

CALIFORNIA TRANSIT ASSOCIATION



2010

INTERIM  
LEGISLATIVE  
SUMMARY





**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)

September 14, 2010

To: All Members of the California Transit Association

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

**RE: 2010 YEAR-END LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY**

The year 2010 marked the worst economic crisis in the state's history and ultimately had a mixed impact on funding for public transportation. Despite addressing a shortfall of over \$60 billion in FY 09-10, the state continues to grapple with a budget deficit of \$19.9 billion for FY 10-11. As of this publication, the legislature has yet to agree on how to solve the problem. The Governor cited the worldwide market collapse, the loss of jobs (12.2% state unemployment rate as of June 2010) 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 \$1.586 billion in FY 10-11, yet the Association was able to acquire the second highest level of State Transit Assistance (STA) program allocations (\$400 million) ever while fully funding the intercity rail program, and creating a growing STA program for the future.

The allocations were made possible through the Supreme Court's ruling to deny the State to an appeal of *Shaw v. Chiang* in late September of 2009, 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 required the legislature to restore funding to the Public Transportation Account (PTA). While the Governor and the legislature attempted to circumvent the court's ruling by repealing the sales tax on gasoline in order to eliminate funding for public transportation, the Association fought to maintain and actually *increased* state funding for public transportation, while providing much needed General Fund relief through the "gas tax swap" package. The package should stave off future raids of public transportation revenue but in the meantime, the Association continues to fight to protect future revenue from being diverted in order to accomplish the Association's vision of a "fully-funded, efficient, and effective public transit system operating in a balanced network."

The Association was also successful in helping to move high-priority legislation for our members to the Governor's desk. 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). In fact, the legislature agreed to appropriate \$1.5 billion in PTMISEA funding through FY 12-13.

The following report summarizes the status of all legislative proposals the Association tracked and/or lobbied during the 2010 Legislative Session, divided as follows:

- **Significant Transit Legislation** – Identifies and describes high-priority legislation supported by the Association, pending the Governor’s signature in 2010.
- **2010-11 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 2010 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. Association staff will produce a final report later this fall, after the Governor has acted on legislation and a final budget agreement has been reached. In the meantime, should you have any questions regarding any portion of this report, please feel free to contact Gus Khouri at (916) 446-4656.

# 2010 Summary of California Transit Association High-Priority Legislation

---

- **AB 987 (Ma) Transit village development districts.**  
Recasts the area in a transit village development district to include all land within 1/2 mile of a transit station entrance.  
**Status: Enrolled to the Governor**
- **AB 2324 (Perez) Transit: public transit facilities.**  
Would make it a misdemeanor to carry weapons at a public transit facility, trespass in an unauthorized area of a public transit facility, destroy property at a public transit facility, and/or engage in other dangerous or disturbing activities at transit facilities.  
**Status: Enrolled to the Governor**
- **SB 82 (Hancock) Community colleges: transportation fees.**  
Increases the ceiling that community college districts are authorized to charge students and district employees for combined parking and transportation costs, in order to make transit service more accessible to students and staff. Any fee for transportation services would have to be approved by a vote of the students.  
**Status: Enrolled to the Governor**
- **SB 1320 (Hancock) Transit fare evasion and passenger misconduct: administrative adjudication.**  
Authorizes the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Sacramento Regional Transit District, Long Beach Transit, Foothill Transit, and the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District to adopt and enforce an administrative adjudication ordinance addressing fare evasion and passenger misconduct.  
**Status: Enrolled to the Governor**
- **SB 1371 (Correa) Transportation: bond-funded projects: letter of no prejudice.**  
Authorizes an eligible recipient of the Proposition 1A High-speed Rail Bond Act connectivity pot (\$950 million) to utilize the letter of no prejudice (LONP) process to secure contracts.  
**Status: Enrolled to the Governor**



# **AB 987 (Ma)**

## **Transit Village Development Districts**

### **Purpose:**

AB 987 (Ma) recasts the area in a Transit Village Development District (TVDD) to include all land within 1/2 mile of a transit station entrance.

### **Position:**

Support

### **Background:**

Under the Transit Village Development Planning Act (TVDPDA) of 1994, a city or county can prepare a Transit Village Plan for a TVDD that addresses several characteristics, including a neighborhood centered around transit, with a mix of housing types within ¼ mile of the transit station. At the time the TVDPDA was developed, it was believed that ¼ mile was the maximum distance that a pedestrian would walk in order to access public transit. Recent research however from 2007 published by the San Jose State University Mineta Transportation Institute found that riders are willing to walk further than what was commonly assumed. This bill therefore expands the boundaries for TVDDs in order to encourage planners and policy makers to broaden their scope in encouraging transit-oriented development.

### **Impact:**

This bill reflects the trend that people are willing to travel longer distances to take transit than previously believed. As a result, it would create the opportunity for wider access to public transit which would increase ridership and further incentivize investments in public transportation.





# **AB 2324 (Perez)**

## **Transit Facilities and Public Safety**

### **Purpose:**

AB 2324 (Perez) makes it a misdemeanor to carry weapons at a public transit facility, trespass in an unauthorized area of a public transit facility, destroy property at a public transit facility, and/or engage in other dangerous or disturbing activities at transit facilities.

### **Position:**

Support

### **Background:**

In the aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attacks, the state made changes to the Penal Code to address issues of trespassing and weapons possession at airports and other public facilities. These laws however were not extended to public transit facilities.

Existing law prohibits a person from knowingly possessing weapons within any sterile area of an airport or passenger vessel terminal, prohibits an unauthorized person from knowingly entering any airport operations area or passenger vessel terminal if the area has been posted with certain notices, and prohibits a person from intentionally avoiding submission to screening and inspection when entering or reentering a sterile area of an airport or passenger vessel terminal. Violations are punishable by a fine or time in county jail. This bill applies these prohibitions and penalties to public transit vehicle stations.

