


# 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)

October 23, 2009

To: All Members of the California Transit Association

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

**RE: 2009 YEAR-END LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY**

The year 2009 marked the worst economic crisis in the state's history and ultimately had an impact on funding for public transportation. Despite signing a budget that addressed a shortfall of \$41.6 billion in late February, the Governor signed another budget compromise in July which addressed an additional \$24.2 billion gap for the 2009-10 fiscal year. As of this publication, the legislature is facing a projected \$7 to \$8 billion deficit for the 2010-11 fiscal year. The Governor cited the worldwide market collapse, the loss of 730,000 jobs (11.2% state unemployment rate as of March 2009) and the decline of personal income for the first time since 1938 in California as the driving factors for the problem. As a result, public transportation lost an additional \$1.249 billion in 09-10, which brought the total loss of Public Transportation Account (PTA) revenue to nearly \$3.4 billion since the 2007-08 budget was enacted.

Hope springs eternal however as the Supreme Court denied the State to an appeal of *Shaw v. Chiang* in late September, validating the appellate court's decision that transfers made from the PTA in the 2007-08 budget year (and subsequently repeated since) were illegal. This should stave off future raids of public transportation revenue but in the meantime, the Association continues to fight to not only protect future revenue from being diverted but also to recoup funds that have been diverted for non-traditional transit purposes in order to accomplish the Association's vision of a "fully-funded, efficient, and effective public transit system operating in a balanced network."

While the budget picture was grim, the Association was successful in enacting both of its sponsored bills (AB 729 and AB 1072) and in helping to enact high priority legislation for our members. Transit providers also received a portion of Proposition 1B allocations from the Public Transportation Modernization and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) and Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response Account (TSSSDRA). The 2009-10 budget will provide a total of \$451 million for these programs. The Association continues to work with the administration to allocate the remainder of funds available for 2008-09 and 2009-10.

The following report summarizes the status of all legislative proposals the Association tracked and/or lobbied during the 2009 Legislative Session, divided as follows:

- **Significant Transit Legislation** – Identifies and describes high-priority legislation supported by the Association, signed into law by the Governor in 2009.
- **2009-10 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 2009 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 729 (EVANS)**, [Chapter 466, Statutes of 2009], Extends the sunset date for transit operators to enter into design-build contracts to January 1, 2015.
- **AB 1072 (ENG)** [Chapter 271, Statutes of 2009], Provides transit operators with predictability in spending transit capital revenue made available through the issuance of the Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) by locking in a formula for allocation of the funds. Allows recipients to “bank” their allocations over multiple years so that they can accumulate funds for large high-priority projects.
- **AB 672 (Bass)**, [Chapter 463, Statutes of 2009], Authorizes letters of no prejudice (LNOP) for Proposition 1B transportation projects, allowing these projects to move forward if bond funding is not yet available.
- **AB 1203 (Ma)**, [Chapter 516, Statutes of 2009], Requires the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA), by February 1 of each fiscal year, to select eligible applicants for transit system safety projects from the Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response program (TSSSDRA) pursuant to Proposition 1B, and provide the State Controller with a list of the projects and sponsoring agencies eligible to receive an allocation.
- **SB 83 (Hancock)**, [Chapter 554, Statutes of 2009], Authorizes a countywide transportation planning agency to place on the ballot a majority vote local measure that would impose a fee of up to \$10 on each vehicle registered in that county. The fee would be used to pay for programs and projects including providing matching funds for bond-funded transportation projects and creating or sustaining congestion or pollution mitigation programs and projects, such as transit projects.



# **AB 729 (Evans)**

## **Design-Build Authority Extension**

### **Purpose:**

AB 729 (Evans), [Chapter 466, Statutes of 2009], eliminates the sunset date for transit operators to enter into design-build contracts. The current authority is set to expire as of January 1, 2011.

### **Position:**

Sponsor

### **Background:**

In the traditional design-bid-build process, a local agency designs a project in-house and then contracts the building of the project to a private entity. Design-build is an alternative method for procuring both the design and construction services for the delivery of public works projects which combines both phases-design and construction-into a single comprehensive contract. The public agency still retains overall control of the project definition and attributes of the final product. However, rather than preparing a set of design plans and specifications, the public agency only completes enough of the design to communicate its intent for the project through a detailed scope of work. The contractors take that description and develop a final design and construct the project. The design-build bid is for the entire cost of the project, including any liability and risk associated with delivering the project within the budget falls on the contractor.

### **Impact:**

This bill will allow transit operators to maintain a tool that can help expedite capital projects made available through allocations from Proposition 1B or the federal economic stimulus package.





# **AB 1072 (Eng)**

## **Proposition 1B Transit Capital Allocations**

### **Purpose:**

AB 1072 (Eng), [Chapter 271, Statutes of 2009,] provides transit operators with predictability in spending transit capital revenue made available through the allocation of the Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) program by locking in a formula for issuance of those funds. The bill will also allow recipients to “bank” their allocations over multiple years so that they can accumulate funds for high-priority projects.

### **Position:**

Sponsor

### **Background:**

Although Proposition 1B already provides a mechanism for determining the amount of PTMISEA funds each transit operator or regional planning agency shall receive out of the total \$3.6 billion – according to the State Transit Assistance (STA) Program formula – the proposition is silent on when and how those funds shall be allocated. As a result, a formula was put into place in 2007 through the enactment of SB 88 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) [Chapter 181, Statutes of 2007] for allocating the first \$600 million of Proposition 1B funds appropriated from the PTMISEA. The formula was based on the average of the STA program formula allocations from the 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 years. In 2008, the Legislature allocated \$350 million in AB 268 (Committee on Budget) [Chapter 756, Statutes of 2008], using the same factors established in SB 88. The PTMISEA allocations and formula however have only applied to the respective budget year appropriation and not the entirety of the PTMISEA which makes it difficult for recipients to conduct long-term planning, engage in contracts with vendors, and spend bond funds efficiently since the annual appropriations are random and not

based on need. AB 1072 supports the application of SB 88's principles, policies and structure to all future appropriations of PTMISEA funds,

**Impact:**

This bill will allow transit operators to maintain a tool that can help expedite capital projects made available through allocations from Proposition 1B or the federal economic stimulus package.

# **AB 672 (Bass)**

## **Proposition 1B: Letters of No Prejudice**

### **Purpose:**

AB 672 (Bass), [Chapter 463, Statutes of 2009], authorizes letters of no prejudice (LNOP) for certain Proposition 1B transportation projects, allowing these projects to move forward if bond funding is not yet available.

### **Position:**

Support

### **Background:**

Proposition 1B, approved by the voters in November 2006, provides \$19.925 billion in general obligation bonds for numerous transportation-related categories and programs. Many of the projects have been programmed in the full amount provided under the bond act.

AB 672 requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) annually to project targeted amounts of money expected to be made available to regional or local agencies under the State-Local Partnership Program of the bond act. The bill authorizes the administrative agency issuing the LNOP to develop guidelines to implement the LNOP process. Eligible expenditures will include project or project component has commenced and local expenditures have been incurred, and projects for which adequate bond proceeds are available in the appropriate bond fund or account in an amount sufficient to make reimbursement payments. Additionally, the timing and final amount of reimbursement is dependent on the terms of the LNOP and the availability of bond funds. The amount of reimbursement may be less than the amount stated in the LNOP.

### **Impact:**

The LNOP process will provide a cash-management strategy for Proposition 1B projects by enabling timely delivery of the voter-approved transportation programs.



# **AB 1203 (Ma)**

## **Proposition 1B: Transit Security Funding**

### **Purpose:**

AB 1203 (Ma), [Chapter 516, Statutes of 2009], requires the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA), by February 1 of each fiscal year, to select eligible applicants for transit system safety projects from the Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response program (TSSSDRA) pursuant to Proposition 1B, and provide the State Controller with a list of the projects and sponsoring agencies eligible to receive an allocation.

### **Position:**

Support

### **Background:**

Current law under Proposition 1B states that 25 percent of available funds are to be allocated to regional public waterborne transit agencies for eligible capital expenditures to enhance their transportation systems to provide improved disaster response in moving people, goods, and emergency personnel and equipment in the aftermath of a disaster or emergency. These funds are awarded to transit agencies through a reimbursable grant program, as opposed to an up-front allocation of funds as is the procedure with the majority of funds provided under this Article.

AB 1203 provides clarifying language that directs the administration of the 25 percent waterborne component of the TSSSDRA funds to be administered by way of an up-front "allocation" of funds as opposed to on a reimbursement basis.

### **Impact:**

The bill will allow for faster receipt of these needed funds, and will ensure that these transit agencies are able to continue to provide essential and timely disaster and emergency response services.



# **SB 83 (Hancock)**

## **Motor Vehicle Fee for Congestion Management**

### **Purpose:**

SB 83 (Hancock), [Chapter 554, Statutes of 2009], authorizes a countywide transportation planning agency to place on the ballot a majority vote local measure that would impose a fee of up to \$10 on each vehicle registered in that county. The fee would be used to pay for programs and projects including providing matching funds for bond-funded transportation projects and creating or sustaining congestion or pollution mitigation programs and projects, such as transit projects.

