



CALIFORNIA  
TRANSIT  
ASSOCIATION

20<sup>08</sup>

LEGISLATIVE  
SUMMARY



*A member service provided by  
California Transit Association*



**CALIFORNIA  
TRANSIT  
ASSOCIATION**

1415 L Street, Suite 200 • Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone (916) 446-4656 • FAX (916) 446-4318

E-Mail: [info@caltransit.org](mailto:info@caltransit.org)

[www.caltransit.org](http://www.caltransit.org)

November 4, 2008

To: All Members of the California Transit Association

Fm: Joshua W. Shaw, Executive Director  
Gus F. Khouri, Legislative Advocate

**RE: 2008 YEAR-END LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY**

The 2008 legislative year was a difficult one for public transportation. With a 2008-09 state budget deficit of over \$25 billion, the legislature diverted nearly \$1.7 billion in transit funding (without any repayment provisions) as part of the package meant to close the shortfall. This diversion occurred on top of the \$1.259 billion that was stripped away in the 2007-08 budget. While the budget picture was grim, the Association was successful in enacting some of the highest priority legislation we supported for our members. In addition, transit providers continued to receive Proposition 1B allocations from the Public Transportation Modernization and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) and Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response Account (TSSSDRA). The 2008-09 budget will provide a total of \$451 million for these programs. The Association is currently appealing the raid of the 2007-08 funds and is seeking to protect future public transportation funds from being diverted through the initiative process in order to accomplish the Association's vision of a "fully-funded, efficient, and effective public transit system operating in a balanced network."

The following report summarizes the status of all legislative proposals the Association tracked and/or lobbied during the 2008 Legislative Session, divided as follows:

- **Significant Transit Legislation** – Identifies and describes bills high-priority legislation supported by the Association, signed into law or vetoed by the Governor in 2008.
- **2008-09 State Budget** – Describes the Budget's impact on public transportation and the State Transit Assistance (STA) Program, and Proposition 1B allocations.
- **Matrix of Significant Transit-Related Legislation** – Identifies the most significant transit-related legislation considered by the Association's Legislative Committee during the 2008 Legislative Session, whether enacted or not.

A complete matrix of all other bills we identified as having some impact on transportation in general can be found on our website [www.caltransit.org](http://www.caltransit.org). This report is presented for your information. Should you have any questions regarding any portion of this report, please feel free to contact Gus Khouri at (916) 446-4656.

## Summary of California Transit Association High-Priority Legislation

---

- **AB 387** (Duvall), [Chapter 185, Statutes of 2008], Expands existing design-build authority for transit projects by eliminating the cost threshold for the acquisition and installation of safety technology or surveillance procurements.
- **AB 1221 (MA)** Would have provided additional financing tools for Transit Village Development. Vetoed by the Governor.
- **AB 2009 (HERNANDEZ)**, [Chapter 221, Statutes of 2008], Exempts public transit operators from utility user taxes assessed on compressed natural gas.
- **AB 2466 (Laird)**, [Chapter 540, Statutes of 2008], Allows a local government entity that produces surplus renewable energy at one of its facilities to receive a credit for the excess electricity supplied to the grid on its bill for another one of its facilities.
- **AB 2705 (JONES)** Would have added public transit to Mello-Roos services. Died in Senate Local Government Committee.
- **SB 1561 (Steinberg)** [Chapter 528, Statutes of 2008], Allows transit districts in Sacramento and Fresno to exclude passengers who have committed prohibited acts while on transit district property from using transit for limited periods of time, depending on the nature and the frequency of offenses committed.

# **AB 387 (Duvall)**

## **Design-Build Contracts for Public Transportation**

### **PURPOSE**

AB 387 (Duvall), [Chapter 185, Statutes of 2008], expands existing design-build authority for transit projects by eliminating the cost threshold for the acquisition and installation of technology or surveillance procurements to enhance safety, disaster preparedness, and homeland security efforts.

### **POSITION**

Support

### **BACKGROUND**

The Association recently sponsored AB 372 (Nation), Chapter 262, Statutes of 2006, which extended the sunset date, from January 1, 2007 to January 2011, on design build authority for public transit agencies and lowered the thresholds for transit projects (from \$50 million to \$25 million) and non-rail transit projects (from \$10 million to \$2.5 million) so that the design-build process could actually be utilized by transit operators.

The existing design-build authority provided to transit agencies in California must meet a cost threshold of \$25 million, which exceeds the typical project cost for transit security technologies such as video surveillance systems (VSS).

### **IMPACT**

By eliminating the threshold for transit projects, transit agencies can plan more effectively for and implement new technologies which will enhance the safety of our transit systems in California.

# **AB 1221 (Ma)**

## **Transit Village Development**

### **PURPOSE**

AB 1221(Ma) would have allowed local officials to divert property tax increment revenues to pay for public facilities and amenities within transit village development districts. The bill would also have increased the area located in a transit village plan to include up to a 1/2 mile of the main entrance of a transit station.

### **POSITION**

Support

### **BACKGROUND**

The Transit Village Development Planning Act allows cities and counties to adopt transit village plans that identify areas where local officials want to encourage neighborhoods centered on transit stations. To qualify, a transit village plan must demonstrate five public benefits, selected from a statutory list of 13 public benefits, including an increased stock of affordable housing and live-travel options for transit-needy groups.

If a city or county finances a transit facility with an infrastructure financing district, Assembly Bill 1221 requires the transit village plan to include: (1) as one of its five demonstrable public benefits either an increased stock of affordable housing or live-travel options for transit-needy groups, and (2) a provision to dedicate at least 20% of revenues from the property tax increment to increase, improve, and preserve housing that is affordable to vulnerable populations, including the elderly, disabled, and people with low- and moderate-incomes.

Federal, state, and local agencies have invested billions of dollars in mass transit projects and programs. But the public investment in public transit does not pay off if local officials fail to promote private development around transit stations. The public sector's investment in commuter rail, light-rail, ferries, and bus lines is part of a wider strategy to improve air quality, save energy, cut congestion, and promote compact development. When communities encourage transit agencies to build expensive systems but then fail to promote higher density development around transit stations, the loss is social as well as physical. Similarly, the loss is regional not just local. One reason that communities do not encourage more density around transit stations is the lack of fiscal incentives to pay for the public works needed to support the new residents and businesses.

## **WHY**

Cities and counties would reap the fiscal benefits of new construction inside transit villages by harnessing property tax increment financing to transit village development. This bill encourages private investment and provides for more incentive for overall public transit use.

## **STATUS**

Vetoed by the Governor.

### Governor's veto message:

I am returning Assembly Bill 1221 without my signature. The historic delay in passing the 2008-2009 State Budget has forced me to prioritize the bills sent to my desk at the end of the year's legislative session. Given the delay, I am only signing bills that are the highest priority for California. This bill does not meet that standard and I cannot sign it at this time. Sincerely, Arnold Schwarzenegger

# **AB 2009 (Hernandez)**

## **Public Transit Exemption from Utility Users Tax**

### **PURPOSE**

AB 2009 (Hernandez), [Chapter 221, Statutes of 2008], exempts from a Utility Users Tax (UUT) any consumption of compressed natural gas by a public transit operator for transportation purposes.

### **POSITION**

Support

### **BACKGROUND**

Existing law authorizes any county to levy a UUT on the consumption of various utilities including the consumption of natural gas, whether the natural gas is used for utility or transportation purposes. A number of cities have also imposed a UUT under a generous interpretation of home-rule authority in the State Constitution. However, other types of fuel used by public transit systems for transportation purposes, such as liquid natural gas and diesel fuel, are not subject to UUT. Further, Revenue and Taxation Code Section 8655 (Mills-Hayes Act) states that no tax shall be imposed upon fuel used by any public transit system or authority.

### **WHY**

The intent of the UUT was to charge households and commercial/industrial users for their specific use of the utility to assist in covering costs for service and improvements. There is no historical legislative intent to levy the tax by a local jurisdiction on a public transit operator that provides regional transportation services.

### **IMPACT**

Transit systems will be better able to provide clean natural gas bus transportation to the communities in which they serve, without incurring extra fuel costs and providing improved air quality and reduced traffic congestion to these communities.

# **AB 2466 (Laird)**

## **Renewable Energy Self-Generation**

### **PURPOSE**

AB 2466 (Laird), [Chapter 540, Statutes of 2008], allows a local government entity that produces surplus renewable energy at one of its facilities to receive a credit for the excess electricity supplied to the grid on its bill for another one of its facilities.

### **POSITION:**

Support

### **BACKGROUND**

Some transit systems are implementing comprehensive programs that are designed to modify business practices and processes in a way that would conserve natural resources, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and alleviate other types of pollution while increasing the use of renewable energy and materials. As part of those programs, transit operators with multiple facilities are looking at converting to either solar or other types of renewable energy sources.

### **WHY**

AB 2466 allows for generation of excess solar power at a bus operating division for example and, rather than losing that electricity to the grid, to receive a credit on an electric bill at a light rail division, where there may not be enough space to install enough solar panels to meet that facility's electricity needs.