### **Impact:**

This bill will allow transit properties to better exercise authority against misdemeanors on their property and enhance security for both transit personnel and the public.



# **SB 82 (Hancock)**

## **Transportation fees at Community Colleges**

### **Purpose:**

SB 82 (Hancock) increases the ceiling that community college districts are authorized to charge students and district employees for combined parking and transportation costs, in order to make transit service more accessible to students and staff. Any fee for transportation services would have to be approved by a vote of the students.

### **Position:**

Support

### **Background:**

A number of community colleges are initiating or expanding transit services for students. These services take the form of either programs provided by the district, or programs where the district contracts with local mass transit agencies to provide passes to students at a discounted rate. Current law provides that a community college district can require students and employees of the district who use parking services to pay up to \$60 per semester and \$30 per intersession for the transportation costs incurred by the district or the costs of reducing fares for services provided by transit systems to students and employees.

By increasing the total ceiling districts are authorized to charge for parking and transportation services combined (to \$70 per semester or \$35 per intersession), college districts would be “incentivized” to continue providing these programs even as overall transportation costs to the district increase.

### **Impact:**

This bill will help to encourage new and/or continued use of transit by community college students and staff, because districts will be able to contract with transit systems to provide lower fares, without incurring as much increased cost year to year as they would under current law.



# **SB 1320 (Hancock)**

## **Administrative Adjudication for Transit Fare Evasion and Passenger Misconduct**

### **Purpose:**

SB 1320 (Hancock) authorizes the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Sacramento Regional Transit District, Long Beach Transit, Foothill Transit, and the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District to adopt and enforce an administrative adjudication ordinance addressing fare evasion and passenger misconduct.

### **Position:**

Support

### **Background:**

Existing law already authorizes the City and County of San Francisco and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) to enforce an administrative adjudication ordinance against fare evaders and misconduct. Through fines and civil proceedings, these entities can provide faster resolution to infractions and more efficient control over a prepaid fare system, while freeing up courts to handle more serious offenses. This bill will grant the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Sacramento Regional Transit District, Long Beach Transit, Foothill Transit, and the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District the same type of administrative adjudication authority.

### **Impact:**

This bill will help the above mentioned transit districts handle fare evasion and misconduct cases in an expeditious and efficient fashion, while reducing pressure on their respective judicial systems by removing these cases from the system. This bill can help these transit agencies with overall efficiency, oversight, and public safety, especially in the case of prepaid fare systems.



# **SB 1371 (Correa)**

## **Letter of No Prejudice Process for Proposition 1A High-Speed Rail Bond Act Projects**

### **Purpose:**

SB 1371 (Correa) authorizes eligible transit systems to utilize the letter of no prejudice (LONP) process for the \$950 million pot of money that is dedicated for capital projects on existing passenger rail lines, in order to provide connectivity to the high-speed train system and for capacity enhancements and safety improvements to those lines, under the \$9.95 billion Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century (Proposition 1A).

### **Position:**

Support

### **Background:**

The Legislature must appropriate the \$950 million transit connectivity Proposition 1A funds in order for the funds to be allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The LONP process provides the option for transit systems to begin these capital improvement projects in advance of the actual CTC allocation. Many transit systems intend to use their apportionment to comply with federal regulations to implement positive train control or institute service efficiencies by electrifying their system in order to reduce operating costs and increase service, among other things. Transit systems have benefited from the LONP process already authorized to address projects under the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1B). SB 1371 would allow a nearly identical process for transit agencies to apply to the CTC for letters of no prejudice for Proposition 1A funds so that they may use their funds up front for projects with the promise of bond fund reimbursement as long as the funds become available.

**Impact:**

By providing the LONP process for Prop 1A funds, transit systems will be able to move forward with projects in a flexible and timely manner. This bill allows transit systems to advance their capital improvement projects more quickly by using their own funds to start a project with the promise of reimbursement once Proposition 1A is available. These systems would be able to provide safer transport to their passengers earlier than they would be able to without the LONP option.



## 2010-11 State Budget Highlights

The year 2010 marked the worst economic crisis in the state's history and ultimately had a mixed impact on funding for public transportation. Despite addressing a shortfall of over \$60 billion in FY 09-10, the state continues to grapple with a budget deficit of \$19 billion for FY 10-11. As of this publication, the legislature has yet to agree on how to solve the problem. The Governor cited the worldwide market collapse, the loss of jobs (12.2% state unemployment rate as of June 2010) 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 \$1.586 billion in FY 10-11, yet the Association was able to acquire the second highest level of State Transit Assistance (STA) program allocations (\$400 million) ever while fully funding the intercity rail program, and creating a growing STA program for the future. The allocations were made possible through the Supreme Court's ruling to deny the State to an appeal of *Shaw v. Chiang* in late September of 2009, 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 required the legislature to restore funding to the Public Transportation Account (PTA).

While the Governor and the legislature attempted to circumvent the court's ruling by repealing the sales tax on gasoline and diesel in order to eliminate funding for public transportation, the Association fought to maintain and actually *increased* state funding for public transportation, while providing much needed General Fund relief through the "gas tax swap" package. The following is a brief of summary of the key impacts to transportation and public transportation due to the gas tax swap, as enacted in March:

### ABx8 6:

- ◆ Eliminates the sales tax on gasoline and increases the excise tax on gasoline by 17.3 cents.
- ◆ Beginning in 2011-12, increases the sales tax on diesel fuel by 1.75% (5% to 6.75%) and decreases the excise tax on diesel by 4.4 cents in 2011-12 (from 18 to 13.6 cents).
- ◆ The Board of Equalization will adjust this tax annually thereafter to maintain revenue neutrality. This change will generate roughly \$118 million in additional revenue for the PTA to fund the STA program and other PTA eligible expenditures.