### **Position:**

Support

### **Background:**

Existing law establishes a basic vehicle registration fee of \$34, plus a \$22 surcharge for additional personnel for the California Highway Patrol, and authorizes local agencies until January 1, 2010 to impose separate vehicle registration fee surcharges in their respective jurisdictions for a variety of special programs.

This bill provides county transportation planning agency with a process for raising voter-approved discretionary revenue generated by motor vehicle registration fee for implementing a program of transportation projects to mitigate congestion and environmental consequences resulting from the operation of motor vehicles.

### **Impact:**

This bill will provide a source of stable funding to pay for the operations and maintenance of technology-based transit improvement projects, as well as congestion-mitigation projects facilitating transit, bicycles and pedestrians.





## 2009-10 State Budget Highlights

Given an economic collapse of historic proportions, the legislature enacted two separate budget packages in 2009 to address the state's monumental budget deficit. The Governor cited the worldwide market collapse, the loss of 730,000 jobs (11.2% state unemployment rate as of March 2009) and the decline of personal income for the first time since 1938 in California as the driving factors for the problem. On February 20<sup>th</sup>, Governor Schwarzenegger signed a budget package which addressed the current (2008-09) and budget year (2009-10). The plan included tax increases (\$12.7 billion), program cuts (\$22.6 billion), and borrowing (\$5.4 billion) to close the state's expected \$41.7 billion dollar deficit by June 30, 2010. Furthermore, the package included a reserve of \$2 billion and a spending cap (based on a ten-year rolling average of General Fund balances) that had to be approved by voters during a Special Election in May along with a bevy of other proposals. If the spending cap was approved, revenues would continue for five years, and for two if the measure failed. Massive cuts to education, healthcare, transportation, and programs to help the disabled were enacted as well.

A spiraling economy ensured that deeper cuts would have to be made. Anticipating the dismal prospects of the May Special Election, the Governor unveiled his May Revision on May 14<sup>th</sup> to the 2009-10 State Budget, which detailed that the deficit had worsened. Despite signing a budget that addressed a shortfall of \$41.7 billion in late February, the Governor estimated a \$15.4 billion deficit out of an \$88.8 billion General Fund budget for 2009-10 in the absence of any corrective action. That budget assumed the passage of Propositions 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, and 1E on the May 19<sup>th</sup> ballot. The failure of these measures resulted in additional \$5.8 billion deficit, which translated into a \$23.7 billion gap for 2009-10. All five of the measures failed passage by more than a 2 to 1 margin and prompted the legislature to address over a \$60 billion hole (\$36 billion in February and nearly \$24 billion in July) in the budget within a span of five months. As a result, public transportation lost an additional \$1.249 billion in 09-10, which brought the total loss of Public Transportation Account (PTA) revenue to nearly \$3.4 billion since the 2007-08 budget was enacted.

The following is a summary of the key impacts to transportation and public transportation of the 2009-10 State Budget:

- The State Transit Assistance (STA) program is reduced to \$153 million (from the \$306 million provided in the budget signed last September), and **ELIMINATED** until 2013 (the program is allowed to remain in statute, but all revenues are diverted away from STA). As a result, we can expect to receive only one more check from the State Controller in the near future. The cuts to STA in 2008-09 can be found in SBX3 2 (Ducheny), while the elimination of the STA funding through 2013 can be found in SBX3 7 (Ducheny).
- Over \$652 million in "spillover revenue" that are projected to accrue in 2009-10 to fund transit bond debt service are diverted for General Fund purposes.
- Proposition 42 is protected, although a portion of the amount marked for public transportation is diverted to fund home-to-school transportation and bond debt service.

The 2009-10 amount is approximately \$1.7 billion – \$300 million higher than the 2008-09 amount due to a temporary 1% increase in the state sales tax rate which was included in the budget package. However, payments for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter payments for cities and counties will be suspended until the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter (March 2010). Payments to the STIP will continue to be made yet the PTA's share is diverted to pay for general obligation bond debt relief.

- The budget contains a three-month deferral of the local portion of the gas tax. Counties are paid gas taxes one month in arrears from when the revenues are actually collected.
- The package also includes a 0.5% increase in the vehicle license fee, from 0.65% to 1.15%.
- Transportation capital outlay support is reduced from \$570 million to \$295 million.
- The package, by enactment of SBx2 4 (Ducheny), also allows up to 15 design-build transportation projects (transit projects are eligible) and authorizes the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and local and regional transportation agencies to enter into an unlimited number of public-private partnership agreements until January 1, 2017.
- For 2009-10, \$350 million is provided for transit capital projects from the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) and \$100 million for transit security through the Transit System Safety Security and Disaster Response Account (TSSSDRA).
- Provides full funding to the High Speed Rail Authority (\$139 million) from Proposition 1A bond funds.

According to the Governor, California's budget situation is likely to remain challenging for some time for two reasons. First, while the economic forecast projects a recovery from the recession will begin next year, the recovery is not expected to be as robust as in past years. Second, some of the solutions to the budget crisis are one-time, or of limited duration. This is to be expected in the face of such a severe fiscal crisis. It would simply not have been possible to have balanced the budget entirely with permanent tax increases and ongoing spending cuts, given federal, constitutional and other limitations. Preliminary projections for the coming fiscal year suggest that the state will face a significant budget shortfall; a minimum of \$7 to 8 billion range with even larger shortfalls projected in out-years.



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

August 21, 2009

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

Re: 4th Quarter State Transit Assistance Allocation

Attached is a schedule of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds allocated for the fourth quarter of the 2008-09 fiscal year to each transportation planning agency, county transportation commission, and the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System. STA funds are allocated pursuant to the Public Utilities Code (PUC) Sections 99313 and 99314. This will be the final allocation of STA funds until the 2003-14 fiscal year pursuant to Senate Bill X3 7, Statutes of 2009.

This is the final of four allocations scheduled to be made for the 2008-09 fiscal year. The total amount allocated to all agencies for the fourth quarter was \$25,522,867. The payment is scheduled to be made on August 26, 2009. Please refer to the schedule for the amounts that relate to your agency.

As supplemental information, we are providing a detailed schedule of STA funds allocated under the 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 PUC Section 99313.

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.

Enclosure



State Controller's Office  
 Division Of Accounting And Reporting  
 State Transit Assistance Fund Allocation  
 2008-2009 Fiscal Year

