on Energy, Utilities, & Communications on	N/A

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
		generation projects proposed to be located within a zone designated pursuant to these provisions.		06/16/2011. No hearing scheduled. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	
<i>Economic Incentives</i>	SB 77	<b>Community Development</b> <b>Author:</b> Budget & Fiscal Review Committee Revises provisions of the Community Development Law relating to actions against redevelopment agencies for certain agency actions. Dissolves all redevelopment and community development agencies. Designates successor agencies. Requires former agency audits. Requires an estimate of property tax funds that would have gone to agency and to deposit that amount in the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund in each county. Allocates funds to counties' public health and safety fund.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill. Requires 2/3 vote threshold.	Introduced in Senate on 01/10/2011. In Senate, read third time, passed (22-2), and to Assembly on 02/14/2011. In Assembly, read second time, and amended on 03/15/2011. Failed (by one vote) 2/3's requirement on Assembly floor, 53-23, 03/16/2011. In Assembly. Granted reconsideration. To Inactive File on 07/05/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	N/A
<i>Infrastructure Financing</i>	SB 214	<b>Infrastructure Financing Districts: Voter Approval</b> <b>Author:</b> Wolk (D) Revises provisions governing the public facilities that may be financed. Eliminates the requirement of voter approval to issue bonds to finance infrastructure facilities. Authorizes the legislative body to create an infrastructure financing district, adopt a financing plan, and issue the bonds by resolutions. Authorizes a district to finance specified actions and projects. Prohibits the district from providing financial assistance to a vehicle dealer or big box retailer.	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Passed Senate (24-13) on 05/16/2011. Referred to Assembly Committee on Local Government on 05/23/2011. From Committee: Do pass (5-3) on 06/29/2011. To Assembly Inactive File on 09/09/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	SCAG Supports  Metro: "Work With Author"
<i>Infrastructure Financing</i>	SB 475	<b>Infrastructure Financing</b> <b>Authors:</b> Wright (D) and Emmerson (R) Authorizes a local governmental agency to enter into an agreement with a private entity for financing for specified types of revenue generating infrastructure projects. Requires an agreement to include adequate financial resources to perform the agreement. Permits the agreements to lease or license to, or provide other permitted uses by, the private entity.	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Passed Senate (26-4) on 05/09/2011. Referred to Assembly Committee on Local Government. In Assembly Committee on Local Government: Not heard on 06/14/2011. In Local Government Committee: Failed passage (2-3) on 06/29/2011. Reconsideration granted. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	SCAG Supports  OCTA Supports
<b>GOVERNMENT</b>					
<i>State Planning</i>	AB 441	<b>State Planning</b> <b>Author:</b> Monning (D) 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 the commission, by no later than 2014, include voluntary health and health equity factors, strategies, goals, and objectives in the guidelines promulgated by the commission for the preparation of regional transportation plans.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	In Assembly: Passed (50-23) to Senate on 01/26/2012. To Senate Committee on Transportation & Housing on 02/16/2012. <b>Pending</b>	

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
<i>Local Planning: Housing Units</i>	AB 485	<b>Local Planning: Transit Village Development Districts</b> <b>Author:</b> Ma (D) Requires 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 and rental units. Relates to the procedures for the formation of an infrastructure financing district by the governing body of a fire protection district. Relates to required plan reporting.	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Passed Assembly (47-29). Referred to Senate Committee on Governance and Finance. From Committee: Do pass (6-3) on 07/06/2011. To Inactive File on 09/07/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	RC Approved Support