### ABx8 9:

- ◆ Appropriates \$400 million to transit operators to help fund operations (STA) for the remainder of FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11.
- ◆ Provides that 75% of revenue from the diesel sales tax be directed to transit operators beginning in 2011-12 (roughly \$350 million per year). The amount available for intercity rail and other state purposes will grow, via receipt of 25% of the state sales tax on gas and most of the non-Article XIX transportation funds (about \$72 million per year).
- ◆ Protects the education funding guarantee (Prop 98).
- ◆ Appropriates approximately \$600 million of revenue from the increased gas excise tax to go to bond debt service on an annual basis. The remaining funds (\$650 million) will be split as follows: 12% SHOPP, 44% STIP, 44% Local Streets and Roads.
- ◆ Exempts the STA program fund allocations made after January 1, 2010, and through FY 2011-12 from the operating cost per revenue vehicle hour eligibility standards of Public Utilities Code section 99314.6.

### Impact on Transit

The legislature was able to capture a total of \$1.586 billion in traditional sources of public transportation funding (spillover, Proposition 42, Proposition 111, and sales tax on diesel) for FY 10-11 through the "gas tax swap". In turn, public transportation received a \$400 million appropriation to the State Transit Assistance program from the balance frozen in the PTA as a result of the *Shaw v. Chiang* lawsuit. The intercity rail program received a \$129 million appropriation from that balance for FY 10-11 and is expected to receive a like amount for FY 11-12.

Beginning in FY 11-12, only the sales tax on diesel is retained. The rate is increased from 4.75% to 6.5% in order to create additional revenue for what remains of state funding for public transportation. Local transit operators are expected to receive \$348 million as a result of the 75% allocation to the STA program from the sales tax on diesel, with the promise of growth in future years. The remaining 25% is dedicated primarily to the intercity rail program, as well as the other traditional expenditures of the PTA (CPUC, CTC, PTA-STIP, etc.). Non-article XIX funds which are derived from the sale of documents and miscellaneous services to the public were also dedicated to the intercity rail program in the future to ensure full funding.

### **Impact on Transportation**

By increasing the excise tax from 18 cents to 35.3 cents, the legislature found new capacity on an annual basis without borrowing to pay down bond debt service and provide additional revenue to the STIP, SHOPP, and local streets and roads. For FY 10-11, the total amount of revenue generated is estimated to be \$2.5 billion and would flow as follows:

- ◆ \$603 million to pay general obligation bond debt (i.e. General Fund savings).
- ◆ \$1.26 billion to pay STIP and streets & roads costs, to fully backfill lost Proposition 42 revenues previously dedicated for those purposes; and
- ◆ \$650 million in additional Article XIX transportation revenues for future appropriation by the legislature which is to be split 44/44/12 between the STIP, local streets and roads, and the SHOPP. The Governor proposes to borrow this amount and repay it in 2013. This funding is available on a one-time only basis.

For 2011-12 and beyond, approximately \$2.4 billion annually in new excise gas tax revenue is to be allocated as follows:

- ◆ \$727 million to pay general obligation bond debt (i.e. General Fund savings); and,
- ◆ \$1.5 billion for STIP, SHOPP and streets & roads costs.

### **Proposition 1B**

The legislature has included \$1.5 billion in funding for the Public Transportation Modernization Improvement and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) and \$101.3 million for the Transit System Security Safety and Disaster Response Account (TSSSDRA). These amounts will be made available once the FY 10-11 budget is enacted.

The PTMISEA appropriation would occur in 2010-11, yet the \$1.5 billion would incorporate three years of expenditures (through FY 12-13) as provided by PTMISEA recipients to Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation (DMT). While the requested amount for expenditures by PTMISEA recipients is over \$700 million for FY 10-11, this action allows more projects to advance ahead of schedule. Any unallocated portion would carry over to 2011-12.

### **Budget Remains Unresolved**

At the time of this publication, the legislature had yet to agree on a solution to address the \$19 billion FY 10-11 budget. There have been some discussions about yet another tax swap that would reduce corporate, personal income, and sales tax rates, while expanding the sales tax to services in order to close the gap. A reduction in the sales tax rate would decimate state funding for public transportation. The Association has received verbal commitments that the sales tax on diesel would be exempted from such a reduction if it were to occur.

According 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. While this is to be expected in the face of such a severe fiscal crisis, the Governor states that it is not possible to have balanced the budget entirely with permanent tax increases and ongoing spending cuts, given federal, constitutional and other limitations. The Legislative Analyst's Office predicts a structural deficit of \$20 bill through 2015.



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

June 22, 2010

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

Re: State Transit Assistance Allocation

Attached is a schedule of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds allocated for the 2009-10 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.

Pursuant to PUC Section 99312, this allocation is intended to cover the two-year period of the 2009-10 and 2010-11 fiscal years. The total amount allocated to all agencies was \$399,984,00. The payment is scheduled to be made on June 25, 2010. 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  
 2009-2010 Fiscal Year