Regional Entity	1st Quarter		2nd Quarter		3rd Quarter		4th Quarter		Total Allocations
	PUC 99313 Allocations Paid 11-05-2008	PUC 99314 Allocations Paid 11-05-2008	PUC 99313 Allocations Paid 3-11-2009	PUC 99314 Allocations Paid 3-11-2009	PUC 99313 Allocations Paid 7-17-2009	PUC 99314 Allocations Paid 7-17-2009	PUC 99313 Allocations Paid 8-26-2009	PUC 99314 Allocations Paid 8-26-2009	
TRPA	\$ 92,935	\$ 3,950	\$ 30,949	\$ 1,316	\$ 30,977	\$ 1,340	\$ 30,977	\$ 1,339	\$ 193,783
MTC	7,346,413	20,327,141	2,446,466	6,779,852	2,448,714	7,172,442	2,448,714	7,172,463	56,142,205
SACOG	1,802,410	1,125,394	600,230	375,357	600,781	374,354	600,781	374,352	5,853,659
Alpine	1,230	0	409	0	410	0	410	0	2,459
Amador	38,179	3,396	12,714	1,132	12,726	788	12,726	788	82,449
Butte	221,776	10,851	73,855	3,619	73,922	3,531	73,922	3,531	465,007
Calaveras	46,413	0	15,456	0	15,471	0	15,471	0	92,811
Colusa	22,046	1,444	7,342	482	7,348	163	7,348	162	46,335
Del Norte	29,602	8,202	9,858	2,735	9,867	0	9,867	0	70,131
El Dorado	149,730	12,936	49,862	4,314	49,908	6,496	49,908	6,496	329,650
Fresno	936,879	146,518	311,995	48,867	312,282	91,559	312,282	91,558	2,251,940
Glenn	29,376	0	9,783	0	9,792	0	9,792	0	58,743
Humboldt	133,646	10,578	44,506	1,026	44,547	3,467	44,547	3,466	285,783
Imperial	177,252	0	59,028	0	59,082	0	59,082	0	354,444
Inyo	18,265	7,286	6,082	2,429	6,088	0	6,088	0	46,238
Kern	822,593	76,369	273,936	25,454	274,188	41,333	274,188	41,329	1,829,390
Kings	155,393	31,306	51,748	10,441	51,796	291	51,796	291	353,062
Lake	64,457	3,734	21,465	1,245	21,485	1,162	21,485	1,162	136,195
Lassen	35,979	2,395	11,982	799	11,993	843	11,993	842	76,826
Los Angeles	10,428,199	12,284,423	3,472,745	4,081,320	3,475,938	3,432,040	3,475,938	3,432,065	44,082,668
Madera	151,824	0	50,560	0	50,606	0	50,606	0	303,596
Mariposa	18,520	203	6,168	68	6,173	121	6,173	121	37,547
Mendocino	90,723	7,598	30,212	2,534	30,240	1,890	30,240	1,889	195,326
Merced	256,835	13,699	85,530	4,568	85,608	4,053	85,608	4,053	539,954
Modoc	9,762	0	3,251	0	3,254	0	3,254	0	19,521
Mono	13,844	0	4,610	0	4,615	4,470	4,615	4,469	36,623
Monterey	431,210	83,597	143,599	27,882	143,731	25,537	143,731	25,535	1,024,822
Nevada	99,802	5,748	33,236	1,917	33,266	2,700	33,266	2,699	212,634
Orange	3,140,631	1,062,368	1,045,877	354,336	1,046,838	594,268	1,046,838	594,266	8,885,422
Placer	273,644	24,753	91,127	8,154	91,211	26,798	91,211	26,798	633,696
Plumas	21,047	0	7,009	0	7,015	0	7,015	0	42,086
Riverside	2,101,289	344,837	699,761	115,014	700,404	99,540	700,404	99,535	4,860,784
San Benito	58,143	0	19,362	0	19,380	0	19,380	0	116,265
San Bernardino	2,068,531	442,418	688,852	147,559	689,485	116,485	689,485	116,481	4,959,296
SANDAG	787,021	333,561	262,090	111,255	262,330	126,134	262,330	126,133	2,270,854
San Diego MTS	2,378,789	1,141,456	792,172	380,714	792,900	373,694	792,900	373,693	7,026,318
San Joaquin	689,917	198,379	229,753	66,166	229,964	47,467	229,964	47,467	1,739,077
San Luis Obispo	271,009	16,904	90,250	4,302	90,333	1,775	90,333	1,772	566,678
Santa Barbara	431,317	127,671	143,635	42,579	143,767	40,119	143,767	40,116	1,112,971
Santa Cruz	268,174	260,761	89,306	86,973	89,388	111,929	89,388	111,928	1,107,847
Shasta	183,368	12,901	61,064	4,303	61,120	3,463	61,120	3,462	390,801
Sierra	3,401	0	1,133	0	1,134	0	1,134	0	6,802
Siskiyou	46,256	4,138	15,404	1,380	15,418	0	15,418	0	98,014
Stanislaus	529,168	40,739	176,221	13,587	176,383	8,900	176,383	8,897	1,130,278
Tehama	62,807	0	20,916	0	20,935	0	20,935	0	125,593
Trinity	14,053	341	4,680	113	4,684	0	4,684	0	28,555
Tulare	437,957	23,147	145,846	7,717	145,980	13,183	145,980	13,179	932,989
Tuolumne	57,152	0	19,032	0	19,050	0	19,050	0	114,284
Ventura	836,750	84,575	278,650	28,208	278,907	29,099	278,906	29,097	1,844,192
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 38,285,717</b>	<b>\$ 38,285,717</b>	<b>\$ 12,749,717</b>	<b>\$ 12,749,717</b>	<b>\$ 12,761,434</b>	<b>\$ 12,761,434</b>	<b>\$ 12,761,433</b>	<b>\$ 12,761,434</b>	<b>\$ 153,116,603</b>



**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2008-09 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**FOURTH QUARTER ALLOCATION SUMMARY**

<u>Regional Entity</u>	<u>PUC 99313 Allocations To Date</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Allocations To Date</u>	<u>Prior Quarter Allocations</u>	<u>Current Quarter Allocation</u>	<u>Total Allocations To Date</u>
TRPA	\$ 185,838	\$ 7,945	\$ 161,467	\$ 32,316	\$ 193,783
MTC	14,690,307	41,451,898	46,521,028	9,621,177	56,142,205
SACOG	3,604,202	2,249,457	4,878,526	975,133	5,853,659
Alpine	2,459	0	2,049	410	2,459
Amador	76,345	6,104	68,935	13,514	82,449
Butte	443,475	21,532	387,554	77,453	465,007
Calaveras	92,811	0	77,340	15,471	92,811
Colusa	44,084	2,251	38,825	7,510	46,335
Del Norte	59,194	10,937	60,264	9,867	70,131
El Dorado	299,408	30,242	273,246	56,404	329,650
Fresno	1,873,438	378,502	1,848,100	403,840	2,251,940
Glenn	58,743	0	48,951	9,792	58,743
Humboldt	267,246	18,537	237,770	48,013	285,783
Imperial	354,444	0	295,362	59,082	354,444
Inyo	36,523	9,715	40,150	6,088	46,238
Kern	1,644,905	184,485	1,513,873	315,517	1,829,390
Kings	310,733	42,329	300,975	52,087	353,062
Lake	128,892	7,303	113,548	22,647	136,195
Lassen	71,947	4,879	63,991	12,835	76,826
Los Angeles	20,852,820	23,229,848	37,174,665	6,908,003	44,082,668
Madera	303,596	0	252,990	50,606	303,596
Mariposa	37,034	513	31,253	6,294	37,547
Mendocino	181,415	13,911	163,197	32,129	195,326
Merced	513,581	26,373	450,293	89,661	539,954
Modoc	19,521	0	16,267	3,254	19,521
Mono	27,684	8,939	27,539	9,084	36,623
Monterey	862,271	162,551	855,556	169,266	1,024,822
Nevada	199,570	13,064	176,669	35,965	212,634
Orange	6,280,184	2,605,238	7,244,318	1,641,104	8,885,422
Placer	547,193	86,503	515,687	118,009	633,696
Plumas	42,086	0	35,071	7,015	42,086
Riverside	4,201,858	658,926	4,060,845	799,939	4,860,784
San Benito	116,265	0	96,885	19,380	116,265
San Bernardino	4,136,353	822,943	4,153,330	805,966	4,959,296
SANDAG	1,573,771	697,083	1,882,391	388,463	2,270,854
San Diego MTS	4,756,761	2,269,557	5,859,725	1,166,593	7,026,318
San Joaquin	1,379,598	359,479	1,461,646	277,431	1,739,077
San Luis Obispo	541,925	24,753	474,573	92,105	566,678
Santa Barbara	862,486	250,485	929,088	183,883	1,112,971
Santa Cruz	536,256	571,591	906,531	201,316	1,107,847
Shasta	366,672	24,129	326,219	64,582	390,801
Sierra	6,802	0	5,668	1,134	6,802
Siskiyou	92,496	5,518	82,596	15,418	98,014
Stanislaus	1,058,155	72,123	944,998	185,280	1,130,278
Tehama	125,593	0	104,658	20,935	125,593
Trinity	28,101	454	23,871	4,684	28,555
Tulare	875,763	57,226	773,830	159,159	932,989
Tuolumne	114,284	0	95,234	19,050	114,284
Ventura	1,673,213	170,979	1,536,189	308,003	1,844,192
Subtotals	<u>\$ 76,558,301</u>	<u>\$ 76,558,302</u>	<u>\$ 127,593,736</u>	<u>\$ 25,522,867</u>	
Totals		<u>\$ 153,116,603</u>		<u>\$ 153,116,603</u>	<u>\$ 153,116,603</u>





**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2008-09 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**FOURTH QUARTER 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Prior Allocations	Current Allocation	Allocations To Date	1 Adjustment To Apply To Future Allocation
<b>TRPA</b>					
County of El Dorado	\$ 50,841	\$ 1,005	\$ 147	\$ 1,152	\$ 1
City of South Lake Tahoe	299,950	5,601	1,192	6,793	7
Regional Entity Totals	350,791	6,606	1,339	7,945	8
<b>MTC</b>					
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District	*	**	***	****	*****
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	NA	65,792	14,219	80,011	117
City of Benicia	308,327	6,066	917	6,983	8
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	9,916,263	193,510	31,076	224,586	246
City of Dixon	88,848	1,690	323	2,013	2
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority	4,424,590	86,038	14,170	100,208	110
City of Fairfield	1,869,031	34,784	7,543	42,327	46
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District	71,211,332	1,305,737	306,887	1,612,624	1,763
City of Healdsburg	64,509	890	569	1,459	2
Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority	3,397,280	67,348	9,598	76,946	84
Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency	695,264	13,929	1,818	15,747	17
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	86,727,425	1,607,269	356,768	1,964,037	2,147
City of Rio Vista	22,185	284	218	502	1
City of San Francisco	*	**	***	****	*****
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	*	**	***	****	*****
San Mateo County Transit District	88,261,578	1,721,120	277,859	1,998,979	2,185
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	262,060,601	5,000,880	934,102	5,934,982	6,488
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	NA	87,923	15,723	103,646	151
City of Santa Rosa	2,334,222	46,175	6,692	52,867	58
County of Sonoma	2,707,433	52,843	8,476	61,319	67
City of Union City	598,579	13,042	518	13,560	15
City of Vallejo	11,120,488	218,608	33,257	251,865	275
Western Contra Costa Transit Authority	4,834,193	93,891	15,594	109,485	120
Regional Entity Totals	1,822,276,566	34,279,435	7,172,463	41,451,898	45,387
<b>SACOG</b>					
City of Davis	2,464,252	44,935	10,869	55,804	61
City of Elk Grove	1,318,150	38,709	0	38,709	(8,803)
City of Folsom	81,569	0	0	0	(1,633)
Sacramento Regional Transit System	92,024,867	1,731,130	352,933	2,084,063	2,278
Yolo County Transit Authority	2,028,182	40,252	5,685	45,937	50
Yuba Sutter Transit Authority	1,101,485	20,079	4,865	24,944	27
Regional Entity Totals	99,018,505	1,875,105	374,352	2,249,457	(8,020)

(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 \$1,271,634,418.