<i>Redevelopment</i>	AB 1585	<b>Redevelopment</b> <b>Author:</b> Perez, J. (D) Modifies the scope of the term enforceable obligation. Modifies provisions relating to the transfer of housing funds and responsibilities associated with dissolved redevelopment agencies. Provides that any amounts on deposit in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund of a dissolved redevelopment agency be transferred to specified entities. Provides that loan agreements entered into between an agency and the city, county, or city and county are deemed to be enforceable obligations.	Urgency, fiscal bill. Requires 2/3 vote threshold.	To Assembly Committees on Housing & Community Development and Local Government on 02/09/2012. From Housing & Community Development: Do pass (5-0) to Local Government on 03/14/2012. From Local Government: Do pass (7-1) to Appropriations on 03/21/2012. From Appropriations: Do pass (11-3) on 03/22/2012. In Assembly: Pass to Senate (58-7) on 03/26/2012. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Redevelopment</i>	SB 654	<b>Redevelopment</b> <b>Author:</b> Steinberg (D) Amends existing law related to redevelopment agencies and funds. Revises the definition of the term enforceable obligation. Modifies provisions relating to the transfer of housing funds and responsibilities associated with dissolved redevelopment agencies. Provides that any amounts on deposit in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund of a dissolved redevelopment agency be transferred to specified entities. Provides that agreements funding for projects loans are still valid.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	In Senate: Do pass (34-1) to Assembly on 01/31/2012. In Assembly. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Redevelopment</i>	SB 659	<b>Community Redevelopment</b> <b>Author:</b> Padilla (D) Provides that a specified dissolution of redevelopment agencies and community development agencies shall take effect on a specified date.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	In Senate: Do pass (39-0) to Assembly on 05/23/2011. From Assembly Committee on Local Government with author's amendments on 01/13/2012. Withdrawn from Committee on Local Government. Re-referred to Rules on 01/19/2012. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Redevelopment</i>	SB 986	<b>Redevelopment: Bond Proceeds</b> <b>Author:</b> Dutton (R) Provides that all bond proceeds that were generated by a former redevelopment agency shall be deemed to be encumbered. Prohibits a successor agency from remitting these proceeds to the county auditor-controller. Requires that the proceeds of bonds issued by a former redevelopment agency must be used by the successor agency for the purposes for which the bonds were sold pursuant to an enforceable obligation that was	Urgency, fiscal bill. Requires 2/3s vote threshold.	Introduced on 01/31/2012. To Senate Committee on Governance & Finance on 02/16/2012. In Committee: Not heard on 03/21/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/18/2012 at 9:30 AM. <b>Pending</b>	

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
		entered into either by the former agency or its successor agency by December 14, 2014.			
<b>RETIREMENT</b>					
<i>Pension</i>	AB 340	<p><b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>  <b>Author:</b> Furutani (D)                      Relates to the State Teachers' Retirement System, the Public Employees' Retirement System, the Judges' Retirement System, and the Judges Retirement System II. Declares the intent of the Legislature to convene a conference committee to craft responsible, comprehensive legislation to reform state and local pension systems in a manner that reflects both the legitimate needs of public employees and the fiscal circumstances of state and local governments.</p>	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	In Senate: Passed (25-15) to Assembly. To Assembly for Concurrence. In Assembly: Failed (4-75) to concur in Senate Amendments. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	N/A
<i>Pension</i>	AB 344	<p><b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>  <b>Author:</b> Furutani (D)                      Deletes the authorization for the Public Employees' Retirement Board to adopt regulations permitting exemptions to the average increase in final compensation for members, including school members, who are not in a group or class. Repeals an existing law that provides that a person may serve without reinstatement under an appointment that exceeds a specified number of hours in any fiscal year, if the governing body of the contracting agency requests approval from the Board.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	In Assembly: Passed (75-0) to Senate on 05/26/2011. In Senate: To Inactive File on 09/09/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	N/A
<i>Public Employees: Retirement</i>	AB 1184	<p><b>Public Employees' Retirement Benefits</b>  <b>Author:</b> Huffman (D)                      Amends the Planning and Zoning Law relating to a city's or county's housing element obligation regarding affordable housing, and the specified criteria that must be met for a unit to qualify. Adds to the list in existing law the additional criterion of being located on foreclosed property and converted with committed assistance from the city or county from non-affordable to very low and low-income households to affordable to those households.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	In Assembly: Do pass (54-23) to Senate on 06/01/2011. In Senate: Do pass (37-0) on 08/30/2011. In Assembly: To Inactive File on 09/09/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	