Regional Entity	PUC 99313 Allocations Paid 6-25-2010	PUC 99314 Allocations Paid 6-25-2010	Total Allocations
TRPA	\$ 488,622	\$ 19,953	\$ 508,575
MTC	38,521,104	105,599,967	144,121,071
SACOG	9,418,393	5,288,117	14,706,510
Alpine	6,272	0	6,272
Amador	198,881	18,979	217,860
Butte	1,152,905	59,490	1,212,395
Calaveras	240,177	0	240,177
Colusa	114,884	6,149	121,033
Del Norte	154,316	1,480	155,796
El Dorado	787,226	72,576	859,802
Fresno	4,921,359	998,704	5,920,063
Glenn	152,707	0	152,707
Humboldt	693,342	83,210	776,552
Imperial	936,194	0	936,194
Inyo	94,265	0	94,265
Kern	4,320,093	378,820	4,698,913
Kings	808,179	108,806	916,985
Lake	334,385	26,601	360,986
Lassen	185,668	16,514	202,182
Los Angeles	54,280,702	62,806,172	117,086,874
Madera	795,582	0	795,582
Mariposa	95,607	1,107	96,714
Mendocino	471,121	34,955	506,076
Merced	1,339,367	72,919	1,412,286
Modoc	50,650	0	50,650
Mono	70,528	29,186	99,714
Monterey	2,255,651	428,901	2,684,552
Nevada	515,577	33,342	548,919
Orange	16,394,208	7,094,938	23,489,146
Placer	1,438,724	290,152	1,728,876
Plumas	107,755	0	107,755
Riverside	11,007,682	1,794,269	12,801,951
San Benito	303,001	0	303,001
San Bernardino	10,763,766	2,373,978	13,137,744
SANDAG	4,120,251	1,824,851	5,945,102
San Diego MTS	12,453,566	6,353,217	18,806,783
San Joaquin	3,600,961	986,314	4,587,275
San Luis Obispo	1,412,375	92,579	1,504,954
Santa Barbara	2,252,622	696,720	2,949,342
Santa Cruz	1,403,016	1,398,534	2,801,550
Shasta	955,878	61,366	1,017,244
Sierra	17,538	0	17,538
Siskiyou	240,104	13,533	253,637
Stanislaus	2,749,151	208,130	2,957,281
Tehama	328,175	0	328,175
Trinity	72,904	2,345	75,249
Tulare	2,305,732	226,151	2,531,883
Tuolumne	294,222	0	294,222
Ventura	4,366,612	488,975	4,855,587
		18	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 199,992,000</b>	<b>\$ 199,992,000</b>	<b>\$ 399,984,000</b>

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2009-10 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**ALLOCATION SUMMARY**

Regional Entity	PUC 99313 Allocations To Date	PUC 99314 Allocations To Date	Prior Allocations	Current Allocation	Total Allocations To Date
TRPA	\$ 488,622	\$ 19,953	\$ 0	\$ 508,575	\$ 508,575
MTC	38,521,104	105,599,967	0	144,121,071	144,121,071
SACOG	9,418,393	5,288,117	0	14,706,510	14,706,510
Alpine	6,272	0	0	6,272	6,272
Amador	198,881	18,979	0	217,860	217,860
Butte	1,152,905	59,490	0	1,212,395	1,212,395
Calaveras	240,177	0	0	240,177	240,177
Colusa	114,884	6,149	0	121,033	121,033
Del Norte	154,316	1,480	0	155,796	155,796
El Dorado	787,226	72,576	0	859,802	859,802
Fresno	4,921,359	998,704	0	5,920,063	5,920,063
Glenn	152,707	0	0	152,707	152,707
Humboldt	693,342	83,210	0	776,552	776,552
Imperial	936,194	0	0	936,194	936,194
Inyo	94,265	0	0	94,265	94,265
Kern	4,320,093	378,820	0	4,698,913	4,698,913
Kings	808,179	108,806	0	916,985	916,985
Lake	334,385	26,601	0	360,986	360,986
Lassen	185,668	16,514	0	202,182	202,182
Los Angeles	54,280,702	62,806,172	0	117,086,874	117,086,874
Madera	795,582	0	0	795,582	795,582
Mariposa	95,607	1,107	0	96,714	96,714
Mendocino	471,121	34,955	0	506,076	506,076
Merced	1,339,367	72,919	0	1,412,286	1,412,286
Modoc	50,650	0	0	50,650	50,650
Mono	70,528	29,186	0	99,714	99,714
Monterey	2,255,651	428,901	0	2,684,552	2,684,552
Nevada	515,577	33,342	0	548,919	548,919
Orange	16,394,208	7,094,938	0	23,489,146	23,489,146
Placer	1,438,724	290,152	0	1,728,876	1,728,876
Plumas	107,755	0	0	107,755	107,755
Riverside	11,007,682	1,794,269	0	12,801,951	12,801,951
San Benito	303,001	0	0	303,001	303,001
San Bernardino	10,763,766	2,373,978	0	13,137,744	13,137,744
SANDAG	4,120,251	1,824,851	0	5,945,102	5,945,102
San Diego MTS	12,453,566	6,353,217	0	18,806,783	18,806,783
San Joaquin	3,600,961	986,314	0	4,587,275	4,587,275
San Luis Obispo	1,412,375	92,579	0	1,504,954	1,504,954
Santa Barbara	2,252,622	696,720	0	2,949,342	2,949,342
Santa Cruz	1,403,016	1,398,534	0	2,801,550	2,801,550
Shasta	955,878	61,366	0	1,017,244	1,017,244
Sierra	17,538	0	0	17,538	17,538
Siskiyou	240,104	13,533	0	253,637	253,637
Stanislaus	2,749,151	208,130	0	2,957,281	2,957,281
Tehama	328,175	0	0	328,175	328,175
Trinity	72,904	2,345	0	75,249	75,249
Tulare	2,305,732	226,151	0	2,531,883	2,531,883
Tuolumne	294,222	0	0	294,222	294,222
Ventura	4,366,612	488,975	0	4,855,587	4,855,587
Subtotals	<u>\$ 199,992,000</u>	<u>\$ 199,992,000</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 399,984,000</u>	<u>\$ 399,984,000</u>
Totals		<u>\$ 399,984,000</u> <sub>19</sub>		<u>\$ 399,984,000</u>	<u>\$ 399,984,000</u>