\*\* The combined prior allocation for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$23,661,616.

\*\*\* The combined current allocation for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$5,136,136.

\*\*\*\* The combined allocation to date for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$28,797,752.

\*\*\*\*\* The combined adjustment to apply to the 2013-14 allocation for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$31,485.

<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 the first and second quarter payments are recalculated using the new revenue amounts which may cause an adjustment (under/over) for the year. These adjustments will be applied to the 2013-14 fiscal year allocation.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2008-09 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**FOURTH QUARTER 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Prior Allocations</u>	<u>Current Allocation</u>	<u>Allocations To Date</u>	<u>1 Adjustment To Apply To Future Allocation</u>
Alpine	None	None	None	None	None
Amador					
Amador Regional Transit System	269,517	5,316	788	6,104	7
Butte					
Butte County Association of Governments	950,792	18,001	3,531	21,532	24
Calaveras	None	None	None	None	None
Colusa					
County of Colusa	99,358	2,089	162	2,251	2
Del Norte					
Redwood Coast Transit Authority	138,103	10,937	0	10,937	(7,795)
El Dorado					
El Dorado County Transit Authority	1,335,526	23,746	6,496	30,242	33
Fresno					
City of Clovis	691,822	8,587	7,070	15,657	17
City of Fresno	14,928,822	261,555	76,488	338,043	370
Fresno County Rural Transit Agency	1,095,578	16,802	8,000	24,802	27
Regional Entity Totals	16,716,222	286,944	91,558	378,502	414
Glenn	None	None	None	None	None
Humboldt					
City of Arcata	241,864	4,711	767	5,478	6
City of Eureka	317,049	1,802	501	2,303	8
City of Fortuna	11,988	216	56	272	0
Humboldt Transit Authority	800,252	8,342	2,142	10,484	20
Regional Entity Totals	1,371,153	15,071	3,466	18,537	34
Imperial	None	None	None	None	None
Inyo					
Inyo Mono Transit	0	9,715	0	9,715	0

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2008-09 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**FOURTH QUARTER 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Prior Allocations</u>	<u>Current Allocation</u>	<u>Allocations To Date</u>	<u>1 Adjustment To Apply To Future Allocation</u>
<b>Kern</b>					
City of Arvin	57,539	1,285	18	1,303	1
City of California City	23,167	401	123	524	1
City of Delano	58,778	1,061	271	1,332	1
Golden Empire Transit District	6,568,764	114,222	34,516	148,738	163
County of Kern	756,545	13,645	3,487	17,132	19
City of McFarland	0	88	0	88	(128)
City of Ridgecrest	219,968	3,871	1,110	4,981	5
City of Shafter	31,847	878	0	878	(156)
City of Taft	369,005	6,869	1,487	8,356	9
City of Tehachapi	5,151	93	24	117	0
City of Wasco	45,744	743	293	1,036	1
Regional Entity Totals	8,136,508	143,156	41,329	184,485	(84)
<b>Kings</b>					
City of Corcoran	75,955	1,429	291	1,720	2
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	552,076	40,609	0	40,609	(28,054)
Regional Entity Totals	628,031	42,038	291	42,329	(28,052)
<b>Lake</b>					
Lake Transit Authority	322,458	6,141	1,162	7,303	8
<b>Lassen</b>					
County of Lassen	215,407	4,037	842	4,879	5

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2008-09 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**FOURTH QUARTER 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Prior Allocations	Current Allocation	Allocations To Date	1 Adjustment To Apply To Future Allocation
Los Angeles					
Antelope Valley Transit Authority	8,443,659	184,770	6,512	191,282	209
City of Arcadia	1,315,788	23,735	6,061	29,796	33
City of Claremont	299,267	5,531	1,247	6,778	7
City of Commerce	2,086,715	40,327	6,932	47,259	52
City of Culver City	7,866,960	141,029	37,116	178,145	195
Foothill Transit Zone	40,329,665	779,314	134,069	913,383	999
City of Gardena	7,525,332	146,408	24,027	170,435	186
City of La Mirada	791,404	15,434	2,489	17,923	20
Long Beach Public Transportation Company	43,603,628	824,541	162,948	987,489	1,080
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	777,427,400	15,063,734	2,543,528	17,607,262	19,248
City of Montebello	17,886,660	338,938	66,142	405,080	443
City of Norwalk	6,293,412	119,261	23,266	142,527	156
City of Redondo Beach	1,865,939	32,576	9,676	42,252	46
City of Santa Monica	29,906,616	575,185	102,132	677,317	740
Southern California Regional Rail Authority	129,783,329				
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority		1,298,035	258,268	1,556,303	1,701
Orange County Transportation Authority		*****	*****	*****	*****
Riverside County Transportation Commission		*****	*****	*****	*****
San Bernardino Associated Governments		*****	*****	*****	*****
Ventura County Transportation Commission		*****	*****	*****	*****
City of Torrance	11,331,753	208,965	47,652	256,617	281
Regional Entity Totals	1,086,757,527	19,797,783	3,432,065	23,229,848	25,396
Madera	None	None	None	None	None
Mariposa					
County of Mariposa	22,697	392	121	513	1
Mendocino					
Mendocino Transit Authority	614,220	12,022	1,889	13,911	15
Merced					
County of Merced	1,164,519	22,320	4,053	26,373	29
Modoc					
	None	None	None	None	None
Mono					
Eastern Sierra Transit Authority	823,826	4,470	4,469	8,939	20
Monterey					
City of Greenfield	18,695	296	128	424	0
City of King City	9,151	172	35	207	0
Monterey-Salinas Transit	7,035,604	135,177	24,163	159,340	174
City of Soledad	114,041	1,371	1,209	2,580	3
Regional Entity Totals	7,177,491	137,016	25,535	162,551	177

(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**  
**2008-09 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**FOURTH QUARTER 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Prior Allocations</u>	<u>Current Allocation</u>	<u>Allocations To Date</u>	<u>1 Adjustment To Apply To Future Allocation</u>
<b>Nevada</b>					
County of Nevada	576,885	10,365	2,699	13,064	14
<b>Orange</b>					
City of Laguna Beach	833,206	14,689	4,177	18,866	21
Orange County Transportation Authority	86,109,839	1,464,174	485,567	1,949,741	2,132
Orange County Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	532,109	104,522	636,631	696
Regional Entity Totals	86,943,045	2,010,972	594,266	2,605,238	2,849
<b>Placer</b>					
City of Auburn	36,474	300	0	300	(289)
City of Lincoln	56,259	847	426	1,273	1
County of Placer	3,021,071	44,989	23,400	68,389	75
City of Roseville	730,421	13,569	2,972	16,541	18
Regional Entity Totals	3,844,225	59,705	26,798	86,503	(195)
<b>Plumas</b>					
	None	None	None	None	None
<b>Riverside</b>					
City of Banning	144,226	2,688	577	3,265	4
City of Beaumont	74,578	1,585	104	1,689	2
City of Corona	372,590	6,977	1,461	8,438	9
Palo Verde Valley Transit Agency	88,452	1,644	360	2,004	2
City of Riverside	312,608	6,079	1,001	7,080	8
Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	189,296	44,943	234,239	256
Riverside Transit Agency	10,669,676	201,126	40,508	241,634	264
Sunline Transit Agency	7,088,828	149,996	10,581	160,577	176
Regional Entity Totals	18,750,958	559,391	99,535	658,926	721
<b>San Benito</b>					
	None	None	None	None	None
<b>San Bernardino</b>					
Morongo Basin Transit Authority	600,475	11,385	2,214	13,599	15
Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority	386,813	6,714	2,044	8,758	10
Omnitrans	15,452,389	307,070	42,914	349,984	383
San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	346,879	69,309	416,188	455
Victor Valley Transit Service Authority	1,447,994	34,414	0	34,414	(1,571)
Regional Entity Totals	17,887,671	706,462	116,481	822,943	(708)
<b>SANDAG</b>					
North San Diego County Transit Development Board	30,781,567	570,950	126,133	697,083	762