<i>Public Employees: Retirement</i>	AB 1320	<p><b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>  <b>Authors:</b> Allen (D) and Ma (D) and Furutani (D)                      Establishes for each employer an Employer Rate Stabilization Account and related fund to stabilize employer retirement contributions. Requires the investment of the fund assets be established by the PERS Board of Administration. Requires contributions to the account and authorizes draws on the account under certain conditions. Establishes in each county or district's retirement fund a Rate Stabilization Account, and also requires contributions to the account and authorizes draws on the account.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	In Assembly: Do pass (51-26) to Senate on 06/02/2011. In Senate: Do pass (22-14) on 09/07/2011 for Concurrence. In Assembly: To Inactive File on 09/09/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	
<i>Public Employees: Retirement</i>	AB 2224	<p><b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>  <b>Author:</b> Smyth (R)                      Prohibits a public retirement system from allowing the purchase of additional retirement service credit. Prohibits any member who does not have at least 5 years of service credit before the operative date of this bill, or any person hired</p>	Urgency, fiscal bill. Requires 2/3 vote threshold.	Introduced on 02/24/2012. To Assembly Committee on Public Employees, Retirement & Social Security on 03/29/2012. No hearing scheduled. <b>Pending</b>	

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
		<p>on or after that date, from purchasing additional retirement service credit. Requires a public employer to offer to its employees first hired on a specified date a hybrid pension plan or alternative pension plan option. Prohibits public employment without reinstatement.</p> <p><i>Note: The text of this bill is identical to SB 1176 (Huff-R)</i></p>			
Public Employees: Retirement	ACA 22	<p><b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>  <b>Author:</b> Smyth (R)                      Proposes an amendment to the Constitution to require each public retirement system to provide one or more hybrid pension plans meeting specified requirements. Establishes other limitations on retirement benefits of public employees. Requires benefit forfeiture for a felony conviction for crimes arising out of an employee's official duties. Relates to collective bargaining contract requirements. Relates to the composition of a retirement system board.</p>	<p>Non-urgency, fiscal bill.                      Requires 2/3 vote threshold.</p>	<p>Introduced on 02/22/2012.  <b>Pending</b></p>	
Public Employees: Retirement	SB 27	<p><b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>  <b>Author:</b> Simitian (D)                      Amends the State Teachers' Retirement Law. Relates to the Defined Benefit Supplement Program and creditable compensation. Relates to the receipt of lump-sum payments. Relates to substitute employees' post-retirement compensation. Authorizes penalties for late or improper adjustments to on Cash Balance Benefit Program contributions. Requires Public Employees' Retirement System participating employers notify Board of Administration of payrate changes.</p>	<p>Non-urgency, fiscal bill.</p>	<p>In Senate: Do pass (39-0) to Assembly on 06/01/2011. In Assembly Appropriations: Not heard on 08/25/2011.  <b>Pending - Carryover</b></p>	
Public Employees: Retirement	SB 1176	<p><b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>  <b>Author:</b> Huff (R)                      Prohibits a public retirement system from allowing the purchase of additional retirement service credit. Prohibits any member who does not have at least 5 years of service credit before the operative date of this bill, or any person hired on or after that date, from purchasing additional retirement service credit. Requires a public employer to offer to its employees first hired on a specified date a hybrid pension plan or alternative pension plan option. Prohibits public employment without reinstatement.</p> <p><i>Note: The text of this bill is identical to AB 2224 (Smyth-R)</i></p>	<p>Urgency, fiscal bill.                      Requires 2/3 vote threshold.</p>	<p>Introduced on 02/22/2012. Referred to Committee on Public Employment &amp; Retirement on 03/01/2012.  <b>Pending</b></p>	