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2009-10 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Prior Allocations	Current Allocation	Allocations To Date
<b>TRPA</b>				
County of El Dorado	\$ 10,461	\$ 0	\$ 600	\$ 600
City of South Lake Tahoe	338,008	0	19,353	19,353
Regional Entity Totals	348,469	0	19,953	19,953
<b>MTC</b>				
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District	*	**	***	****
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	NA	0	237,921	237,921
City of Benicia	203,572	0	11,659	11,659
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	9,651,967	0	552,672	552,672
City of Dixon	98,000	0	5,611	5,611
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority	3,693,676	0	211,516	211,516
City of Fairfield	2,325,012	0	133,117	133,117
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District	78,285,853	0	4,482,415	4,482,415
City of Healdsburg	47,608	0	2,727	2,727
Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority	3,523,024	0	201,723	201,723
Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency	758,822	0	43,448	43,448
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	89,491,116	0	5,124,127	5,124,127
City of Rio Vista	65,593	0	3,755	3,755
City of San Francisco	*	**	***	****
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	*	**	***	****
San Mateo County Transit District	73,190,851	0	4,191,227	4,191,227
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	253,858,786	0	14,535,971	14,535,971
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express	NA	0	331,352	331,352
City of Santa Rosa	2,663,856	0	152,522	152,522
County of Sonoma	2,667,546	0	152,743	152,743
City of Union City	363,528	0	20,821	20,821
City of Vallejo	9,834,238	0	563,133	563,133
Western Contra Costa Transit Authority	4,368,008	0	250,121	250,121
Regional Entity Totals	1,834,305,512	0	105,599,967	105,599,967
<b>SACOG</b>				
City of Davis	2,592,732	0	148,455	148,455
City of Elk Grove	1,942,385	0	102,368	102,368
City of Folsom	272,826	0	13,982	13,982
Sacramento Regional Transit System	83,970,378	0	4,808,281	4,808,281
Yolo County Transit Authority	2,497,965	0	143,020	143,020
Yuba Sutter Transit Authority	1,257,710	0	72,011	72,011
Regional Entity Totals	92,533,996	0	5,288,117	5,288,117

(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 \$1,299,214,456.
- \*\* The combined prior allocation for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$0.
- \*\*\* The combined current allocation for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$74,391,386.
- \*\*\*\* 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 \$74,391,386.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2009-10 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**PUC 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>
Alpine	None	None	None	None
Amador				
Amador Regional Transit System	331,473	0	18,979	18,979
Butte				
Butte County Association of Governments	1,038,995	0	59,490	59,490
Calaveras	None	None	None	None
Colusa				
County of Colusa	107,398	0	6,149	6,149
Del Norte				
Redwood Coast Transit Authority	162,059	0	1,480	1,480
El Dorado				
El Dorado County Transit Authority	1,267,468	0	72,576	72,576
Fresno				
City of Clovis	210,151	0	12,045	12,045
City of Fresno	15,800,482	0	904,703	904,703
Fresno County Rural Transit Agency	1,431,453	0	81,956	81,956
Regional Entity Totals	17,442,086	0	998,704	998,704
Glenn	None	None	None	None
Humboldt				
City of Arcata	235,088	0	13,461	13,461
City of Eureka	254,140	0	14,554	14,554
City of Fortuna	11,628	0	666	666
Humboldt Transit Authority	952,386	0	54,529	54,529
Regional Entity Totals	1,453,242	0	83,210	83,210
Imperial	None	None	None	None
Inyo	None	None	None	None

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2009-10 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**PUC 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>
<b>Kern</b>				
City of Arvin	37,266	0	2,134	2,134
City of California City	23,420	0	1,341	1,341
City of Delano	65,779	0	3,766	3,766
Golden Empire Transit District	5,268,626	0	301,710	301,710
County of Kern	764,878	0	43,796	43,796
City of Ridgecrest	43,762	0	2,510	2,510
City of Shafter	53,381	0	2,899	2,899
City of Taft	319,973	0	18,322	18,322
City of Tehachapi	4,005	0	229	229
City of Wasco	36,899	0	2,113	2,113
Regional Entity Totals	<u>6,617,989</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>378,820</u>	<u>378,820</u>
<b>Kings</b>				
City of Corcoran	106,104	0	6,075	6,075
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	2,285,078	0	102,731	102,731
Regional Entity Totals	<u>2,391,182</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>108,806</u>	<u>108,806</u>
<b>Lake</b>				
Lake Transit Authority	464,624	0	26,601	26,601
<b>Lassen</b>				
County of Lassen	288,449	0	16,514	16,514

(Continued)