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2008-09 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**FOURTH QUARTER 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Prior Allocations	Current Allocation	Allocations To Date	1 Adjustment To Apply To Future Allocation
San Diego MTS	100,214,551	1,895,864	373,693	2,269,557	2,481
San Joaquin					
Altamont Commuter Express Authority	10,820,639				
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency		*****	*****	*****	*****
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority		*****	*****	*****	*****
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission		65,799	0	65,799	(4,372)
City of Lodi	372,834	7,445	1,000	8,445	9
City of Ripon	1,108	20	5	25	0
San Joaquin Regional Transit District	12,593,692	238,748	46,462	285,210	312
Regional Entity Totals	23,788,273	312,012	47,467	359,479	(4,051)
San Luis Obispo					
City of Atascadero	109,432	2,159	319	2,478	3
City of Morro Bay	48,593	944	157	1,101	1
City of Paso Robles Transit	156,103	3,119	416	3,535	4
City of San Luis Obispo	516,500	10,995	705	11,700	13
County of San Luis Obispo	85,588	1,764	175	1,939	2
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority	621,276	4,000	0	4,000	(22,254)
South County Area Transit	113,433	0	0	0	(8,141)
Regional Entity Totals	1,650,925	22,981	1,772	24,753	(30,372)
Santa Barbara					
City of Guadalupe	73,854	1,368	304	1,672	2
City of Lompoc	149,843	2,898	496	3,394	4
County of Santa Barbara	60,768	1,212	164	1,376	2
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District	9,840,409	186,985	35,872	222,857	244
City of Santa Maria	882,598	16,805	3,183	19,988	22
City of Solvang	52,874	1,101	97	1,198	1
Regional Entity Totals	11,060,346	210,369	40,116	250,485	275
Santa Cruz					
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	25,241,009	459,663	111,928	571,591	625
Shasta					
Redding Area Bus Authority	1,065,381	20,667	3,462	24,129	26
Sierra	None	None	None	None	None
Siskiyou					
County of Siskiyou	232,047	5,518	0	5,518	(255)

(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**  
**2008-09 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**FOURTH QUARTER 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Prior Allocations</u>	<u>Current Allocation</u>	<u>Allocations To Date</u>	<u>1 Adjustment To Apply To Future Allocation</u>
<b>Stanislaus</b>					
City of Modesto	2,714,753	53,948	7,539	61,487	67
County of Stanislaus	287,647	5,540	974	6,514	7
City of Turlock	182,011	3,738	384	4,122	5
Regional Entity Totals	<u>3,184,411</u>	<u>63,226</u>	<u>8,897</u>	<u>72,123</u>	<u>79</u>
<b>Tehama</b>					
	None	None	None	None	None
<b>Trinity</b>					
County of Trinity	15,184	454	0	454	(109)
<b>Tulare</b>					
City of Exeter	14,514	303	26	329	0
City of Porterville	311,868	6,539	525	7,064	8
City of Tulare	262,484	5,119	826	5,945	6
County of Tulare	154,512	2,862	637	3,499	4
City of Visalia	1,783,891	29,224	11,165	40,389	44
Regional Entity Totals	<u>2,527,269</u>	<u>44,047</u>	<u>13,179</u>	<u>57,226</u>	<u>62</u>
<b>Tuolumne</b>					
	None	None	None	None	None
<b>Ventura</b>					
Gold Coast Transit	3,318,823	61,936	13,223	75,159	82
Ventura County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	79,946	15,874	95,820	105
Regional Entity Totals	<u>3,318,823</u>	<u>141,882</u>	<u>29,097</u>	<u>170,979</u>	<u>187</u>
<b>STATE TOTALS</b>	<u>\$ 3,379,471,787</u>	<u>\$ 63,796,868</u>	<u>\$ 12,761,434</u>	<u>\$ 76,558,302</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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kelly J. Martell".

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**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation</u>
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	<u>96,888</u>
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	<u>301,769</u>
Kings	
City of Corcoran	3,303
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	131,585
Regional Entity Totals	<u>134,888</u>
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

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>GC 8879.55(a)(3) Eligible Allocation</u>
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	<u>426,858</u>
STATE TOTALS	<u>\$ 168,959,034</u>



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

August 21, 2009

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 2009-10 fiscal year appropriation in the Budget Act of 2009.

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 2009-10 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kelly J. Martell".

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

Enclosure

MAILING ADDRESS P.O. Box 942850, Sacramento, CA 94250  
STREET ADDRESS 3301 C Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95816



**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58 ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION - FISCAL YEAR 2009-20010**

<u>Regional Entity</u>	<u>GC 8879.58(a)(2) Eligible Allocation</u>	<u>GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation</u>	<u>2009-2010 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	0	15,039
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	3,168	14,188
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 2009-2010**

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 and Planning 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 2009-2010**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
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	759,904
Alpine	
	None
Amador	
Amador Regional 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	98,478

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**TRANSIT SYSTEM SAFETY, SECURITY, AND DISASTER RESPONSE ACCOUNT**  
**GOVERNMENT CODE 8879.58(a)(3) ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION DETAIL - FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010**

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	None
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 2009-2010**

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 2009-2010**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Mono	
Eastern Sierra Transit Authority	3,168
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 2009-2010**

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 2009-2010**

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 2009-2010**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	GC 8879.58(a)(3) Eligible Allocation
Tuolumne	None
Ventura	
Gold Coast 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





**Public Transportation Account (PTA) Funds Allocated & Diverted:  
FY 2007-08 through FY 2009-10**

In the last three budget cycles, billions of dollars have been diverted away from public transportation in order to plug the state's chronic General Fund deficits. The following display shows these funds, by year and by the total over the three-year period, according to amount of state revenue collected per period that traditionally would have been dedicated to public transit purposes through the normal Public Transportation Account (PTA) distribution mechanisms and formulae. The numbers reflected in the chart represent a rough estimate. Numbers have been rounded up. Certain revenues, such as non-article XIX funds, have not been factored into the estimates.

Budget Year	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	3-Year Total Per Revenue Source / Expenditure
<b>Core PTA Revenues</b>				
Spillover *	\$827	\$1,027	\$652	\$2,506
Sales Tax on Diesel	\$365	\$453	\$245	\$1,063
Proposition 42	\$283	\$270	\$288	\$841
Sales Tax on Proposition 111 Gas Tax	\$66	\$64	\$64	\$194
<b>Total Core PTA Revenues</b>	<b>\$1,541</b>	<b>\$1,814</b>	<b>\$1,249</b>	<b>\$4,604</b>
<b>Core PTA Expenditures</b>				
State Transit Assistance (STA) Program **	\$770.5	\$975	\$697	\$2,442.5
State & Regional Programming	\$770.5	\$839	\$552	\$2,161.5
<b>Total Core PTA Expenditures</b>	<b>\$1,541</b>	<b>\$1,814</b>	<b>\$1,249</b>	<b>\$4,604</b>

\* The 2008-09 spillover estimate of \$1.427 billion was as of the September 2008 enacted budget. The Department of Finance states that estimate has since dropped by approximately \$400 million.

\*\* The 2008-09 and 2009-10 STA amounts factor in the enactment of SB 717 (Perata) [Chapter 733, Statutes of 2007], which divided the PTA's share of Prop. 42 revenue 75%/25% in favor of the STA program.

**STA Program Impacts**

As referenced by the chart above, \$2.443 billion should have been made available to the STA program over FY 07-08, 08-09, and 09-10. The STA program however was funded at \$315 million for FY 2007-08 and \$150 million for FY 2008-09, while funding for the program was eliminated for 2009-10 and beyond, until FY 2012-13. Consequently, the loss in STA revenue for 07-08 is approximately \$455.5 million (\$770.5 - \$315); \$825 million for 08-09 (\$975 - \$150); and \$697 million for 09-10. Therefore, the total loss of STA over the three-year period is approximately **\$1.978 billion**.

**PTA-STIP Impacts**

The amount of PTA—STIP/ITIP lost over the three-year period is **\$1.37 billion** (\$587 million in 2007-08, \$570 million in 2008-09, and \$213 million in 2009-10). There have been zero dollars available for PTA-STIP over the past three years. In fact, the \$2.162 billion figure referenced in the chart was spent on Home-to-School transportation, G.O. Bond debt service, and regional occupation centers, in addition to traditional purposes such as the intercity rail program, and administrative costs for the CPUC, CTC, and HSRA, among other things.

**The total loss of PTA revenues is approximately \$3.348 billion (\$1.978 + \$1.37 = \$3.348) over the three-year period.**



## State Transit Assistance (STA) Program Funding Allocations and Diversions: FY 2007-08 through FY 2009-10

Over the past three years, \$2,442,500,000 should have been made available to the STA program. The STA program however was funded at \$315 million for FY 07-08 and \$150 million for FY 08-09, yet funding for the program was eliminated for FY 09-10 and beyond (until FY 2012-13). Consequently, the loss in STA revenue for FY 07-08 is about \$455 million; \$825 million for FY 08-09; and \$697 million for FY 09-10. Therefore, the total loss of STA over the three-year period is approximately **\$1.977 billion**.

The chart below provides a rough estimate of the amount of STA funding that should have been made available to recipients had transit funding not been diverted for FY 07-08,08-09, and 09-10. This chart represents our best estimate of allocations and diversions. We used numbers made available through the State Controller's Office (SCO) and the Department of Finance (DOF) in developing our estimates. For FY 09-10, numbers used are current pursuant to the Budget Act signed on July 28, 2009. Therefore, estimates such as spillover for FY 09-10 may be subject to change. Numbers are rounded to the nearest dollar.