### **IMPACT**

Transit systems will be better able to provide service at a lower cost as a result of their efforts to use and produce renewable energy at their facilities, thus providing these systems the opportunity to increase efforts to maintain or expand service, or complete needed transit projects.



# **AB 2705 (Jones)**

## **Mello-Roos and Public Transit**

### **PURPOSE**

AB 2705 (Jones) would have added public transit services to the types of services that may be financed under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982.

### **POSITION**

Support

### **BACKGROUND**

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 allows any county, city, special district, school district or joint powers authority to establish a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD). Mello-Roos Community Facilities Districts raise money through special taxes that must be approved by a 2/3 vote requirement within the district. This money can finance major improvements and services within the district which might include schools, roads, libraries, police and fire protection services, or ambulance services.

A recent report by CALPIRG states that studies have shown that land in immediate proximity to transit stops will generally have a higher land value than land that does not have this proximity. By providing better access to work, markets, and other services, transit lends to increased economic vitality for communities. The American Public Transportation Association (APTA) reports that every \$1 invested in public transportation projects generates approximately \$6 in local economic activity.

Our car-centered transportation system has led to pollution and poor air quality. Emissions from road vehicles are the largest contributors to smog. Public transit gives commuters an additional option of travel. By taking existing public transportation instead of driving a car, a single person saves 4,800 pounds of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. Each person traveling in peak periods via automobile wastes, on average, 62 hours a year – nearly eight full working days – in congestion delays. Public transportation services in America's most congested cities saved travelers 1.1 billion hours of added travel time each year.

## **WHY**

Increased investment in and use of public transportation can directly improve and protect the personal health of all Californians. Adding public transit to Mello-Roos services will allow more communities to access the benefits of public transit.

## **STATUS**

Died in the Senate Local Government Committee.

# **SB 1561 (Steinberg)**

## **Conduct on Public Transportation Facilities**

### **PURPOSE**

SB 1561 (Steinberg), [Chapter 528, Statutes of 2008], allows transit districts in Sacramento and Fresno to exclude passengers who have committed prohibited acts while on transit district property from using transit for limited periods of time, depending on the nature and the frequency of offenses committed.

### **POSITION**

Support

### **BACKGROUND**

Transit security officers have historically had limited power in dealing with problem riders – while these officers have the ability to cite problem riders and escort them off of a train or bus, there are no authority measures to keep the same problem riders from getting on the next train or bus that comes along.

### **IMPACT**

This bill will help to maintain and encourage more transit use through safer traveling conditions, and provide more authority to transit systems to prevent problem riders from using their transit systems for a period of time.

## 2008-09 State Budget Highlights

Following is a summary of the key transportation impacts of the 2008-09 State Budget:

The 2008-09 State Budget, AB 1781, was signed by the Governor on September 23<sup>rd</sup> along with a host of trailer bills (including AB 88 and AB 268) implementing several policy changes and making further appropriations and or cuts to the Budget Act.

The total budget deficit as of September 23<sup>rd</sup> was estimated at \$25 billion. Due to the recession that has gripped the country however, a current year deficit of \$4.6 billion has developed and remains to be resolved. The legislature is expected to reconvene in Extraordinary Session either after the election or in early January to address the shortfall. This Budget enacts a \$1.67 billion shift of Public Transportation Account (PTA) funds to pay for traditional General Fund expenditures. Additional public transportation dollars could be compromised if Proposition 42 is suspended to address a portion of the \$4.6 billion shortfall.

### Transit and Transportation Impacts

- The 2008-09 State transit assistance (STA) Program is funded at \$306 million. The Governor reduced this amount by \$100 million from what the legislature approved. The Administration contends that this is not a cut since STA was funded at approximately the same level last year (\$316 million). The STA program is funded substantially from sales tax revenues. The Proposition 42 contribution into the STA is **\$213 million**. This amount includes a \$71 million increase in Proposition 42 revenue resulting from the enactment of SB 717 (Perata), [Chapter 733, Statutes of 2007], which split revenues 75%/25% to favor STA for all Proposition 42 revenue deposited into the PTA. The total STA amount also includes a mix of the STA's share of half of the sales tax on diesel fuel (**\$34.5 million**) and half of the state sales tax on diesel (**\$246 million**), yet only \$93 million of these funds are included in the \$306 million amount. A fully-funded STA program would provide \$967 million. If Proposition 42 is suspended in an Extraordinary Session, the STA allocation level would be reduced to approximately \$93 million.
- Upon the enactment of the 2007-08 budget and the actions by CTC to front-load the STIP, it was anticipated that there would be no additional money in 2008-09 for new project starts. This is still what we are seeing upon enactment of the 2008-09 budget, yet there is still some capital spending from PTA. The Department of Finance estimates that there is currently \$304 million in capital spending available from the PTA in 2008-09, including funds for AB 3090 repayments.
- The total spillover amount projected thus far for 2008-09 is **\$1.427 billion**. Under current law, the budget act should contribute half of that amount (\$713.5 million), to the PTA, with 2/3 of that amount (\$470.9 million) going to STA. The 2008-09 Budget Act however has ignored that allocation formula and now the STA Program will receive only \$306 million, an amount roughly equivalent to last year's total (\$316 million).
- Approximately \$1.67 billion in PTA funds are shifted to fund non-transit obligations of the General Fund. The diversions are allocated as follows: \$857 million to the General

Fund for transportation related G.O. bond debt; \$589 million to the General Fund for Home-to-School transportation; \$138 million to the Department of Developmental Services for regional center transportation; and \$83 million to reimburse the General Fund for repayment of a prior loan from Proposition 42 transit funds to the General Fund.

- Proposition 42 is fully funded at \$1.42 billion (\$568 million for STIP; \$284 million each for cities and counties; and \$284 million for the PTA).
- \$4.7 billion in Proposition 1B funds are appropriated, including \$350 million for transit capital (PTMISEA), \$101 million for transit security (TSSSDRA), and \$996 million for STIP.

Please see the attached documents to view the distribution of STA, PTMISEA and TSSSDRA as provided by the State Controller for the 2008-09 year.



JOHN CHIANG  
California State Controller  
Division of Accounting and Reporting

October 8, 2008

COUNTY AUDITORS RESPONSIBLE FOR STATE TRANSIT  
ASSISTANCE FUNDS  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES  
COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONS  
SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM

Re: 2008-2009 State Transit Assistance Allocation Revised Estimate

Pursuant to Section 99312.7 of the Public Utilities Code (PUC), the State Controller is required to provide a revised estimate of the amount of the State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to be allocated to each transportation planning entity for the purposes of Sections 99313 and 99314 of the PUC.

The amount of STA funds approved by the Governor in the State Budget for the 2008-09 fiscal year is \$306,285,734. We anticipate that the first quarter's allocation will be paid in October.

PUC section 99313 allocations are based on the latest available annual population estimates from the Department of Finance. PUC section 99314 allocations are based primarily on qualifying revenues from the Annual Report of Financial Transactions of Transit Operators and Non-Transit Claimants under the Transportation Development Act.

Enclosed are schedules indicating the estimated fund allocation for the fiscal year 2008-09 to each transportation planning entity. We are providing a detailed schedule of STA funds allocated under the PUC section 99314. Since the detail for the PUC section 99313 is not reported to the Controller's Office, we are not able to provide that information.

Any questions you have regarding the STA program should be directed to Mike Silvera of the Division of Accounting and Reporting at (916) 323-0704.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Kelly A. Martell in cursive script.

KELLY MARTELL, Section Supervisor  
County Cost Plans and Local Apportionments Section

Enclosure

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity</u>	<u>PUC 99313 Allocations</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Allocations</u>	<u>2008-2009 Allocations</u>
TRPA	\$ 371,742	\$ 15,788	\$ 387,530
MTC	29,385,654	81,276,765	110,662,419
SACOG	7,209,641	4,499,853	11,709,494
Alpine	4,918	0	4,918
Amador	152,714	13,579	166,293
Butte	887,102	43,385	930,487
Calaveras	185,654	0	185,654
Colusa	88,184	5,774	93,958
Del Norte	118,407	32,794	151,201
El Dorado	598,920	51,723	650,643
Fresno	3,747,517	585,840	4,333,357
Glenn	117,505	0	117,505
Humboldt	534,583	43,307	577,890
Imperial	709,007	0	709,007
Inyo	73,059	29,129	102,188
Kern	3,290,372	305,390	3,595,762
Kings	621,572	125,177	746,749
Lake	257,827	14,929	272,756
Lassen	143,916	9,576	153,492
Los Angeles	41,712,805	49,182,140	90,894,945
Madera	607,296	0	607,296
Mariposa	74,081	812	74,893
Mendocino	362,891	30,379	393,270
Merced	1,027,340	54,773	1,082,113
Modoc	39,049	0	39,049
Mono	55,378	0	55,378
Monterey	1,724,840	334,258	2,059,098
Nevada	399,207	22,982	422,189
Orange	12,562,525	4,247,812	16,810,337
Placer	1,094,574	99,024	1,193,598
Plumas	84,188	0	84,188
Riverside	8,405,155	1,378,809	9,783,964
San Benito	232,571	0	232,571
San Bernardino	8,274,122	1,768,979	10,043,101
SANDAG	3,148,082	1,333,723	4,481,805
San Diego MTS	9,515,156	4,564,032	14,079,188
San Joaquin	2,759,669	793,206	3,552,875
San Luis Obispo	1,084,037	62,720	1,146,757
Santa Barbara	1,725,266	510,479	2,235,745
Santa Cruz	1,072,695	1,042,637	2,115,332
Shasta	733,470	51,584	785,054
Sierra	13,604	0	13,604
Siskiyou	185,026	16,546	201,572
Stanislaus	2,116,674	162,895	2,279,569
Tehama	251,226	0	251,226
Trinity	56,211	1,362	57,573
Tulare	1,751,826	92,544	1,844,370
Tuolumne	228,607	0	228,607
Ventura	3,347,002	338,162	3,685,164
State Totals	<u>\$ 153,142,867</u>	<u>\$ 153,142,867</u>	<u>\$ 306,285,734</u>