**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE  
2009-10 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION  
PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Prior Allocations	Current Allocation	Allocations To Date
<b>Los Angeles</b>				
Antelope Valley Transit Authority	12,113,481	0	693,518	693,518
City of Arcadia	1,167,113	0	66,832	66,832
City of Claremont	59,037	0	3,386	3,386
City of Commerce	1,982,809	0	113,537	113,537
City of Culver City	4,431,027	0	253,803	253,803
Foothill Transit Zone	40,100,773	0	2,296,147	2,296,147
City of Gardena	6,439,195	0	368,730	368,730
City of La Mirada	840,725	0	48,138	48,138
Long Beach Public Transportation Company	46,395,248	0	2,656,489	2,656,489
City of Los Angeles	61,295,682	0	3,508,228	3,508,228
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	763,411,611	0	43,712,609	43,712,609
City of Montebello	15,474,412	0	886,113	886,113
City of Norwalk	6,402,177	0	366,581	366,581
City of Redondo Beach	2,854,335	0	163,412	163,412
City of Santa Monica	34,565,984	0	1,979,107	1,979,107
Southern California Regional Rail Authority	161,959,904			
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority		0	4,942,448	4,942,448
Orange County Transportation Authority		*****	*****	*****
Riverside County Transportation Commission		*****	*****	*****
San Bernardino Associated Governments		*****	*****	*****
Ventura County Transportation Commission		*****	*****	*****
City of Torrance	13,048,303	0	747,094	747,094
Regional Entity Totals	1,172,541,816	0	62,806,172	62,806,172
<b>Madera</b>	None	None	None	None
<b>Mariposa</b>				
County of Mariposa	19,325	0	1,107	1,107
<b>Mendocino</b>				
Mendocino Transit Authority	610,466	0	34,955	34,955
<b>Merced</b>				
County of Merced	1,273,525	0	72,919	72,919
<b>Modoc</b>	None	None	None	None
<b>Mono</b>				
Eastern Sierra Transit Authority	509,594	0	29,186	29,186
<b>Monterey</b>				
City of Greenfield	10,398	0	595	595
City of King City	16,255	0	930	930
Monterey-Salinas Transit	7,373,356	0	422,184	422,184
City of Soledad	90,664	0	5,192	5,192
Regional Entity Totals	7,490,673	0	428,901	428,901

(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**  
**2009-10 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Prior Allocations	Current Allocation	Allocations To Date
<b>Nevada</b>				
County of Nevada	582,307	0	33,342	33,342
<b>Orange</b>				
City of Laguna Beach	977,796	0	55,985	55,985
Orange County Transportation Authority	88,081,241	0	5,043,419	5,043,419
Orange County Transportation Authority - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	0	1,995,534	1,995,534
Regional Entity Totals	89,059,037	0	7,094,938	7,094,938
<b>Placer</b>				
City of Auburn	35,575	0	1,747	1,747
City of Lincoln	47,955	0	2,746	2,746
County of Placer	4,137,043	0	236,857	236,857
City of Roseville	852,355	0	48,802	48,802
Regional Entity Totals	5,072,928	0	290,152	290,152
<b>Plumas</b>				
	None	None	None	None
<b>Riverside</b>				
City of Banning	149,546	0	8,563	8,563
City of Beaumont	105,018	0	6,013	6,013
City of Corona	399,533	0	22,876	22,876
Palo Verde Valley Transit Agency	87,547	0	5,013	5,013
City of Riverside	335,833	0	19,229	19,229
Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	0	715,877	715,877
Riverside Transit Agency	11,088,140	0	634,888	634,888
Sunline Transit Agency	6,667,903	0	381,810	381,810
Regional Entity Totals	18,833,520	0	1,794,269	1,794,269
<b>San Benito</b>				
	None	None	None	None
<b>San Bernardino</b>				
Morongo Basin Transit Authority	609,461	0	34,897	34,897
Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority	218,131	0	12,495	12,495
Omnitrans	14,655,457	0	839,181	839,181
San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	0	1,324,167	1,324,167
Victor Valley Transit Service Authority	2,879,537	0	163,238	163,238
Regional Entity Totals	18,362,586	0	2,373,978	2,373,978
<b>SANDAG</b>				
North San Diego County Transit Development Board	31,870,446	0	1,824,851	1,824,851

(Continued)

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**  
**2009-10 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Prior Allocations	Current Allocation	Allocations To Date
San Diego MTS	110,959,908	0	6,353,217	6,353,217
San Joaquin				
Altamont Commuter Express Authority	13,226,212			
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency		*****	*****	*****
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority		*****	*****	*****
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission		0	183,619	183,619
City of Lodi	570,742	0	32,675	32,675
City of Ripon	971	0	56	56
San Joaquin Regional Transit District	13,447,345	0	769,964	769,964
Regional Entity Totals	27,245,270	0	986,314	986,314
San Luis Obispo				
City of Atascadero	106,113	0	6,076	6,076
City of Morro Bay	47,584	0	2,724	2,724
City of Paso Robles Transit	141,411	0	8,098	8,098
City of San Luis Obispo	577,000	0	33,037	33,037
County of San Luis Obispo	62,564	0	3,583	3,583
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority	1,017,216	0	35,966	35,966
South County Area Transit	196,308	0	3,095	3,095
Regional Entity Totals	2,148,196	0	92,579	92,579
Santa Barbara				
City of Guadalupe	112,409	0	6,436	6,436
City of Lompoc	203,740	0	11,665	11,665
County of Santa Barbara	56,878	0	3,257	3,257
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District	10,687,726	0	611,951	611,951
City of Santa Maria	1,051,557	0	60,207	60,207
City of Solvang	55,957	0	3,204	3,204
Regional Entity Totals	12,168,267	0	696,720	696,720
Santa Cruz				
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	24,424,234	0	1,398,534	1,398,534
Shasta				
Redding Area Bus Authority	1,071,723	0	61,366	61,366
Sierra	None	None	None	None
Siskiyou				
County of Siskiyou	240,898	0	13,533	13,533

(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**  
**2009-10 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION**  
**PUC 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>
<b>Stanislaus</b>				
City of Modesto	3,029,456	0	173,456	173,456
County of Stanislaus	361,282	0	20,685	20,685
City of Turlock	244,320	0	13,989	13,989
Regional Entity Totals	<u>3,635,058</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>208,130</u>	<u>208,130</u>
<b>Tehama</b>				
	None	None	None	None
<b>Trinity</b>				
County of Trinity	42,881	0	2,345	2,345
<b>Tulare</b>				
City of Exeter	18,132	0	1,038	1,038
City of Porterville	354,612	0	20,304	20,304
City of Tulare	248,004	0	14,200	14,200
County of Tulare	855,549	0	48,971	48,971
City of Visalia	2,473,919	0	141,638	141,638
Regional Entity Totals	<u>3,950,216</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>226,151</u>	<u>226,151</u>
<b>Tuolumne</b>				
	None	None	None	None
<b>Ventura</b>				
Gold Coast Transit	3,389,761	0	194,093	194,093
Ventura County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	0	294,882	294,882
Regional Entity Totals	<u>3,389,761</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>488,975</u>	<u>488,975</u>
<b>STATE TOTALS</b>	<u>\$ 3,494,255,577</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 199,992,000</u>	<u>\$ 199,992,000</u>