Regional Entity	2007-08 Amount Received (A)	2007-08 Amount Owed (B)	2007-08 Amount Diverted (A-B=C)	2008-09 Amount Received (D)	2008-09 Amount Owed (E)	2008-09 Amount Diverted (D-E=F)	2009-10 Amount Eliminated (G)	Total Amount Lost (07-08,08- 09,09-10) (C)+(F)+ (G)=H
TRPA	\$ 395,387	\$ 966,147	\$ (570,670)	\$ 193,783	\$ 1,233,841	(1,040,058)	\$ (882,038)	(2,492,766)
MTC	113,848,000	278,193,015	(164,345,015)	56,122,580	357,371,532	(301,248,953)	(255,474,827)	(721,068,794)
SACOG	12,020,625	29,372,970	(17,352,345)	5,853,659	37,278,968	(31,425,309)	(26,649,683)	(75,427,337)
Alpine	5,279	12,899	(7,620)	2,459	15,657	(13,198)	(11,193)	(32,011)
Amador	174,867	427,296	(252,429)	82,449	526,763	(444,314)	(376,568)	(1,073,311)
Butte	957,508	2,339,716	(1,382,208)	465,007	2,961,471	(2,496,464)	(2,117,072)	(5,995,744)
Calaveras	192,679	470,820	(278,141)	92,811	590,989	(498,178)	(422,481)	(1,198,800)
Colusa	97,830	239,052	(141,222)	46,335	296,679	(250,344)	(212,087)	(603,653)
Del Norte	156,561	382,564	(226,003)	70,131	460,504	(390,373)	(329,201)	(945,577)
El Dorado	664,060	1,622,662	(958,602)	329,650	2,087,993	(1,758,343)	(1,492,647)	(4,209,592)
Fresno	4,443,645	10,858,258	(6,414,613)	2,251,940	14,122,147	(11,870,207)	(10,095,525)	(28,380,345)
Glenn	121,042	295,772	(174,730)	58,743	374,056	(315,313)	(267,402)	(757,445)
Humboldt	622,364	1,520,776	(898,412)	285,783	1,816,905	(1,531,122)	(1,298,854)	(3,728,388)
Imperial	722,827	1,766,262	(1,043,435)	354,444	2,256,991	(1,902,547)	(1,613,459)	(4,559,441)
Inyo	106,926	261,279	(154,353)	46,238	306,804	(260,566)	(219,325)	(634,244)
Kern	3,670,127	8,968,130	(5,289,003)	1,829,390	11,568,171	(9,738,781)	(8,269,759)	(23,297,543)
Kings	762,514	1,863,239	(1,100,725)	353,062	2,299,883	(1,946,821)	(1,644,121)	(4,691,667)
Lake	284,429	695,016	(410,587)	136,195	867,670	(731,475)	(620,273)	(1,762,335)

Regional Entity	2007-08 Amount Received (A)	2007-08 Amount Owed (B)	2007-08 Amount Diverted (A-B=C)	2008-09 Amount Received (D)	2008-09 Amount Owed (E)	2008-09 Amount Diverted (D-E=F)	2009-10 Amount Eliminated* (G)	Total Amount Shorted (07- 08,08-09,09-10) (C)+(F)+ (G)=H
Lassen	162,123	396,155	(234,032)	76,826	488,983	(412,157)	(349,560)	(995,749)
Los Angeles	93,861,240	229,354,415	(135,493,175)	44,082,668	284,068,008	(239,985,340)	(203,072,206)	(578,550,721)
Madera	622,565	1,521,267	(898,702)	303,596	1,933,208	(1,629,612)	(1,381,996)	(3,910,310)
Mariposa	77,249	188,762	(111,513)	37,547	238,818	(201,271)	(170,724)	(483,508)
Mendocino	409,232	999,978	(590,746)	195,326	1,247,060	(1,051,734)	(891,488)	(2,533,968)
Merced	1,109,214	2,710,417	(1,601,203)	539,954	3,440,887	(2,900,933)	(2,459,793)	(6,961,929)
Modoc	40,694	99,438	(58,744)	19,521	124,303	(104,782)	(88,861)	(252,387)
Mono	58,543	143,053	(84,510)	36,623	210,438	(173,815)	(150,436)	(408,761)
Monterey	2,127,074	5,197,607	(3,070,533)	1,024,822	6,537,681	(5,512,859)	(4,673,604)	(13,256,996)
Nevada	441,284	1,078,298	(637,014)	212,634	1,350,006	(1,137,372)	(965,081)	(2,739,467)
Orange	17,340,595	42,372,571	(25,031,976)	8,885,422	55,357,028	(46,471,606)	(39,573,178)	(111,076,760)
Placer	1,216,969	2,973,722	(1,756,753)	633,696	3,940,592	(3,306,896)	(2,817,018)	(7,880,667)
Plumas	88,445	216,120	(127,675)	42,086	267,993	(225,907)	(191,581)	(545,163)
Riverside	9,923,425	24,248,362	(14,324,937)	4,860,784	31,030,707	(26,169,923)	(22,182,977)	(62,677,837)
San Benito	241,970	591,265	(349,295)	116,265	740,341	(624,076)	(529,249)	(1,502,620)
San Bernardino	10,309,797	25,192,480	(14,882,683)	4,959,296	31,737,426	(26,778,130)	(22,688,191)	(64,349,004)
SANDAG	4,596,677	11,232,199	(6,635,522)	2,270,854	14,384,180	(12,113,326)	(10,282,844)	(29,031,692)
San Diego MTS	14,442,019	35,289,762	(20,847,743)	7,026,318	44,776,743	(37,750,425)	(32,009,630)	(90,607,798)
San Joaquin	3,661,440	8,946,903	(5,285,463)	1,739,077	11,169,082	(9,430,005)	(7,984,461)	(22,699,929)
San Luis Obispo	1,244,713	3,041,516	(1,796,803)	566,678	3,626,422	(3,059,744)	(2,592,426)	(7,448,973)
Santa Barbara	2,301,978	5,624,993	(3,323,015)	1,112,971	7,099,571	(5,986,600)	(5,075,283)	(14,384,898)
Santa Cruz	2,178,587	5,323,481	(3,144,894)	1,107,847	6,927,203	(5,819,356)	(4,952,062)	(13,916,312)
Shasta	812,446	1,985,251	(1,172,805)	390,801	2,492,783	(2,101,982)	(1,782,020)	(5,056,807)
Sierra	14,588	35,646	(21,058)	6,802	43,312	(36,510)	(30,962)	(88,530)
Siskiyou	209,391	511,657	(302,266)	98,014	631,152	(533,138)	(451,193)	(1,286,597)
Stanislaus	2,350,675	5,743,986	(3,393,311)	1,130,278	7,221,146	(6,090,868)	(5,162,194)	(14,646,373)
Tehama	258,594	631,887	(373,293)	125,593	799,738	(674,145)	(571,710)	(1,619,148)
Trinity	60,722	148,377	(87,655)	28,555	182,409	(153,854)	(130,399)	(371,908)
Tulare	1,891,099	4,620,991	(2,729,892)	932,989	5,913,176	(4,980,187)	(4,227,163)	(11,937,242)
Tuolumne	239,543	585,335	(345,792)	114,284	727,725	(613,441)	(520,230)	(1,479,463)
Ventura	3,780,663	9,238,230	(5,457,567)	1,844,192	11,738,698	(9,894,506)	(8,391,664)	(23,743,737)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$315,320,224</b>	<b>\$770,499,998</b>	<b>\$(455,170,684)</b>	<b>\$ 153,116,603</b>	<b>\$975,000,000</b>	<b>\$(821,883,397)</b>	<b>\$(696,999,994)</b>	<b>\$ (1,974,054,075)</b>