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE**  
**PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	PUC 99314 Fund Allocation	<sup>1</sup> Adjustment To Apply To 2008-09 Allocation
<b>TRPA</b>			
County of El Dorado	\$ 50,917	\$ 2,566	\$ 1
City of South Lake Tahoe	262,222	13,216	5
Regional Entity Totals	313,139	15,782	6
<b>MTC</b>			
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District	*	**	***
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	NA	154,572	60
City of Benicia	306,160	15,431	6
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	9,659,404	486,846	190
City of Dixon	81,276	4,096	2
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority	4,273,737	215,401	84
City of Fairfield	1,619,957	81,648	32
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District	59,398,417	2,993,752	1,171
City of Healdsburg	19,060	961	0
Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority	3,434,187	173,087	68
Napa County Transportation Agency	720,245	36,301	14
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	74,363,265	3,747,998	1,467
City of San Francisco	*	**	***
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	*	**	***
San Mateo County Transit District	85,826,031	4,325,735	1,693
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	241,838,314	12,188,942	4,769
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	NA	216,401	85
City of Santa Rosa	2,347,898	118,337	46
County of Sonoma	2,638,360	132,977	52
City of Union City	744,778	37,538	15
City of Vallejo	11,022,207	555,533	217
Western Contra Costa Transit Authority	4,656,061	234,671	92
Regional Entity Totals	1,604,604,589	81,244,977	31,788
<b>SACOG</b>			
City of Davis	2,025,763	102,101	40
City of Elk Grove	2,301,914	116,019	45
City of Folsom	69,922	3,524	(3,481)
Sacramento Regional Transit System	81,956,954	4,130,729	1,617
Yolo County Transit Authority	2,055,523	103,601	41
Yuba Sutter Transit Authority	904,714	45,599	18
Regional Entity Totals	89,314,790	4,501,573	(1,720)

(Continued)

\* The combined revenue basis for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$1,101,655,232.

\*\* The combined allocation estimate for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$55,524,750.

\*\*\* The combined adjustment to apply to the 2008-09 fiscal year allocation for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$21,725.

<sup>1</sup> The first two quarterly payments made pursuant to PUC section 99314 are based on prior year revenue, and taken from the State Controller's Transit Operators and Non-Transit Claimants Annual Report. The revenue amounts used to calculate the third and fourth quarter payments use the newly published Transit Operator and Non-Transit Claimants Annual Report. During the third quarter payment of the 2007-08 Fiscal Year, the first and second quarter payments were recalculated using the new revenue amounts which caused adjustments (under/over) for the year. These adjustments will be applied to the 2008-09 fiscal year allocation.



**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE  
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE  
PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Fund Allocation</u>	<u><sup>1</sup> Adjustment To Apply To 2008-09 Allocation</u>
Alpine	None	None	None
Amador			
Amador Regional Transit System	269,313	13,574	5
Butte			
Butte County Association of Governments	860,455	43,368	17
Calaveras	None	None	None
Colusa			
County of Colusa	114,524	5,772	2
Del Norte			
Redwood Coast Transit Authority	650,403	32,781	13
El Dorado			
El Dorado County Transit Authority	1,025,823	51,703	20
Fresno			
City of Clovis	90,187	4,546	2
City of Fresno	11,005,339	554,682	217
Fresno County Rural Transit Agency	523,463	26,383	10
Regional Entity Totals	11,618,989	585,611	229
Glenn	None	None	None
Humboldt			
City of Arcata	234,520	11,820	5
City of Eureka	214,867	10,830	(4,871)
City of Fortuna	9,552	481	0
Humboldt Transit Authority	648,132	32,667	(7,625)
Regional Entity Totals	1,107,071	55,798	(12,491)
Imperial	None	None	None
Inyo			
Inyo Mono Transit	577,731	29,118	11

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE**  
**PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Fund Allocation</u>	<u><sup>1</sup> Adjustment To Apply To 2008-09 Allocation</u>
<b>Kern</b>			
City of Arvin	75,298	3,795	1
City of California City	16,505	832	0
City of Delano	46,996	2,369	1
Golden Empire Transit District	4,739,926	238,898	93
County of Kern	604,051	30,445	12
City of McFarland	7,585	382	(40)
City of Ridgecrest	164,220	8,277	3
City of Shafter	52,233	2,633	1
City of Taft	320,070	16,132	6
City of Tehachapi	4,070	205	0
City of Wasco	26,665	1,344	1
Regional Entity Totals	6,057,619	305,312	78
<b>Kings</b>			
City of Corcoran	67,729	3,414	1
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	2,414,899	121,714	48
Regional Entity Totals	2,482,628	125,128	49
<b>Lake</b>			
Lake Transit Authority	296,087	14,923	6
<b>Lassen</b>			
County of Lassen	189,912	9,572	4

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE**  
**PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Fund Allocation</u>	<u><sup>1</sup> Adjustment To Apply To 2008-09 Allocation</u>
<b>Los Angeles</b>			
Antelope Valley Transit Authority	10,600,399	534,273	209
City of Arcadia	1,050,976	52,970	21
City of Claremont	254,737	12,839	5
City of Commerce	1,985,845	100,089	39
City of Culver City	6,179,415	311,450	122
Foothill Transit Zone	38,370,660	1,933,927	757
City of Gardena	7,277,567	366,798	143
City of La Mirada	769,704	38,794	15
Long Beach Public Transportation Company	39,342,781	1,982,924	776
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	746,751,506	37,637,174	14,725
City of Montebello	16,222,280	817,622	320
City of Norwalk	5,708,414	287,711	113
City of Redondo Beach	1,361,732	68,633	27
City of Santa Monica	28,130,934	1,417,833	555
Southern California Regional Rail Authority	116,159,233		
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority		3,116,385	1,220
Orange County Transportation Authority		****	****
Riverside County Transportation Commission		****	****
San Bernardino Associated Governments		****	****
Ventura County Transportation Commission		****	****
City of Torrance	9,592,672	483,482	189
Regional Entity Totals	<u>1,029,758,855</u>	<u>49,162,904</u>	<u>19,236</u>
<b>Madera</b>	None	None	None
<b>Mariposa</b>			
County of Mariposa	16,105	812	0
<b>Mendocino</b>			
Mendocino Transit Authority	602,505	30,367	12
<b>Merced</b>			
County of Merced	1,086,320	54,752	21
<b>Modoc</b>	None	None	None
<b>Mono</b>	None	None	None
<b>Monterey</b>			
City of Greenfield	10,007	504	0
City of King City	8,096	408	0
Monterey-Salinas Transit	6,601,685	332,733	130
City of Soledad	9,589	483	0
Regional Entity Totals	<u>6,629,377</u>	<u>334,128</u>	<u>130</u>

(Continued)

\*\*\*\*\* The amounts allocated to the member agencies of Southern California Regional Rail Authority are paid by their corresponding regional transportation authority.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE**  
**PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Fund Allocation</u>	<u><sup>1</sup> Adjustment To Apply To 2008-09 Allocation</u>
<b>Nevada</b>			
County of Nevada	455,810	22,973	9
<b>Orange</b>			
City of Laguna Beach	625,097	31,506	12
Orange County Transportation Authority	58,194,674	2,933,082	1,147
Orange County Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	1,281,564	501
Regional Entity Totals	<u>58,819,771</u>	<u>4,246,152</u>	<u>1,660</u>
<b>Placer</b>			
City of Auburn	41,015	2,067	(815)
City of Lincoln	25,084	1,264	0
County of Placer	1,283,847	64,707	25
City of Roseville	630,218	31,764	12
Regional Entity Totals	<u>1,980,164</u>	<u>99,802</u>	<u>(778)</u>
<b>Plumas</b>			
	None	None	None
<b>Riverside</b>			
City of Banning	125,588	6,330	2
City of Beaumont	88,004	4,436	2
City of Corona	327,974	16,530	6
Palo Verde Valley Transit Agency	76,376	3,849	2
City of Riverside	301,922	15,217	6
Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	432,652	169
Riverside Transit Agency	9,551,432	481,404	188
Sunline Transit Agency	8,290,533	417,853	163
Regional Entity Totals	<u>18,761,829</u>	<u>1,378,271</u>	<u>538</u>
<b>San Benito</b>			
	None	None	None
<b>San Bernardino</b>			
Morongo Basin Transit Authority	545,293	27,483	11
Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority	277,731	13,998	5
Omnitrans	15,708,456	791,725	310
San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	831,934	325
Victor Valley Transit Service Authority	2,046,541	103,148	40
Regional Entity Totals	<u>18,578,021</u>	<u>1,768,288</u>	<u>691</u>
<b>SANDAG</b>			
North San Diego County Transit Development Board	26,451,772	1,333,201	522