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<a href="#">AB 231</a> <a href="#">Huber D</a>  Environment: California Environmental Quality Act: overriding consideration.	ASSEMBLY ENROLLMENT 8/31/2010 - In Assembly. Concurrence in Senate amendments pending. Urgency clause adopted. Senate amendments concurred in. To enrollment. (Ayes 57. Noes 10.)	The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. The CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. This bill would authorize a lead agency, until January 1, 2016, to incorporate by reference a finding of overriding consideration made in a prior EIR for a later project if specified conditions are met, including that the lead agency determines that the later project's significant impacts on the environment are not greater than or different from those identified in the prior EIR. This bill contains other related provisions. <b>Introduced: 2/5/2009</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/20/2010</b>	Watch
<a href="#">AB 569</a> <a href="#">Emmerson R</a>  Meal periods: exemptions.	ASSEMBLY ENROLLED 9/8/2010 - Enrolled and to the Governor at 4 p.m.	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, employees in the security services industry employed as security officers, and employees of electrical and gas corporations or local publicly owned electric utilities, as defined, 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. <b>Introduced: 2/25/2009</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/20/2010</b>	Watch
<a href="#">AB 987</a> <a href="#">Ma D</a>  Transit village development districts.	ASSEMBLY ENROLLED 9/3/2010 - Enrolled and to the Governor at 3 p.m.	Existing law, the Transit Village Development Planning Act of 1994, authorizes a city or county to create a transit village plan for a transit village development district. A transit village development district is required to include all land within not less than 1/4 mile of the exterior boundary of the parcel on which is located a transit station, as defined. This bill would recast the area included in a transit village development district to include all land within not more than 1/2 mile of the main entrance of a transit station and make additional legislative findings. The bill also would make technical, nonsubstantive changes. This bill contains other related provisions. <b>Introduced: 2/27/2009</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/18/2010</b>	Support
<a href="#">AB 1955</a> <a href="#">De La Torre D</a>  Local government: compensation.	SENATE DEAD 8/31/2010 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was THIRD READING on 8/31/2010)	Existing law charges the Controller with various duties, including, among others, superintending the fiscal concerns of the state. This bill would require the Controller to determine, based on a review of public records or reported salary information, whether a city is an excess compensation city, as defined. The bill would authorize a city to request a hearing, as specified, to contest the Controller's determination. The bill would require the Controller, if the city does not request a hearing or if the Attorney General concurs with the Controller's determination after a hearing, to notify the city and the redevelopment agency in the city of the city's status as an excess compensation city, as prescribed. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Introduced: 2/17/2010</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/30/2010</b>	Watch
<a href="#">AB 2324</a> <a href="#">John A. Perez D</a>  Transit: public transit facilities.	ASSEMBLY ENROLLMENT 8/27/2010 - Senate amendments concurred in. To enrollment. (Ayes 75. Noes 0.)	Existing law prohibits a person from knowingly possessing specified weapons and other items within any sterile area, as defined, of an airport or passenger vessel terminal, except as specified. This bill would make it a misdemeanor, punishable as specified, for any person to knowingly possess at a public transit vehicle facility, as defined, specified weapons, if a notice is posted at the facility, as specified. By creating a new crime, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Introduced: 2/19/2010</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/20/2010</b>	Support
<a href="#">AB 2509</a>	SENATE DEAD	Existing law authorizes a city or county to create a transit village plan for a transit village development district. Existing law	Support