Public Employees: Retirement	SCA 18	<p><b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>  <b>Author:</b> Huff (R)                      Proposes an amendment to the Constitution to require each public retirement system to provide one or more hybrid pension plans meeting specified requirements. Establishes other limitations on retirement benefits of public employees. Requires benefit forfeiture for a felony conviction for crimes arising out of an employee's official duties. Relates to collective bargaining contract requirements. Relates to the composition of a retirement system board.</p>	<p>Non-urgency, fiscal bill.                      Requires 2/3 vote threshold.</p>	<p>Introduced on 02/22/2012. Referred to Committees on Public Employment &amp; Retirement and Elections &amp; Constitutional Amendments on 03/01/2012. No hearing scheduled.  <b>Pending</b></p>	

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>					
<i>High-Speed Rail</i>	AB 16	<p><b>High-Speed Rail Authority</b>  <b>Author:</b> Perea (D)                      Amends existing law that creates the High-Speed Rail Authority. Requires the authority to make every effort to purchase high-speed train rolling stock and related equipment that are manufactured in California, consistent with federal and state laws.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Passed Assembly floor (57-19) on 06/02/2011. Referred to Senate Committee on Transportation & Housing on 06/16/2011. From Transportation & Housing: Do pass (7-2) to Appropriations on 06/28/2011. To Inactive File on 09/09/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	N/A
<i>Transportation Agencies</i>	AB 57	<p><b>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</b>  <b>Author:</b> Beall (D)                      Requires the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to consist of a specified number of members, including one member appointed by the Mayor of the City of Oakland and one member appointed by the Mayor of the City of San Jose. Specified the term end date for those members. Prohibits more than 3 members from being residents of the same county. Requires the member from the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission to be a member of the commission, a resident of San Francisco.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Passed Assembly (71-5) on 5/26/11. Referred to Senate Transportation & Housing Committee. Not heard on 07/05/2011. Read second time, re-referred to Transportation & Housing on 03/05/2012. No hearing scheduled. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	N/A
<i>High-Speed Rail</i>	AB 145	<p><b>High-Speed Rail</b>  <b>Author:</b> Galgiani (D); co-author Bonnie Lowenthal (D)                      Repeals all of the State High-Speed Train Act and enacts a new act. Continues the High-Speed Rail Authority with limited responsibilities within the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency. Requires specified personnel matters. Requires the authority to adopt policies directing the development and implementation of high-speed rail, prepare and adopt a business plan and high-speed train capital program, and select alignments for the routes of the trains system, award franchises, and provide for fares.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Passed Assembly (57-18) on 06/03/2011. Referred to Senate. To Senate Committee on Transportation & Housing on 06/16/2011. From Transportation & Housing: Do pass (5-3) to Senate Appropriations on 07/05/2011. In Appropriations: To Suspense File on 08/15/2011. Held in Committee on 08/25/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	N/A  Metro: "Work With Author"
<i>Transportation Financing Criteria</i>	AB 845	<p>Transportation: Bond Funds  <b>Author:</b> Ma (D)                      Requires the guidelines adopted by the Transportation Commission to determine the funding share for each eligible commuter and urban rail recipient to use the distribution factors gathered from the 2007 Data Tables in the National Transit Database of the Federal Transit Administration. Requires the commission to accept from each eligible recipient a priority list of projects up to the target amount expected to be available for the recipient and would require matching funds for bond fund allocation purposes.</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Passed Assembly floor (75-0), 06/02/2011. Referred to Senate Committee on Transportation & Housing on 06/16/2011. From Committee: Do pass (5-3) to Appropriations on 07/05/2011. To Inactive File on 08/22/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	Metro Supports
<i>Transportation Funding/ Subsidies</i>	AB 1229	<p><b>Transportation: Finance: Federal Highway Grant Notes</b>  <b>Author:</b> Feuer (D)                      Provides that the term eligible transportation project in existing law may include projects programmed by a regional transportation planning agency using specified federal funds. Authorizes a minimum percentage of bonding capacity</p>	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Passed Assembly (77-0) on 06/02/2011. To Senate. Referred to Senate. To Senate Committee on Transportation & Housing on 06/16/2011. From Committee: Do pass (9-0) to Appropriations on 07/05/2011. In	SCAG Supports  Metro Supports