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE**  
**PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Fund Allocation</u>	<u><sup>1</sup> Adjustment To Apply To 2008-09 Allocation</u>
San Diego MTS	90,518,629	4,562,248	1,784
San Joaquin			
Altamont Commuter Express Authority	11,273,262		
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency		*****	*****
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority		*****	*****
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission		197,213	77
City of Lodi	383,262	19,317	8
City of Ripon	896	45	0
San Joaquin Regional Transit District	11,434,664	576,321	225
Regional Entity Totals	<u>23,092,084</u>	<u>792,896</u>	<u>310</u>
San Luis Obispo			
City of Atascadero	109,364	5,512	2
City of Morro Bay	46,776	2,358	1
City of Paso Robles Transit	160,685	8,099	3
City of San Luis Obispo	611,900	30,840	12
County of San Luis Obispo	94,483	4,762	2
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority	970,438	48,911	(32,328)
South County Area Transit	104,310	5,257	(10,711)
Regional Entity Totals	<u>2,097,956</u>	<u>105,739</u>	<u>(43,019)</u>
Santa Barbara			
City of Guadalupe	63,233	3,187	1
City of Lompoc	142,793	7,197	3
County of Santa Barbara	62,335	3,142	1
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District	8,986,204	452,916	177
City of Santa Maria	810,096	40,830	16
City of Solvang	59,676	3,008	1
Regional Entity Totals	<u>10,124,337</u>	<u>510,280</u>	<u>199</u>
Santa Cruz			
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	20,678,653	1,042,229	408
Shasta			
Redding Area Bus Authority	1,023,077	51,564	20
Sierra	None	None	None
Siskiyou			
County of Siskiyou	328,162	16,540	6

(Continued)

\*\*\*\*\* The amounts allocated to the member agencies of Altamont Commuter Express Authority are paid by their corresponding regional transportation authority.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE  
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE  
PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Fund Allocation</u>	<u><sup>1</sup> Adjustment To Apply To 2008-09 Allocation</u>
<b>Stanislaus</b>			
City of Modesto	2,759,807	139,098	54
County of Stanislaus	271,523	13,685	5
City of Turlock	199,378	10,049	4
Regional Entity Totals	<u>3,230,708</u>	<u>162,832</u>	<u>63</u>
<b>Tehama</b>			
	None	None	None
<b>Trinity</b>			
County of Trinity	26,999	1,361	1
<b>Tulare</b>			
City of Exeter	16,467	830	0
City of Porterville	357,585	18,023	7
City of Tulare	255,207	12,863	5
County of Tulare	132,245	6,665	3
City of Visalia	1,073,913	54,127	21
Regional Entity Totals	<u>1,835,417</u>	<u>92,508</u>	<u>36</u>
<b>Tuolumne</b>			
	None	None	None
<b>Ventura</b>			
Gold Coast Transit	2,896,723	145,998	57
Ventura County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	192,030	77
Regional Entity Totals	<u>2,896,723</u>	<u>338,028</u>	<u>134</u>
<b>STATE TOTALS</b>	<u>\$ 3,038,476,347</u>	<u>\$ 153,142,867</u>	<u>0</u>



**JOHN CHIANG**  
**California State Controller**  
Division of Accounting and Reporting

October 10, 2008

COUNTY AUDITORS  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES  
COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONS  
SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM

Re: Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account

Pursuant to Section 8879.55 of the Government Code (GC), the State Controller's Office (SCO) is required to provide a schedule of eligible entities and to calculate the amount of funds each is available to receive from the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) upon appropriation of the Legislature. Attached is a schedule that provides the amounts available from the 2008-09 fiscal year appropriation in the Budget Act of 2008.

GC Section 8879.55 requires that funds made available, upon appropriation of the Legislature, from the PTMISEA be allocated to agencies and transit operators eligible to receive State Transit Assistance funds pursuant to Sections 99313 and 99314 of the Public Utility Code (PUC). The SCO is providing a detailed schedule of the GC Section 8879.55(a)(3) eligible amounts for the entities eligible pursuant to PUC Section 99314. Since the detail for PUC Section 99313 allocations is not reported to the Controller's Office, the SCO is only able to provide eligible amounts for each county for GC Section 8879.55(a)(2). From the GC Section 8879.55(a)(2) eligible amount listed, the county transportation commissions will be responsible for calculating eligible amounts for each project sponsor under their authority.

The amount of funds for GC Section 8879.55 approved by the Governor in the State Budget for the 2008-09 fiscal year after a reduction due to interest on a Pooled Money Investment Account Loan and State administrative charges is \$337,918,068. The SCO will make allocations after receiving, on a biannual basis, a list of approved project sponsors eligible to receive an allocation from the account determined by the Department of Transportation pursuant to GC Section 8879.55(d).

Any questions you have regarding the program stated in this letter should be directed to Mike Silvera of the Division of Accounting and Reporting at (916) 323-0704.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Kelly J. Martell in cursive.

KELLY MARTELL, Section Supervisor  
County Cost Plans and Local Apportionments Section

Enclosure

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**

**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT**

**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.55 ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity</u>	<u>GC 8879.55(a)(2) Eligible Allocation</u>	<u>GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation</u>	<u>2008-2009 Eligible Allocations</u>
TRPA	\$ 399,585	\$ 25,245	\$ 424,830
MTC	32,476,760	87,568,598	120,045,358
SACOG	7,878,327	4,279,753	12,158,080
Alpine	5,716	0	5,716
Amador	173,011	13,613	186,624
Butte	987,204	37,691	1,024,895
Calaveras	206,674	0	206,674
Colusa	96,890	8,004	104,894
Del Norte	132,607	0	132,607
El Dorado	643,769	59,404	703,173
Fresno	4,074,511	554,626	4,629,137
Glenn	129,994	0	129,994
Humboldt	603,133	96,888	700,021
Imperial	750,957	0	750,957
Inyo	84,697	17,842	102,539
Kern	3,506,525	301,769	3,808,294
Kings	668,645	134,888	803,533
Lake	291,657	16,264	307,921
Lassen	161,702	8,134	169,836
Los Angeles	46,730,314	56,400,629	103,130,943
Madera	651,416	0	651,416
Mariposa	82,714	934	83,648
Mendocino	412,233	41,067	453,300
Merced	1,112,911	48,904	1,161,815
Modoc	44,718	0	44,718
Mono	62,062	0	62,062
Monterey	1,940,180	327,330	2,267,510
Nevada	454,001	25,339	479,340
Orange	13,996,311	5,831,445	19,827,756
Placer	1,176,546	117,353	1,293,899
Plumas	97,611	0	97,611
Riverside	8,751,074	1,302,234	10,053,308
San Benito	263,079	0	263,079
San Bernardino	8,998,594	1,745,874	10,744,468
SANDAG	3,473,980	1,372,294	4,846,274
San Diego MTS	10,500,204	5,153,530	15,653,734
San Joaquin	3,018,070	738,266	3,756,336
San Luis Obispo	1,197,871	195,995	1,393,866
Santa Barbara	1,920,939	518,483	2,439,422
Santa Cruz	1,195,875	1,285,035	2,480,910
Shasta	822,969	41,880	864,849
Sierra	16,051	0	16,051
Siskiyou	209,856	9,416	219,272
Stanislaus	2,328,404	165,662	2,494,066
Tehama	278,134	0	278,134
Trinity	63,500	1,304	64,804
Tulare	1,898,246	86,483	1,984,729
Tuolumne	265,663	0	265,663
Ventura	3,723,144	426,858	4,150,002
State Totals	<u>\$ 168,959,034</u>	<u>\$ 168,959,034</u>	<u>\$ 337,918,068</u>