<p><a href="#">Hayashi D</a> Transit village plan.</p>	<p>8/31/2010 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 8/30/2010)</p>	<p>authorizes a city or county to prepare a transit village plan for a transit village development district that addresses specified characteristics. This bill would revise the list of specified characteristics that a transit village plan may address to add, among other things, 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. <b>Introduced: 2/19/2010</b> <b>Last Amended on 4/8/2010</b></p>	
<p><a href="#">AB 2516 Hill D</a> Housing accessibility: Accessible Housing Task Force.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 6/4/2010 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(11). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 5/19/2010)</p>	<p>The State Housing Law requires the Department of Housing and Community Development to submit to the Building Standards Commission proposed building standards for hotels, motels, lodging houses, apartment houses, and dwellings. Existing law authorizes the department to adopt regulations it determines are necessary for the use and enforcement of certain provisions relating to a list of universal accessibility features for persons with disabilities. This bill would require the department to establish the Accessible Housing Task Force. The bill would require the director of the department to appoint the members of the task force, which would include, but not be limited to, representatives of specified organizations and state agencies. The bill would also require the task force to prepare and submit a report to the Legislature no later than June 30, 2012, making specified recommendations relating to increasing housing accessibility. The bill would further require the department to carry out the bill's provisions relating to the Accessible Housing Task Force only to the extent that funding is made available from local, regional, federal, or private sources. <b>Introduced: 2/19/2010</b> <b>Last Amended on 4/27/2010</b></p>	Support
<p><a href="#">ACA 9 Huffman D</a> Local government bonds: special taxes: voter approval.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 8/31/2010 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 1/14/2010)</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. <b>Introduced: 2/6/2009</b> <b>Last Amended on 6/26/2009</b></p>	Support
<p><a href="#">ACA 15 Arambula I</a> Local government transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 8/31/2010 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 6/1/2009)</p>	<p>Amends the California Constitution to change the two-thirds voter-approval requirement for transportation related special taxes to 55%. <b>Introduced: 3/10/2009</b></p>	Support
<p><a href="#">SB 31 Pavlev D</a> California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: revenue allocations.</p>	<p>SENATE DEAD 1/31/2010 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(3). (Last location was DEAD on 2/1/2010)</p>	<p>Specifies certain uses for revenues collected pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. <b>Introduced: 12/2/2008</b> <b>Last Amended on 1/25/2010</b></p>	Watch
<p><a href="#">SB 82 Hancock D</a> Community colleges: transportation fees.</p>	<p>SENATE ENROLLED 9/3/2010 - Enrolled. To Governor at 4 p.m.</p>	<p>This bill would increase the combined limit of the transportation fee and the parking services fee to \$70 per semester or \$35 per intersession for community college districts. The bill would require these fee limits to increase annually based on a specified calculation. This bill contains other existing laws. <b>Introduced: 1/20/2009</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/16/2010</b></p>	Support
<p><a href="#">SB 409 Ducheny D</a> Passenger rail programs: strategic planning.</p>	<p>ASSEMBLY DEAD 8/31/2010 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was APPR. on 8/12/2010)</p>	<p>This bill would require the 5 members of the High-Speed Rail Authority appointed by the Governor to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill would require the authority to annually adopt and submit a 5-year high-speed rail passenger train program to the Governor and Legislature, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions. <b>Introduced: 2/26/2009</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/2/2010</b></p>	Watch
<p><a href="#">SB 455 Lowenthal D</a></p>	<p>SENATE ENROLLMENT 8/30/2010 - In Senate. Senate concurs in Assembly</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</p>	Watch

High-speed rail.	amendments. (Ayes 25. Noes 12.) To enrollment.	with the advice and consent of the Senate. <b>Introduced: 2/26/2009</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/19/2010</b>	
<a href="#">SB 501</a> <a href="#">Correa D</a>  Local government: compensation disclosure.	SENATE DEAD 8/31/2010 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was UNFINISHED BUSINESS on 8/31/2010)	Existing law provides for the compensation of local government officers and employees, as specified. This bill would require filers , as defined, to annually file a compensation disclosure form, as specified. This bill would require the Secretary of State to develop the form, which would provide for the disclosure of, among other things, salaries and stipends , automobile and equipment allowances, and incentive and bonus payments . This bill would also require a county, city, city and county, school district, special district, or joint powers agency that maintains an Internet Web site to post the information contained on the filed form on that Internet Web site, as specified. The bill would authorize a district attorney or any interested person to commence an action by mandamus to enforce the provisions of the bill, as specified. The duties imposed on local departmental agencies by the bill would create a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <b>Introduced: 2/26/2009</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/20/2010</b>	Watch
<a href="#">SB 1320</a> <a href="#">Hancock D</a>  Transit fare evasion and passenger misconduct: administrative adjudication.	SENATE ENROLLED 9/2/2010 - Enrolled. To Governor at 5 p.m.	Existing law provides that it is an infraction, punishable by a fine not to exceed \$250 and by specified community service, to evade the payment of any fare of, or to engage in passenger misconduct on or in a facility or vehicle of, a public transportation system. Existing law authorizes the City and County of San Francisco and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority to adopt and enforce an ordinance to impose and enforce civil administrative penalties for fare evasion or passenger misconduct, other than by minors, on or in a transit facility or vehicle in lieu of the criminal penalties, with specified administrative adjudication procedures for the imposition and enforcement of the administrative penalties, including an initial review and opportunity for a subsequent administrative hearing. Fare evasion and passenger misconduct violation penalties are deposited in the general fund of the City and County of San Francisco or the County of Los Angeles, as applicable. This bill would authorize the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, the Sacramento Regional Transit District, Long Beach Transit, Foothill Transit, and the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District to adopt and enforce a similar administrative adjudication ordinance. Fare evasion and passenger misconduct violation penalties would be deposited in the general fund of the county in which the citation is administered. This bill contains other related provisions. <b>Introduced: 2/19/2010</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/9/2010</b>	Support
<a href="#">SB 1371</a> <a href="#">Correa D</a>  Transportation: bond funded projects: letter of no prejudice.	SENATE ENROLLMENT 8/31/2010 - In Senate. Senate concurs in Assembly amendments. (Ayes 30. Noes 0.) To enrollment.	Existing law, the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, provides for the issuance of \$9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes, including \$950 million to be allocated by the California Transportation Commission to eligible recipients for capital improvements to intercity and commuter rail lines and urban rail transit systems in connection with or otherwise related to the high-speed train system. This bill would allow an eligible recipient for funding for capital improvements to intercity and commuter rail lines and urban rail transit systems in connection with or otherwise related to the high-speed train system under the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century to apply to the California Transportation Commission for a letter of no prejudice relating to those projects. The bill would authorize the commission to develop guidelines to implement these provisions. <b>Introduced: 2/19/2010</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/16/2010</b>	Support
<a href="#">SB 1475</a> <a href="#">Simitian D</a>  Vehicles: electronic wireless communications devices: prohibitions.	ASSEMBLY DEAD 8/31/2010 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(17). (Last location was APPR. on 8/12/2010)	This bill requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to include a test of a driver license applicant's understanding of the distractions and dangers of handheld cell phone use and text messaging while operating a motor vehicle. This bill increases the penalties for using cell phones or texting while driving a motor vehicle, and prohibits the use of handheld cell phones for conversing or for texting while riding a bicycle. <b>Introduced: 2/19/2010</b> <b>Last Amended on 8/2/2010</b>	Watch