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
		of GARVEE bonds from being made available for these projects. Requires such agency to commit to repaying the state for debt service if that agency's share of federal regional surface transportation program funds or federal congestion mitigation and air quality funds is insufficient.		Appropriations: To Suspense File on 08/15/2011. Held in Committee on 08/25/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	
<i>Transportation Funding</i>	AB 1308	<b>Highway Users Tax Account</b> <b>Author:</b> Miller (R) and Huff (R), Galgiani (D), Portantino (D) Provides that in any year in which the Budget Act has not been enacted by a certain date, would provide that all moneys in the Highway Users Tax Account in the Transportation Tax Fund are continuously appropriated and may be encumbered for certain purposes until the Budget Act is enacted.	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill	From Committee on Transportation: Do pass (12-0) to Appropriations on 04/11/2011. Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee. <b>FAILED</b>	SCAG Supports Metro Supports OCTA Supports
<i>Metro</i>	AB 1446	<b>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation</b> <b>Author:</b> Feuer (D) Authorizes the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) to impose the transactions and use tax without a limitation as to its duration, subject to voter approval. Requires the MTA to secure bonded indebtedness payable from the proceeds of an extension. Requires that the proceeds from those bonds be used to accelerate the completion of specified projects and programs.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced on 01/04/2012. To Assembly Committees on Local Government and Transportation on 01/26/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/11/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>High-Speed Rail</i>	AB 1455	<b>High-Speed Rail</b> <b>Author:</b> Harkey (R) Reduces the amount of general obligation debt authorized for high-speed rail purposes pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century to the amount contracted as of January 1, 2013.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced 01/09/2012. To Committee on Transportation on 01/19/2012. In Assembly, read second time and amended. Re-referred to Transportation on 02/09/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/23/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Metro Gold Line Extension</i>	AB 1600	<b>Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction</b> <b>Author:</b> Torres (D) Provides for the extension of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension project to the City of Montclair, instead of the City of Claremont. Authorizes the acceptance of grants, fees, and allocations from federal agencies, and transfers of funds from those agencies. Requires the local authority to assume responsibility for operating all completed phases of the project. Grants authority to operate the portion of the project located in San Bernardino county. Specifies contracting requirements.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced 02/06/2012. To Assembly Committees on Local Government and Transportation on 02/17/2012. From Local Government: Do pass (9-0) to Transportation Committee on 03/21/2012. From Transportation: Do pass (14-0) to Appropriations on 04/09/2012. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Local Transportation Funds</i>	AB 1778	<b>Local Transportation Funds</b> <b>Author:</b> Williams (D) Provides that local transportation funds in Ventura County would be available solely for transit purposes beginning on July 1, 2013, and not July 1, 2014, unless a specified legislative proposal is enacted by the specified date.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/21/2012. To Assembly Committee on Transportation on 03/01/2012. In Committee: Not heard on 04/09/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/16/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>HOT Lane Exemption</i>	AB 2405	<b>Vehicles: High-Occupancy Toll Lanes</b> <b>Author:</b> Blumenfield (D) Exempts a vehicle that meets California's advanced technology partial zero-	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/24/2012. To Assembly Committee on Transportation on 03/15/2012. Read second time and	