**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**

**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT  
GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.55(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
<b>TRPA</b>	
County of El Dorado	3,611
City of South Lake Tahoe	21,634
Regional Entity Totals	25,245
<b>MTC</b>	
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District	*
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	159,509
City of Benicia	12,158
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	480,337
City of Dixon	3,900
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority	194,901
City of Fairfield	68,021
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District	3,296,871
City of Healdsburg	1,053
Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority	150,759
Napa County Transportation Agency	40,276
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	3,858,715
City of San Francisco	*
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	*
San Mateo County Transit District	4,545,458
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	13,516,126
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	222,592
City of Santa Rosa	103,173
County of Sonoma	130,708
City of Union City	38,599
City of Vallejo	556,930
Western Contra Costa Transit Authority	233,239
Regional Entity Totals	87,568,598
	(Continued)

\* The combined allocation for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$59,955,273.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**

**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT  
GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.55(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
SACOG	
City of Davis	114,282
City of Elk Grove	36,732
City of Folsom	12,324
Sacramento Regional Transit System	3,979,024
Yolo County Transportation District	92,512
Yuba Sutter Transit Authority	44,879
Regional Entity Totals	4,279,753
Alpine	None
Amador	
Amador Rapid Transit System	13,613
Butte	
Butte County Association of Governments	37,691
Calaveras	None
Colusa	
County of Colusa	8,004
Del Norte	None
El Dorado	
El Dorado County Transit Authority	59,404
Fresno	
City of Clovis	5,150
City of Fresno	525,170
Fresno County Rural Transit Agency	24,306
Regional Entity Totals	554,626

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**

**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT  
GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.55(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Glenn	None
Humboldt	
City of Arcata	9,482
City of Eureka	22,880
City of Fortuna	546
Humboldt Transit Authority	63,980
Regional Entity Totals	96,888
Imperial	None
Inyo	
County of Inyo	17,842
Kern	
City of Arvin	3,420
City of California City	1,142
City of Delano	2,915
Golden Empire Transit District	233,760
County of Kern	34,425
City of McFarland	644
City of Ridgecrest	5,740
City of Shafter	3,035
City of Taft	14,808
City of Tehachapi	341
City of Wasco	1,539
Regional Entity Totals	301,769
Kings	
City of Corcoran	3,303
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	131,585
Regional Entity Totals	134,888
Lake	
Lake Transit Authority	16,264

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.55(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Lassen	
County of Lassen	8,134
Los Angeles	
Antelope Valley Transit Authority	539,466
City of Arcadia	56,649
City of Claremont	17,306
City of Commerce	120,201
City of Culver City	372,215
Foothill Transit Zone	1,842,742
City of Gardena	432,153
City of La Mirada	45,629
Long Beach Public Transportation Company	2,090,089
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	43,961,559
City of Montebello	854,358
City of Norwalk	403,395
City of Redondo Beach	51,438
City of Santa Monica	1,504,249
Southern California Regional Rail Authority	
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	3,458,858
Orange County Transportation Authority	**
Riverside County Transportation Commission	**
San Bernardino Associated Governments	**
Ventura County Transportation Commission	**
City of Torrance	650,322
Regional Entity Totals	56,400,629
Madera	None
Mariposa	
County of Mariposa	934
Mendocino	
Mendocino Transit Authority	41,067
Merced	
County of Merced	48,904
Modoc	None
	(Continued)

\*\* The amounts allocated to the member agencies of Southern California Regional Rail Authority are paid by their corresponding regional transportation authority.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**

**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT  
GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.55(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Mono	None
Monterey	
City of Greenfield	529
City of King City	460
Monterey-Salinas Transit	325,908
City of Soledad	433
Regional Entity Totals	327,330
Nevada	
County of Nevada	25,339
Orange	
City of Laguna Beach	29,733
Orange County Transportation Authority	4,545,633
Orange County Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	1,256,079
Regional Entity Totals	5,831,445
Placer	
City of Auburn	3,906
City of Lincoln	1,311
County of Placer	80,198
City of Roseville	31,938
Regional Entity Totals	117,353
Plumas	None
Riverside	
City of Banning	6,659
City of Beaumont	4,040
City of Corona	14,512
Palo Verde Valley Transit Agency	5,283
City of Riverside	13,108
Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	473,198
Riverside Transit Agency	381,014
Sunline Transit Agency	404,420
Regional Entity Totals	1,302,234
San Benito	None

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**

**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT  
GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.55(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
<b>San Bernardino</b>	
Morongo Basin Transit Authority	27,530
Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority	18,515
Omnitrans	724,081
San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	870,475
Victor Valley Transit Service Authority	105,273
Regional Entity Totals	1,745,874
 <b>SANDAG</b>	
North San Diego County Transit Development Board	1,372,294
 <b>San Diego MTS</b>	
	5,153,530
 <b>San Joaquin</b>	
Altamont Commuter Express Authority	
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	***
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	***
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission	103,982
City of Lodi	21,015
City of Ripon	49
San Joaquin Regional Transit District	613,220
Regional Entity Totals	738,266
 <b>San Luis Obispo</b>	
City of Atascadero	3,156
City of Morro Bay	2,392
City of Paso Robles Transit	7,191
City of San Luis Obispo	25,689
County of San Luis Obispo	3,622
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority	134,297
South County Area Transit	19,648
Regional Entity Totals	195,995

(Continued)

-----  
\*\*\* The amounts allocated to the member agencies of Altamont Commuter Express Authority are paid by their corresponding regional transportation authority.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.55(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Santa Barbara	
City of Lompoc	7,965
County of Santa Barbara	2,979
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District	466,547
City of Santa Maria	38,496
City of Solvang	2,496
Regional Entity Totals	518,483
Santa Cruz	
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	1,285,035
Shasta	
Redding Area Bus Authority	41,880
Sierra	
	None
Siskiyou	
County of Siskiyou	9,416
Stanislaus	
City of Modesto	144,213
County of Stanislaus	14,140
City of Turlock	7,309
Regional Entity Totals	165,662
Tehama	
	None
Trinity	
County of Trinity	1,304
Tulare	
City of Exeter	598
City of Porterville	16,811
City of Tulare	11,398
County of Tulare	6,747
City of Visalia	50,929
Regional Entity Totals	86,483

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.55(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Tuolumne	None
Ventura	
South Coast Area Transit	151,458
Ventura County Transportation Commission - Corresponding	
to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	275,400
Regional Entity Totals	426,858
STATE TOTALS	\$ 168,959,034





**JOHN CHIANG**  
**California State Controller**  
Division of Accounting and Reporting

October 1, 2008

COUNTY AUDITORS  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES  
COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONS  
SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM

Re: Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account

Pursuant to Section 8879.58 of the Government Code (GC), the State Controller's Office (SCO) is required to provide a schedule of eligible entities and to calculate the amount of funds each is available to receive from the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account (TSSSDRA) upon appropriation of the Legislature for the purposes of GC Section 8879.57(a)(1). Attached is a schedule that provides estimated amounts available from the 2008-09 fiscal year appropriation in the Budget Act of 2008.

GC Section 8879.57(a)(1) requires that sixty percent of the funds made available, upon appropriation of the Legislature, from the TSSSDRA be allocated to agencies and transit operators eligible to receive State Transit Assistance funds pursuant to Sections 99313 and 99314 of the Public Utility Code (PUC). The SCO is providing a detailed schedule of the GC Section 8879.58(a)(3) eligible amounts for the entities eligible pursuant to PUC Section 99314. Since the detail for PUC Section 99313 allocations is not reported to the Controller's Office, the SCO is only able to provide eligible amounts for each county for GC Section 8879.58(a)(2). From the GC Section 8879.58(a)(2) eligible amount listed, the county transportation commissions will be responsible for calculating eligible amounts for each project sponsor under their authority.

The amount of funds for GC 8879.57(a)(1) approved by the Governor in the State Budget for the 2008-09 fiscal year is \$60,000,000. All estimated amounts will be reduced due to interest on a Pooled Money Investment Account Loan and State administrative charges. These amounts are unknown at this time.

Any questions you have regarding the program stated in this letter should be directed to Mike Silvera of the Division of Accounting and Reporting at (916) 323-0704.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Kelly A. Martell in cursive.