## California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2009

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 231</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Huffman</u></a> (D)</p> <p>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: Climate Protection Trust Fund.</p>	<p>SENATE E.Q. 06/18/2009-From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on EQ.</p>	<p>Requires that revenues collected pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 be deposited into a Climate Protection Trust Fund, and establishes parameters by which those funds can be distributed for the reduction of GHG and mitigation of climate change impacts.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 06/26/2009</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 266</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Carter</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Transportation needs assessment.</p>	<p>SENATE RLS. 06/11/2009-Referred to Com. on RLS.</p>	<p>Requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to, on an every-5-year basis, to develop an assessment of the unfunded costs of programmed state projects and federally earmarked projects in the state, , as well as an assessment of available funding for transportation purposes and unmet transportation needs on a statewide basis.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 04/20/2009</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 282</u></a> <b>Committee on Transportation</b></p> <p>Transportation.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 229, Statutes of 2009</p>	<p>The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 authorizes the issuance of \$19.925 billion in general obligation bonds for various transportation improvements, of which \$2 billion are to be allocated, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to cities and counties for specified street and road improvements. The act requires a city or county to reimburse the state for funds it receives if it fails to comply with certain conditions applicable to the expenditure of the bond funds. This bill would require any interest or other return earned by a city or county from investment of bond funds received under these provisions to be expended or reimbursed under the same conditions as are applicable to the bond funds themselves. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 09/02/2009</b></p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 338</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Ma</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Transit village developments: infrastructure financing.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY VETOED 10/11/2009-Vetoed by the Governor</p>	<p>Recasts 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, and eliminates the requirement of voter approval for the formation of an infrastructure financing district, adoption of an infrastructure financing plan, and an issuance of bonds for the purpose of developing and financing a transit facility.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 06/25/2009</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 569</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Emmerson</u></a> (R)</p> <p>Meal periods: exemptions.</p>	<p>SENATE RLS. 09/11/2009-From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on RLS.</p>	<p>Existing law prohibits, subject to certain exceptions, an employer from requiring an employee to work more than 5 hours per day without providing a meal period and, notwithstanding that provision, authorizes the Industrial Welfare Commission to adopt a working condition order permitting a meal period to commence after 6 hours of work if the order is consistent with the health and welfare of affected employees. This bill would exempt from these provisions employees in a construction occupation, commercial drivers in the transportation industry, and employees in the security services industry employed as security officers if those employees are covered by a valid collective bargaining agreement containing specified terms, including meal period provisions. It would specify that its provisions do not affect the requirements for meal periods for certain other employees or employers.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 09/11/2009</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>

## California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2009

<p><a href="#"><u>AB 652</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Skinner</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Vehicles: vehicle length limitation.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 369, Statutes of 2009</p>	<p>Authorizes the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District to install folding devices attached to the front of its buses, extending not more than 40 inches from the front of the bus when fully deployed, and that the handlebars of the bicycles being transported extend not more than 46 inches from the front of the bus. Requires the district to report to the Legislature regarding safety issues and mobility improvements.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 08/24/2009</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 672</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Bass</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Transportation: bond-funded projects: letter of no prejudice.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 463, Statutes of 2009</p>	<p>Authorizes letters of no prejudice (LNOP) for certain bond-funded transportation projects, allowing these projects to move forward if bond funding is not yet available.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 06/02/2009</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 729</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Evans</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Public contracts: transit design-build contracts.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 466, Statutes of 2009</p>	<p>Extends the sunset date for transit operators to enter into design-build contracts to January 1, 2015.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 06/30/2009</b></p>	<p>Sponsor</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 744</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Torrico</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Transportation: toll lanes: Express Lane Network.</p>	<p>SENATE APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 08/27/2009-In committee: Held under submission.</p>	<p>Authorize development of a comprehensive network of high-occupancy toll — or HOT — lanes on Bay Area freeways, and allows solo drivers to pay a toll to use these lanes.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 07/15/2009</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 798</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Nava</u></a> (D)</p> <p>California Transportation Financing Authority: toll facilities.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 474, Statutes of 2009</p>	<p>Creates the California Transportation Financing Authority to issue bonds to fund transportation projects at the request of a public sector “project sponsor”.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 06/24/2009</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 810</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Caballero</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Circulation and transportation element.</p>	<p>SENATE L. GOV. 06/04/2009-Referred to Com. on L. GOV.</p>	<p>Existing law requires a general plan to include a statement of development policies and, among other elements, a circulation element consisting of the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and military airports and ports, and other local public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the land use element of the plan. This bill would rename the circulation element the circulation and transportation element and make other technical and conforming changes.</p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 1072</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Eng</u></a> (D)</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by</p>	<p>Provides transit operators with predictability in spending transit capital revenue made available through the issuance of the Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) by locking in a formula for allocation of the funds. Allows recipients</p>	<p>Sponsor</p>

### California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2009

Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account.	the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 271, Statutes of 2009	to “bank” their allocations over multiple years so that they can accumulate funds for large high-priority projects.  <b>Last Amended on 06/18/2009</b>	
<a href="#">AB 1135 Skinner</a> (D)  Vehicles: registration renewal.	ASSEMBLY 2 YEAR 06/02/2009-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. on 05/28/2009)	Existing law requires an owner of a vehicle to submit an application for renewal of a vehicle registration to the Department of Motor Vehicles no later than midnight of the expiration date. This bill would require the owner of a vehicle, upon application for renewal of a vehicle registration, to report the current odometer reading of the vehicle. The bill would require that information, except for the name and address of the vehicle owner and the vehicle license plate number , to be public information. The bill would also require the department to group the information into census blocks, create a database that can compile census block data and sort it by block group, census tract, and city and county, and post the data on the department's Internet Web site.  <b>Last Amended on 04/13/2009</b>	Watch
<a href="#">AB 1158 Havashi</a> (D)  Transit village plan.	ASSEMBLY VETOED 10/11/2009-Vetoed by the Governor	Adds the characteristic of other land uses, including educational facilities, that provide direct linkages for people traveling to and from primary and secondary education schools, community colleges, and universities, to the list of specified characteristics that a transit village plan may address. This bill would become operative only if AB 338 and this bill are both chaptered and become effective on or before January 1, 2010, and this bill is chaptered last.  <b>Last Amended on 06/25/2009</b>	Support
<a href="#">AB 1192 Strickland, Audra</a> (R)  Cities: powers.	ASSEMBLY 2 YEAR 06/08/2009-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(8). (Last location was L. GOV. on 5/6/2009)	Existing law authorizes a board of trustees, city council, or other governing body of a city, defined as a legislative body, to pass ordinances not in conflict with state or federal law and the state or federal constitution. This bill would prohibit a legislative body from selling or leasing any existing public improvement to a private or public entity, including any entity controlled by the city, for the purposes of renting or leasing back, or repurchasing through installment payments that existing public improvement . This bill would also declare that this prohibition is a matter of statewide concern, thus making it applicable to charter and general cities.  <b>Last Amended on 04/20/2009</b>	Oppose
<a href="#">AB 1203 Ma</a> (D)  Transportation bond funds: transit system safety.	ASSEMBLY CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 516, Statutes of 2009	Requires the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA), by February 1 of each fiscal year, to select eligible applicants for transit system safety projects from the Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response program (TSSSDRA) pursuant to Proposition 1B, and provide the State Controller with a list of the projects and sponsoring agencies eligible to receive an allocation.	Support
<a href="#">AB 1500 Lieu</a> (D)  High-occupancy lanes:	SENATE INACTIVE FILE 09/11/2009-To inactive file on motion of Senator	Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to designate certain lanes for the exclusive use of high-occupancy vehicles (HOV), which lanes may also be used, until January 1, 2011, by certain low-emission and hybrid vehicles not carrying the requisite number of passengers otherwise required for the use of an HOV lane if the vehicle displays a valid identifier issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles.	Watch

## California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2009

<p>single occupancy vehicles: sunset date.</p>	<p>Florez.</p>	<p>Existing law, until January 1, 2011, makes it a misdemeanor to illegally use a decal, label, or other identifiers issued by the department. This bill would extend the date, to January 1, 2014 , that specified low-emission vehicles can use high-occupancy lanes, the department can issue low-emission decals or other identifiers, and illegal use of a department-issued decal on a low-emission vehicle is considered a misdemeanor, creating a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 07/14/2009</b></p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>ACA 9</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Huffman</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Local government bonds: special taxes: voter approval.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY THIRD READING 08/31/2009-From committee: Be adopted. (Ayes 12. Noes 5.) (August 27). Read second time. To third reading.</p> <p>10/26/09 20 ASM ASSEMBLY THIRD READING FILE</p>	<p>Creates an additional exemption to the 1% limit on the tax rate on real property for a rate imposed by a city, county, or city and county to service bonded indebtedness, incurred to fund specified public improvements, facilities, and housing, and related costs that is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, or city and county.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 06/26/2009</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>ACA 15</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Arambula</u></a> (I)</p> <p>Local government transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY INACTIVE FILE 06/01/2009-To inactive file on motion of Assembly Member Arambula.</p>	<p>Amends the California Constitution to change the two-thirds voter-approval requirement for transportation related special taxes to 55%.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 31</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Pavley</u></a> (D)</p> <p>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: revenue allocations.</p>	<p>SENATE 2 YEAR 06/08/2009-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(8). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 6/3/2009)</p>	<p>Specifies certain uses for revenues collected pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 05/05/2009</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 83</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Hancock</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Traffic congestion: motor vehicle registration fees.</p>	<p>SENATE CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 554, Statutes of 2009</p>	<p>Existing law provides for the imposition by certain districts and local agencies of fees on the registration of motor vehicles in certain areas of the state that are in addition to the basic vehicle registration fee collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles for specific limited purposes. The bill would authorize a countywide transportation planning agency, 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 require voter approval of the measure. The 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</p>	<p>Support</p>