# 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
		emission vehicle standard from toll changes imposed on single-occupant vehicles in lanes designated for tolls unless prohibited by federal law.		amended, re-referred to Transportation on 04/10/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/16/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Transportation: Airports</i>	SB 446	<b>Ontario International Airport</b> <b>Authors:</b> Dutton (R), Negrete McLeod (D), Carter (D), Jeffries (R), Nestande (R) Establishes the Ontario International Airport Authority as a local entity of regional government. Authorizes the authority to enter into an agreement with the City of Los Angeles to facilitate the sale of or transfer of management and operational control of the Ontario International Airport to the authority. Requires the authority and specified entities to cooperate to develop a transition plan to facilitate the sale of or transfer of operational control of the airport and surface transportation access.	Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill.	Passed Senate on (33-1) on 05/31/2011. Referred to Assembly. To Assembly Committee on Local Government. No hearing scheduled. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	N/A  SANBAG Supports
<i>High-Speed Rail</i>	SB 517	<b>High-Speed Rail Authority</b> <b>Authors:</b> Lowenthal A. (D) and DeSaulnier (D) Places the High-Speed Rail Authority within the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency. Requires the Secretary to propose an annual budget for the authority. Requires the members of the authority appointed by the Governor to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. Vacates the membership of the authority. Provides for the appointment or reappointment of members on a specified date. Provides that the executive director is subject to appointment with the advice and consent of the Senate.	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Passed Senate (26-12) on 06/01/2011. Referred to Assembly. Referred to Assembly Committee on Transportation on 06/09/2011. From Committee: Do pass (9-3) to Appropriations on 06/27/2011. Re-referred to Rules on 07/01/2011. Re-referred to Appropriations on 07/14/2011. In Appropriations: To Suspense File on 08/17/2011. Held in Committee on 08/25/2011. <b>Pending - Carryover</b>	N/A  Metro: "Work With Author"
<i>Transportation Bonds: High-Speed Rail</i>	SB 985	<b>Transportation Bonds</b> <b>Author:</b> LaMalfa (R) Provides that no further bonds shall be sold for high-speed rail and related rail purposes pursuant to the Safe, Reliable, High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century. Authorizes redirection of the net proceeds received from outstanding bonds issued and sold prior to the effective date of this act, to retiring the debt incurred from the issuance and sale of those outstanding bonds.	Urgency, fiscal bill. Requires 2/3s vote threshold.	Introduced on 01/30/2012. Referred to Senate Committees on Transportation & Housing and Governance & Finance on 02/16/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/17/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	
<i>Intercity Rail</i>	SB 1225	<b>Intercity Rail Agreements</b> <b>Author:</b> Padilla (D) Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to contract with Amtrak for intercity rail passenger services and provides funding for these services from the Public Transportation Account. Existing law, until December 31, 1996, authorized the department, subject to approval of the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, to enter into an interagency transfer agreement under which a joint powers board assumes responsibility for administering the state-funded intercity rail service in a particular corridor. This bill would authorize the department, with the approval of the secretary, to enter into an additional interagency transfer agreement with respect to the	Non-urgency, fiscal bill.	Introduced on 02/23/2012. Referred to Committee on Transportation & Housing on 03/08/2012. Read second time and amended, re-referred to Transportation & Housing on 04/09/2012. Hearing scheduled for 04/17/2012 at 1:30 PM. <b>Pending</b>	LOSSAN Supports  Metro Supports  OCTA Supports  VCTC Supports

## 2012 State Legislative Summary

April 2012

SUBJECT	BILL NUMBER	BILL SUMMARY	COMMENTS	STATUS	AGENCY POSITIONS
		LOSSAN Corridor, defined to mean the intercity passenger rail corridor between San Diego, Los Angeles, and San Luis Obispo, if the LOSSAN Agency, an existing joint powers agency, is reconstituted through an amended joint powers agreement approved by the governing boards of its members to enable that agency to enter into an interagency transfer agreement with the secretary relative to the LOSSAN Corridor. This bill would require an interagency transfer agreement for the LOSSAN Corridor to cover the initial 5-year period after the transfer. The bill would require the secretary, if an agreement is not entered into by December 31, 2013, to report to the Governor and the Legislature by January 31, 2014, as specified.			
<i>Transportation Funding</i>	ACA 23	<p><b>Local Government Transportation Projects: Special Taxes: Voter Approval</b>  <b>Author:</b> Perea (D)</p> <p>Provides that the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects requires the approval of a specified percent of its voters voting on the proposition.</p>	<p>Non-urgency, non-fiscal bill. Requires 2/3s vote threshold.</p>	<p>Introduced on 02/23/2012. No hearing scheduled.  <b>Pending</b></p>	