KELLY MARTELL, Section Supervisor  
County Cost Plans and Local Apportionments Section

Enclosure

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58 ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity</u>	<u>GC 8879.58(a)(2) Eligible Allocation</u>	<u>GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation</u>	<u>2008-2009 Eligible Allocations</u>
TRPA	\$ 70,949	\$ 4,482	\$ 75,431
MTC	5,766,503	15,548,491	21,314,994
SACOG	1,398,859	759,904	2,158,763
Alpine	1,015	0	1,015
Amador	30,719	2,417	33,136
Butte	175,286	6,692	181,978
Calaveras	36,697	0	36,697
Colusa	17,204	1,421	18,625
Del Norte	23,546	0	23,546
El Dorado	114,306	10,548	124,854
Fresno	723,461	98,478	821,939
Glenn	23,081	0	23,081
Humboldt	107,091	17,204	124,295
Imperial	133,338	0	133,338
Inyo	15,039	3,168	18,207
Kern	622,611	53,582	676,193
Kings	118,723	23,951	142,674
Lake	51,786	2,888	54,674
Lassen	28,712	1,444	30,156
Los Angeles	8,297,329	10,014,368	18,311,697
Madera	115,664	0	115,664
Mariposa	14,687	166	14,853
Mendocino	73,195	7,292	80,487
Merced	197,606	8,683	206,289
Modoc	7,940	0	7,940
Mono	11,020	0	11,020
Monterey	344,494	58,121	402,615
Nevada	80,612	4,499	85,111
Orange	2,485,155	1,035,419	3,520,574
Placer	208,905	20,838	229,743
Plumas	17,332	0	17,332
Riverside	1,553,822	231,221	1,785,043
San Benito	46,712	0	46,712
San Bernardino	1,597,771	309,993	1,907,764
SANDAG	616,832	243,662	860,494
San Diego MTS	1,864,394	915,051	2,779,445
San Joaquin	535,882	131,085	666,967
San Luis Obispo	212,691	34,801	247,492
Santa Barbara	341,078	92,060	433,138
Santa Cruz	212,337	228,168	440,505
Shasta	146,125	7,436	153,561
Sierra	2,850	0	2,850
Siskiyou	37,262	1,672	38,934
Stanislaus	413,426	29,415	442,841
Tehama	49,385	0	49,385
Trinity	11,275	232	11,507
Tulare	337,049	15,356	352,405
Tuolumne	47,171	0	47,171
Ventura	661,073	75,792	736,865
State Totals	<u>\$ 30,000,000</u>	<u>\$ 30,000,000</u>	<u>\$ 60,000,000</u>

\*\* All amounts will be reduced for administrative costs and loan interest until the loan is repaid.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
<b>TRPA</b>	
County of El Dorado	641
City of South Lake Tahoe	3,841
Regional Entity Totals	4,482
<b>MTC</b>	
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District	*
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	28,322
City of Benicia	2,159
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	85,288
City of Dixon	692
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority	34,606
City of Fairfield	12,078
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District	585,385
City of Healdsburg	187
Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority	26,768
Napa County Transportation Agency	7,151
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	685,145
City of San Francisco	*
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	*
San Mateo County Transit District	807,082
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	2,399,894
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	39,523
City of Santa Rosa	18,319
County of Sonoma	23,208
City of Union City	6,854
City of Vallejo	98,887
Western Contra Costa Transit Authority	41,414
Regional Entity Totals	15,548,491
	(Continued)

\* The combined allocation for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$10,645,529.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation</u>
SACOG	
City of Davis	20,292
City of Elk Grove	6,522
City of Folsom	2,188
Sacramento Regional Transit System	706,507
Yolo County Transportation District	16,426
Yuba Sutter Transit Authority	7,969
Regional Entity Totals	<u>759,904</u>
Alpine	None
Amador	
Amador Rapid Transit System	2,417
Butte	
Butte County Association of Governments	6,692
Calaveras	None
Colusa	
County of Colusa	1,421
Del Norte	None
El Dorado	
El Dorado County Transit Authority	10,548
Fresno	
City of Clovis	914
City of Fresno	93,248
Fresno County Rural Transit Agency	4,316
Regional Entity Totals	<u>98,478</u>

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Glenn	None
Humboldt	
City of Arcata	1,684
City of Eureka	4,063
City of Fortuna	97
Humboldt Transit Authority	11,360
Regional Entity Totals	17,204
Imperial	None
Inyo	
County of Inyo	3,168
Kern	
City of Arvin	607
City of California City	203
City of Delano	518
Golden Empire Transit District	41,506
County of Kern	6,113
City of McFarland	114
City of Ridgecrest	1,019
City of Shafter	539
City of Taft	2,629
City of Tehachapi	61
City of Wasco	273
Regional Entity Totals	53,582
Kings	
City of Corcoran	587
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	23,364
Regional Entity Totals	23,951
Lake	
Lake Transit Authority	2,888

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Lassen	
County of Lassen	1,444
Los Angeles	
Antelope Valley Transit Authority	95,786
City of Arcadia	10,058
City of Claremont	3,073
City of Commerce	21,343
City of Culver City	66,090
Foothill Transit Zone	327,193
City of Gardena	76,732
City of La Mirada	8,102
Long Beach Public Transportation Company	371,112
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	7,805,714
City of Montebello	151,698
City of Norwalk	71,626
City of Redondo Beach	9,133
City of Santa Monica	267,091
Southern California Regional Rail Authority	
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	614,147
Orange County Transportation Authority	**
Riverside County Transportation Commission	**
San Bernardino Associated Governments	**
Ventura County Transportation Commission	**
City of Torrance	115,470
Regional Entity Totals	10,014,368
Madera	None
Mariposa	
County of Mariposa	166
Mendocino	
Mendocino Transit Authority	7,292
Merced	
County of Merced	8,683
Modoc	None

(Continued)

-----  
 \*\* The amounts allocated to the member agencies of Southern California Regional Rail Authority are paid by their corresponding regional transportation authority.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Mono	None
Monterey	
City of Greenfield	94
City of King City	82
Monterey-Salinas Transit	57,868
City of Soledad	77
Regional Entity Totals	58,121
Nevada	
County of Nevada	4,499
Orange	
City of Laguna Beach	5,279
Orange County Transportation Authority	807,113
Orange County Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	223,027
Regional Entity Totals	1,035,419
Placer	
City of Auburn	694
City of Lincoln	233
County of Placer	14,240
City of Roseville	5,671
Regional Entity Totals	20,838
Plumas	None
Riverside	
City of Banning	1,182
City of Beaumont	717
City of Corona	2,577
Palo Verde Valley Transit Agency	938
City of Riverside	2,327
Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	84,020
Riverside Transit Agency	67,652
Sunline Transit Agency	71,808
Regional Entity Totals	231,221
San Benito	None

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
<b>San Bernardino</b>	
Morongo Basin Transit Authority	4,888
Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority	3,287
Omnitrans	128,566
San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	154,560
Victor Valley Transit Service Authority	18,692
Regional Entity Totals	309,993
<b>SANDAG</b>	
North San Diego County Transit Development Board	243,662
<b>San Diego MTS</b>	
	915,051
<b>San Joaquin</b>	
Altamont Commuter Express Authority	
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	***
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	***
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission	18,463
City of Lodi	3,731
City of Ripon	9
San Joaquin Regional Transit District	108,882
Regional Entity Totals	131,085
<b>San Luis Obispo</b>	
City of Atascadero	560
City of Morro Bay	425
City of Paso Robles Transit	1,277
City of San Luis Obispo	4,561
County of San Luis Obispo	643
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority	23,846
South County Area Transit	3,489
Regional Entity Totals	34,801

(Continued)

-----  
 \*\*\* The amounts allocated to the member agencies of Altamont Commuter Express Authority are paid by their corresponding regional transportation authority.



**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Santa Barbara	
City of Lompoc	1,414
County of Santa Barbara	529
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District	82,839
City of Santa Maria	6,835
City of Solvang	443
Regional Entity Totals	92,060
Santa Cruz	
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	228,168
Shasta	
Redding Area Bus Authority	7,436
Sierra	
	None
Siskiyou	
County of Siskiyou	1,672
Stanislaus	
City of Modesto	25,606
County of Stanislaus	2,511
City of Turlock	1,298
Regional Entity Totals	29,415
Tehama	
	None
Trinity	
County of Trinity	232
Tulare	
City of Exeter	106
City of Porterville	2,985
City of Tulare	2,024
County of Tulare	1,198
City of Visalia	9,043
Regional Entity Totals	15,356

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Tuolumne	None
Ventura	
South Coast Area Transit	26,893
Ventura County Transportation Commission - Corresponding	
to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	48,899
Regional Entity Totals	75,792
STATE TOTALS	\$ 30,000,000