## California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2009

		<p>require that the fees collected may be used only to pay for programs and projects bearing a relationship or benefit to the owners of motor vehicles paying the fee and are consistent with a regional transportation plan, 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 countywide transportation planning agency to adopt a specified expenditure plan.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 09/04/2009</b></p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 124 Oropeza</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Air pollution: schoolbus idling and idling at schools.</p>	<p>SENATE CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 561, Statutes of 2009</p>	<p>Existing regulations adopted by the state board establish toxic control measures to limit schoolbus idling and idling at schools. Those existing regulations require drivers of schoolbuses, transit buses, school pupil activity buses, youth buses, general public paratransit vehicles, as those terms are defined in the regulations, and specified transit buses and commercial motor vehicles to, among other things, turn off the bus or vehicle engine upon stopping at or within 100 feet of a school, prohibits those drivers from turning the bus or vehicle engine on more than 30 seconds before beginning to depart from a school or within 100 feet of a school, and prohibits those drivers from causing the bus or vehicle to idle for more than 5 consecutive minutes or 5 aggregate minutes in any one hour at any location greater than 100 feet from a school. Those existing regulations provide that any violation of those requirements subjects the driver or the motor carrier to a minimum civil penalty of \$100 and to criminal penalties. This bill would codify those regulations, and would increase the minimum civil penalty for a violation to \$300 and authorize additional civil penalties.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 08/27/2009</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 205 Hancock</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Traffic congestion: motor vehicle registration fees.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY APPR. SUSPENSE 08/27/2009-Set, second hearing. Held in committee and under submission.</p>	<p>Existing law provides for the imposition by certain districts and local agencies of fees on the registration of motor vehicles in certain areas of the state that are in addition to the basic vehicle registration fee collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles for specific limited purposes. The bill would authorize a countywide transportation planning agency, 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 require voter approval of the measure. The 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 are consistent with a regional transportation plan, 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 countywide transportation planning agency to adopt a specified expenditure plan.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 07/13/2009</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 406 DeSaulnier</u></a> (D)</p> <p>Land use: environmental quality.</p>	<p>SENATE VETOED 10/11/2009-Vetoed by the Governor</p>	<p>The Planning and Zoning Law establishes the Planning Advisory and Assistance Council in the Office of Planning and Research, and prescribes the membership and duties of the council. This bill would change the designated membership, as specified, of the Planning Advisory and Assistance Council and would require that the council work with the Strategic Growth Council, regional agencies, and cities and counties to facilitate the implementation of regional blueprint plans. The bill would also require the council to develop and propose recommendations to specified state agencies to facilitate coordination between</p>	<p>Watch</p>

## California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2009

		<p>regional blueprint plans, state growth and infrastructure funding plans, and programs that facilitate the implementation of regional blueprint plans. The bill would further require the council to report to the Legislature on regional performance measures, as specified, and on the manner in which state agencies are implementing the 5-year infrastructure plan. The bill would require the council to begin to perform the above functions and duties when sufficient funding, as determined by the council, exists from the revenue transmitted to it by metropolitan planning organizations, councils of governments, or county transportation commissions and subregional councils of governments jointly preparing subregional sustainable communities strategies. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 09/04/2009</b></p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 409</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Ducheny</u></a> (D) Department of Railroads.</p>	<p>SENATE THIRD READING 09/01/2009-Read second time. To third reading.</p>	<p>Existing law creates the Department of Transportation in the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, with various powers and duties relative to the intercity rail passenger program, among other transportation programs. Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority, with various powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed passenger train system. Existing law creates the Public Utilities Commission, with various powers and duties relative to railroads, among other responsibilities. This bill would create the Department of Railroads in the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, and create the positions of director and deputy director within the department, to be appointed by the Governor, as specified. The director would be subject to Senate confirmation. The bill would transfer to the department responsibility for various state railroad programs currently administered by the above-referenced agencies. The bill would specify new duties of the department relative to an analysis of the state's freight rail transportation system. The bill would provide that the department shall be the only state agency eligible to apply for and receive grant and loan funds from the federal government for intercity rail, high-speed rail, or freight rail purposes. The bill would require the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing to convene a joint task force cochaired by the Director of Transportation, the Director of Railroads, and a representative of the Public Utilities Commission for the purpose of resolving issues relative to overlapping jurisdiction of the agencies. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 05/21/2009</b></p>	Watch
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 455</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Lowenthal</u></a> (D) High-speed rail.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY INACTIVE FILE 07/24/2009-Placed on inactive file on request of Assembly Member Torrico.</p>	<p>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed train system. The authority is composed of 9 members, including 5 members appointed by the Governor. This bill would provide that the members of the authority appointed by the Governor are subject to appointment with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill would require the members of the authority, at a scheduled board meeting, to cause to be prepared an overall project schedule with project delivery milestones on a quarterly basis, and to approve a quarterly contract status report, beginning at the first board meeting after March 1, 2010. The bill would also require the members of the authority to approve all contract amendments at a scheduled board meeting.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 04/16/2009</b></p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 518</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Lowenthal</u></a> (D)</p>	<p>SENATE 2 YEAR 06/08/2009-Failed Deadline pursuant to</p>	<p>Existing law authorizes the governing board of a community college district to require students in attendance and employees at a campus of the district to pay a fee for the purposes of partially or fully recovering transportation costs incurred by the district or of reducing fares for services provided by</p>	Watch

## California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2009

<p>Vehicles: parking services and fees.</p>	<p>Rule 61(a)(8). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 6/3/2009)</p>	<p>common carriers or municipally owned transit systems to those students and employees. The fees authorized may be required to be paid only by students and employees using the services. In the alternative, all students and employees on that campus may be required to pay the fees for a certain period of time upon a favorable vote of a majority of both groups or by all students on that campus for a certain period of time upon a favorable majority vote of the students; however, the employees would be excluded from using the services. Los Rios, Peralta, and Rio Hondo community college districts are only authorized to charge the transportation services fee to students and employees using the services, unless the above voting procedures have been followed. This bill would remove the limitations on the Los Rios, Peralta, and Rio Hondo community college districts' collection of the transportation service fees from the students and employees at the affected campuses.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 05/28/2009</b></p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 575 Steinberg</u></a> (D) Local planning: housing element.</p>	<p>SENATE CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 354, Statutes of 2009</p>	<p>Existing law requires metropolitan planning organizations to conduct at least 2 informational meetings in each county within the region for members of the board of supervisors and city councils on the sustainable communities strategy and alternative planning strategy. Existing law provides that the purpose of the meetings is to present a draft of the sustainable communities strategy to the members of the board of supervisors and the city council members in that county and to solicit and consider their input and recommendations. This bill would instead provide that the purpose of the meeting or meetings is to discuss the sustainable communities strategy and alternative planning strategy, if any, including the key land use and planning assumptions, with the members of the board of supervisors and the city council members in that county and to solicit and consider their input and recommendations. The bill would require the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization to use the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region as its sustainable communities strategy, if specified requirements are met.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 08/17/2009</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 716 Wolk</u></a> (D) Local transportation funds.</p>	<p>SENATE CHAPTERED 10/11/2009-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 609, Statutes of 2009</p>	<p>Existing law requires that 1/4% of the local sales and use tax be transferred to the local transportation fund of the county for allocation, as directed by the transportation planning agency, to various transportation purposes. Existing law specifies the allowable uses for local transportation funds, and generally requires these funds to be used for transit purposes in urban counties, while in counties with a population under 500,000 as of the 1970 census and certain other counties, these funds may also be used for local streets and roads, if the transportation planning agency finds that there are no unmet transit needs or no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, and for other specified purposes. This bill, for counties that had a population of less than 500,000 as of the 1970 decennial census, but that have a population of 500,000 or more as of the 2000 decennial census or at a subsequent census, would require the local transportation funds apportioned to the urbanized areas of those counties to generally be allocated for public transit purposes and not for street and road purposes, except that cities in those counties with a population of 100,000 or fewer would be exempt from this requirement. Local transportation funds apportioned to the nonurbanized areas in those counties would remain available for allocation to street and road purposes and for other specified purposes. The bill would delay, until July 1, 2014, the application of these new provisions in counties where they apply. The bill would exempt Ventura County from these provisions and instead authorize the Ventura County Transportation Commission to submit, by December 31, 2011, a report to the Legislature analyzing options for organizing public mass transportation services in the county</p>	<p>Neutral</p>

### California Transit Association Matrix of Significant Legislation 2009

		<p>and for expenditure of revenues in the local transportation fund, along with a recommended legislative proposal. If a legislative proposal is not enacted by the end of the 2011-12 Regular Session of the Legislature, local transportation funds in Ventura County would be available solely for transit purposes beginning July 1, 2014. The bill, in counties and areas of counties where local transportation funds may be allocated to local streets and roads, would also authorize allocation of those funds for specified farmworker vanpool purposes upon a finding by the transportation planning agency that there are no unmet transit needs or no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet and after all of the capital and operating funds necessary to meet unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet are allocated. The bill would make other related changes.</p> <p><b>Last Amended on 09/03/2009</b></p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>SCR 10</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Liu</u></a> (D) Railroad Safety Month.</p>	<p>SENATE CHAPTERED 06/02/2009-Chaptered by Secretary of State. Res. Chapter 42, Statutes of 2009.</p>	<p>This measure would designate September as "Railroad Safety Month."</p>	<p>Support</p>