## California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2008

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<p><a href="#">AB 109 Nunez (D)</a></p> <p>Air pollution: alternative fuels and vehicle technologies.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 09/26/2008-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 313, Statutes of 2008</p>	<p>Requires the Energy Commission to implement the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program by regulation pursuant to the rulemaking requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. The bill would require both this program provide a public competitive process for the allocation of funds. The bill also authorizes the Energy Commission to make a single source or sole source award for applied research meeting specified requirements, including the applied research to be conducted by the Quiet Motorized Road Vehicle and Safe Mobility Committee that would be created by Senate Bill 1174 of the 2007-08 Regular Session, if that bill is enacted. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 08/19/2008</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#">AB 268</a></p> <p>Committee on Budget Transportation.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 09/30/2008-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 756, Statutes of 2008.</p>	<p>This is the transportation budget omnibus bill. It provides statutory changes for transportation to implement the Budget Act of 2008. It contains language to allocate gasoline sales tax "spillover" revenue for 2008-09. Of the estimated revenue of \$1.4 billion, \$939 million is allocated to the Mass Transportation Fund to provide General Fund relief by reimbursing past-year and budget-year general obligation bond debt for transportation-related bonds (\$857 million), and by reimbursing the General Fund for the 2008-09 Proposition 42 loan repayment (\$83 million). The spillover revenue in excess of \$939 million, which is estimated at \$488 million, is transferred to the Public Transportation Account (PTA). The revenues in the PTA are appropriated in the budget bill and support traditional transit operations and capital, as well as additional General Fund relief. Implements the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) for 2008-09 by using the same allocation formula that was used with the funding provided in the 2007 Budget Act. Implements the State-Local Partnership Program by establishing criteria for eligibility and allocation - generally, bond funds will be allocated to local or regional transportation agencies in proportion to transportation revenue raised at the local level through voter-approved fees and taxes. The bill makes several other non-transit related changes as well. <b>Last Amended on 09/15/2008</b></p>	<p>None</p>
<p><a href="#">AB 387 Duvall (R)</a></p> <p>Design-build: transit contracts.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 07/22/2008-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 185, Statutes of 2008</p>	<p>Provides that there would be no cost threshold for the acquisition and installation of technology applications or surveillance equipment designed to enhance safety, disaster preparedness, and homeland security efforts, and would allow those projects to be awarded based on either the lowest responsible bidder or best value. <b>Last Amended on 01/07/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#">AB 444 Hancock (D)</a></p> <p>Congestion management: motor vehicle registration fees.</p>	<p>SENATE DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was REV. &amp; TAX SUSPENSE FILE on 07/11/2007)</p>	<p>Would have authorized the county congestion management agency in the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Santa Clara, and Solano, by a majority vote of the agency's board, to impose an annual fee of up to \$10 on motor vehicles registered within the county for programs and projects for certain purposes. The bill would have required voter approval of the measure. This bill would require the department, if requested, to collect the additional fee and distribute the net revenues to the agency, after deduction of specified costs, and would limit the agency's administrative costs to not more than 5% of the distributed fees. The bill would require that the fees collected may only be used to pay for programs and projects bearing a relationship or benefit to the owners of motor vehicles paying the fee, and would require the agency's board to make a specified finding of fact in that regard. The bill would require the governing board of the congestion management agency to adopt a specified expenditure plan. <b>Last Amended on 06/28/2007</b></p>	<p>Support</p>

### California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2008

<p><a href="#"><u>AB 842</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Jones</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Regional plans: traffic reduction.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY VETOED 09/27/2008-Vetoed by Governor</p>	<p>Would have required the Department of Housing and Community Development to rank applicants for the award of capital improvement project grants based upon a reduction of vehicle miles traveled as a result of the project, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions. <b>Last Amended on 08/18/2008</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 981</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Leno</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Treasure Island Transportation Management Act.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 09/26/2008-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 317, Statutes of 2008</p>	<p>Enacts the Treasure Island Transportation Management Act and authorizes the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco to designate a board or agency to act as the transportation management agency for Treasure Island, defined to also include Yerba Buena Island. The bill also authorizes the transportation management agency, pursuant to the terms of a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors, to recommend an initial fee structure for congestion pricing fees to be adopted by the board of supervisors and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, and to adopt on-street and off-street parking fees, fines, and penalties, and other parking-related revenues and a transit pass fee structure for Treasure Island. Furthermore, the bill specifies the powers and duties of the agency on these and other related matters, including adoption and administration of a transportation program, collection and use of revenues generated from those fees, and coordination with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 08/06/2008</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 1221</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Ma</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Transit village developments: infrastructure financing.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY VETOED 09/28/2008-Vetoed by Governor</p>	<p>Would have redefined the area included in a transit village plan to include all land within not more than 1/2 mile of the main entrance of a transit station. This bill would have also required a transit village plan financed by bonds issued through an infrastructure financing district to include specified demonstrable public benefits regarding housing, provide replacement dwelling units at an affordable housing cost when specified dwelling units are destroyed or removed, and provide that at least 20% of all revenues derived from the property tax increment be dedicated to increase, improve, and preserve the transit village district's supply of affordable housing, as defined. This bill would also make technical, non-substantive changes. <b>Last Amended on 08/14/2008</b></p>	<p>Co-Sponsor</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 1358</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Leno</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Planning: circulation element: transportation.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 09/30/2008-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 657, Statutes of 2008.</p>	<p>Requires, commencing January 1, 2011, that the legislative body of a city or county, upon any substantive revision of the circulation element of the general plan, modify the circulation element to plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways, defined to include motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, seniors, movers of commercial goods, and users of public transportation, in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan. By requiring new duties of local officials, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 08/20/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 1781</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Laird</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Budget Act of 2008.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 09/23/2008-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 268, Statutes of 2008.</p>	<p>This is the main vehicle to implement the 2008-09 State Budget Act (the Budget Conference Committee report). It makes appropriations for support of state government for the 2008-09 fiscal year. This bill contains other related provisions. <b>Last Amended on 07/17/2008</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>

### California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2008

<p><a href="#"><u>AB 1836</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Feuer</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Infrastructure Financing Districts.</p>	<p>SENATE DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was CONSENT CALENDAR on 06/25/2008)</p>	<p>Would have required that the date in the infrastructure financing plan on which the district will cease to exist be no more than 40 years from the date on which the ordinance forming the district is adopted. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 06/23/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2009</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Hernandez</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Utility user taxes: exemption.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 08/01/2008-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 221, Statutes of 2008</p>	<p>Provides that no utility user tax shall be imposed upon compressed natural gas dispensed by a gas compressor within a local jurisdiction, as defined, if that natural gas is dispensed by a gas compressor that is separately metered and dedicated to serve the local agency or public transit operator. <b>Last Amended on 06/18/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2195</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Brownley</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Rail transit.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 06/02/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(11). Last location was INACTIVE FILE</p>	<p>Would have authorized the California Public Utilities Commission to approve a public transit guideway, or to otherwise carry out its regulatory and oversight duties over public transit guideways, without a hearing . <b>Last Amended on 04/02/2008</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2295</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Arambula</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Transportation capital improvement projects.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY VETOED 09/28/2008-Vetoed by Governor</p>	<p>Existing law generally provides for allocation of transportation capital improvement funds pursuant to the State Transportation Improvement Program process. Existing law provides for 75% of funds available for transportation capital improvement projects to be made available for regional projects, and 25% for interregional projects. Existing law describes the types of projects that may be funded with the regional share of funds, and includes local road projects as a category of eligible projects. This bill would have stated that local road rehabilitation projects are eligible for these funds. <b>Last Amended on 07/14/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2321</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Feuer</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Transportation funding: County of Los Angeles.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 09/25/2008-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 302, Statutes of 2008</p>	<p>Amends current law, pursuant to a vote by the people of the County of Los Angeles on the November 2008 ballot, to require the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) tax ordinance to specify that a voter-approved sales tax is to be imposed for a period not to exceed 30 years, and to include specified projects and programs in the MTA's Long Range Transportation Plan. Upon voter-approval, this bill would require the MTA to notify Members of the Legislature representing the County of Los Angeles of proposed amendments to the expenditure plan, as specified. This bill would also authorize the MTA to incur bonded indebtedness, as specified, and would make other related changes. <b>Last Amended on 08/22/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2388</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Feuer</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Vehicles: registration fees.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 06/02/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(11). Last location was TRANS.</p>	<p>Would have imposed additional fees for the registration of a passenger vehicle (1) a weight fee for a vehicle operated with an unladen vehicle weight of 10,000 pounds or less according to a specified schedule and (2) a carbon dioxide (CO2) fee based on the pounds of CO2 emitted by the vehicle. The bill would have applied these provisions to all original registrations on or after July 1, 2010, and to renewal of registrations to vehicles with expiration dates on or after October 1, 2010. The bill would have exempted specified persons who are eligible for public assistance from its provisions. <b>Last Amended on 04/03/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>

### California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2008

<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2466</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Laird</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Local government renewable energy self-generation program.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 09/28/2008-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 540, Statutes of 2008</p>	<p>Allows a local government entity that produces surplus renewable energy at one of its facilities to receive a credit for the excess electricity supplied to the grid on its bill for another one of its facilities. <b>Last Amended on 08/12/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2546</u></a> <a href="#"><u>De La Torre</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Air Toxics</p>	<p>SENATE DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 08/05/2008)</p>	<p>Would have revised the definition of "air release" or "release" to include mobile source emissions at a railyard. The bill would make other conforming and clarifying changes to the act. <b>Last Amended on 05/23/2008</b></p>	<p>Oppose</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2558</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Feuer</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Regional transportation agencies: climate protection and system preservation fee.</p>	<p>SENATE DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 08/25/2008)</p>	<p>Would have authorized a regional transportation agency, subject to voter approval, to impose a climate protection and system preservation fee in its jurisdiction . The bill would specify two alternative options for imposing the fee , which would either be a motor vehicle fuel fee or a vehicle fee, subject to certain maximum amounts, to be collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles or the State Board of Equalization, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 08/19/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2600</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Niello</u></a> (R)</p> <p>State government: infrastructure.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 06/02/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(11). Last location was B. &amp; P.</p>	<p>Would have authorized a state agency or department to enter into a performance-based infrastructure partnership with a private partner for eligible facilities. <b>Last Amended on 04/21/2008</b></p>	<p>No Position</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2705</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Jones</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Local government: Mello-Roos Community Facilities districts: public transit.</p>	<p>SENATE DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was L. GOV. on 06/18/2008)</p>	<p>Would have added public transit services to the types of services that may be financed under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 2971</u></a> <a href="#"><u>DeSaulnier</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Department of Transportation: safety programs: bicyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY VETOED 09/30/2008-Vetoed by the Governor</p>	<p>Would have required the Department of Transportation on or before January 1, 2010, to establish guidance and criteria to ensure that the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians are addressed in the development of its safety programs, and to consider specified factors in that regard. <b>Last Amended on 08/19/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>

## California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2008

<p><a href="#"><u>AB 3005</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Jones</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Community development: mitigation fees.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 09/30/2008-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 692, Statutes of 2008.</p>	<p>Requires a local agency, when imposing as a condition of approval of a development project an impact fee for mitigating vehicular traffic impacts of a housing development that satisfies certain characteristics, to set the fee, or the portion thereof relating to vehicular traffic impacts, at a rate that reflects a lower rate of automobile trip generation. The bill provides an exemption from this requirement until January 1, 2011, for a housing development in an area having a capital improvement plan for which traffic mitigation fees are collected. The bill authorizes a local agency to charge an impact fee in proportion to the estimated rate of automobile trip generation associated with a housing development if the housing development does not satisfy the specified characteristics. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 08/27/2008</b></p>	<p>Concerns</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 3021</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Nava</u></a> (D)</p> <p>California Transportation Financing Authority: toll facilities.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY VETOED 09/30/2008-Vetoed by the Governor</p>	<p>Would have created the California Transportation Financing Authority with specified powers and duties relative to issuance of bonds to fund transportation projects to be backed, in whole or in part, by various revenue streams of transportation funds, and toll revenues under certain conditions, in order to increase the construction of new capacity or improvements for the state transportation system consistent with specified goals. The bill would have set forth the requirements for a project sponsor to obtain bond funding from the authority, would allow the authority to approve the imposition and collection of tolls on a proposed project under certain conditions, and would require the authority to report to the California Transportation Commission annually beginning June 30, 2010. In addition, the bill would have created the California Transportation Financing Authority Fund, which would be continuously appropriated for these purposes. The bill would enact other related provisions. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 08/20/2008</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 3034</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Galgiani</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 08/26/2008-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter No. 267, Statutes of 2008</p>	<p>Rewrites provision of the \$9.95 billion general obligation High-Speed Rail Bond Act which is subject to voter approval on the November 2008 ballot. The bill refers to construction of a high-speed train system consistent with the High Speed Rail Authority's (authority)certified environmental impact reports of November 2005 and July 9, 2008, rather than with the final business plan of June 2000. The bill revises the descriptions of route corridors of the proposed high-speed train system. It also requires excess revenues from operation of the high-speed train system beyond the amount needed for operating and maintenance costs and financing obligations, as determined by the authority, to be used for construction, expansion, improvement, replacement, and rehabilitation of the high-speed train system. Furthermore, the bill requires that not more than 10% of high-speed rail bond proceeds be used for environmental studies, planning, and preliminary engineering activities and that not more than 2.5% of high-speed rail bond proceeds be used for administrative expenses, except as specified. The bill generally requires the authority to complete various funding plans and financial analyses, as specified, prior to submitting a request for appropriation of bond funds for eligible capital costs and prior to committing bond proceeds for expenditure for construction and real property and equipment acquisition, but would also provide that up to 7.5% of high-speed rail bond proceeds may be used for specified expenditures outside of those requirements. The bill requires the authority to give priority in selecting corridors for construction to those corridors that are expected to require the least amount of bond funds as a percentage of total cost of construction, among other considerations. It provides for the bonds to have a final maturity of not more than 40 years. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 08/06/2008</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>

### California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2008

<p><a href="#"><u>ACA 10</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Feuer</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Bonded indebtedness: local government: transportation infrastructure.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was L. GOV. on 06/12/2008)</p>	<p>Would have created an additional exception to the 1% limit on ad valorem tax on real property for a city, county, or city and county to pay for bonded indebtedness, incurred to fund specified transportation infrastructure, that is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, or city and county, as appropriate. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 76</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Florez</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Local agencies: ethics training.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 08/30/2007)</p>	<p>Would have included school districts in the definition of "local agency," and would define "governing body," for purposes of these provisions. The bill would have also required local agency officials who serve a school district as of January 1, 2008, to receive ethics training by January 1, 2009, and at least every two years thereafter, except as specified. <b>Last Amended on 05/07/2007</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 303</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Ducheny</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Local government: land use planning.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 08/08/2008)</p>	<p>Would have required a transportation planning agency with a population exceeding 200,000 persons (A) to prepare an initial planning scenario, as specified, and an alternative planning scenario, as specified, (B) to adopt and publish procedures governing the preparation and adoption of the initial planning scenario and the alternative planning scenario, as specified, and (C) to submit, at least 90 days prior to circulation of the draft regional transportation plan, the initial planning scenario and the alternative planning scenario and accompanying report to the State Air Resources Board, as specified. These additional duties would impose a state-mandated local program. The State Air Resources Board would have been required to hold a public hearing and issue a written report determining whether either the initial planning scenario or the alternative planning scenario will inhibit the state from achieving its goals under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. A city or county would have also been authorized to create one or more transportation infill areas, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 07/01/2008</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 342</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Torlakson</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Employment: rest and meal periods.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was DESK on 05/24/2007)</p>	<p>Existing law prohibits, with specified exceptions, an employer from requiring any employee to work during a meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission. Existing law requires, with specified exceptions, employers to provide rest and meal periods to employees during work periods of specified duration. Would have expressed the intent of the Legislature to clarify these provisions regarding employees who work in the armored car industry. <b>Last Amended on 05/07/2007</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 375</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Steinberg</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Transportation planning: travel demand models: sustainable communities strategy: environmental review.</p>	<p>SENATE CHAPTERED 09/30/2008-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 728, Statutes of 2008</p>	<p>This bill several changes to the regional transportation plan by altering land-use and transportation planning practices in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Specifically, this bill requires the Air Resources Board to provide each region with greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for the automobile and light truck sector; 2) requires a regional transportation plan to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy designed to achieve the targets for greenhouse gas emission reduction; 3) requires the California Transportation Commission to maintain guidelines for travel demand models; 4) requires cities and counties, in general, to revise their housing elements every eight years in conjunction with the regional transportation plan and complete any necessary rezonings within a specific time period; and 5) relaxes</p>	<p>Watch</p>



### California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2008

		CEQA requirements for housing developments that are consistent with a Sustainable Communities Strategy. <b>Last Amended on 08/22/2008</b>	
<a href="#"><u>SB 445</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Torlakson</u></a> (D)  Greenhouse gas mitigation fee.	ASSEMBLY DEAD 08/31/2008-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was TRANS. on 06/09/2008)	Would have authorized specified regional transportation agencies to impose a greenhouse gas mitigation fee. The fee would either be a registration fee on vehicles subject to registration within the jurisdiction of the agency implementing the fee, or a fee on motor vehicle fuel, not to exceed \$0.10 per gallon, that is sold within the agency's jurisdiction. The bill would have required the fee to be implemented pursuant to a plan, which would be required to contain an expenditure plan describing specified greenhouse gas mitigation projects and programs to be funded from fee revenues. The fee would have been subject to majority approval of the governing board of the implementing agency and voter approval of a ballot measure containing the expenditure plan and the proposed fee in the jurisdiction where the fee is to be imposed. The fee would be collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles or by another appropriate agency, as specified. <b>Last Amended on 05/12/2008</b>	Watch
<a href="#"><u>SB 1561</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Steinberg</u></a> (D)  Transit districts: prohibition orders: Sacramento Regional Transit District: Fresno Area Express.	SENATE CHAPTERED 09/28/2008-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 528, Statutes of 2008	Authorizes the Sacramento Regional Transit District and the Fresno Area Express to issue a prohibition order to any person cited for committing one or more of certain prohibited acts and under various other circumstances. The prohibition order would prohibit the person subject to the order from entering the property, facilities, or vehicles of the transit district for specified periods of time up to one year. The bill would establish notice requirements in that regard and would provide opportunities for initial and administrative review of the order. The bill requires the transit districts exercising this authority to establish an advisory committee, to ensure that personnel charged with issuance and enforcement of prohibition orders receive training, to provide reasonable notice to transit district riders, as specified, and to provide an annual report to the Legislature, as specified. A violation of a prohibition order would be punishable as an infraction. By revising the definition of a crime, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Last Amended on 08/15/2008</b>	Support



**CALIFORNIA TRANSIT ASSOCIATION**

p. (916) 446-4656

f. (916) 446-4318

[www.caltransit.org](http://www.caltransit.org)