



# CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNCILS OF GOVERNMENTS

## HIGHLIGHTS COG DIRECTOR ASSOCIATION MEETING MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2004

### MEMBER AGENCIES

Association of Bay Area Governments  
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments  
Butte County Association of Governments  
Calaveras Council of Governments  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
Council of Fresno County Governments  
Council of San Benito County Governments  
El Dorado County Transportation Commission  
Humboldt County Association of Governments  
Kern Council of Governments  
Kings County Association of Governments  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Madera County Transportation Commission  
Mendocino Council of Governments  
Merced County Association of Governments  
Orange County Transportation Authority  
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency  
Riverside County Transportation Commission  
Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
San Bernardino Associated Governments  
San Diego Association of Governments  
San Joaquin Council of Governments  
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments  
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency  
Southern California Association of Governments  
Stanislaus Council of Governments  
Transportation Agency for Monterey County  
Tulare County Association of Governments  
Ventura County Transportation Commission  
Western Riverside Council of Governments

### CONSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

California State Association of Counties  
League of California Cities

### Review of Election Results for Self-Help County Sales Tax Measures and Lessons Learned

All 10 counties were about 4-8% above predicted support. In San Bernardino (which enjoyed 79% support), advice was to commission a private committee to start the campaign early (they started the campaign 3 ½ years ago), raise enough money to tell the story (they raised \$1.3 million), and stick with the original timetable. In the counties that lost, there was little consensus, and significant activism around the “no” campaign.

- Santa Cruz Measure J, Failed. Yes – 42.8% No – 57.2%;
- Marin Measure A, Passed. Yes – 71% No – 29%;
- San Mateo Measure A, Passed. Yes- 75%;
- Ventura Measure A, Failed. Yes – 40.4% No – 59.6%;
- San Diego Proposition A (TransNet). – Too close to call;
- San Bernardino Measure I, Passed. Yes - 79.44% No - 20.56%;
- Sonoma Measure M, Passed Yes. - 66.7% (with absentees still to count.);
- Sacramento Measure A, Passed. Yes - 74.76% No - 25.24%;
- Solano Measure A, Failed. Yes – 63.77% No – 36.22%;
- Contra Costa Measure J, Passed. (with absentees still being counted) Yes - 70.2%

### Status of Federal Reauthorization

It was recommended that CALCOG should become more proactive in discussions surrounding reauthorization. For example, we should unite with the West Coast Corridor Coalition (includes CA, OR, WA, and AK) to discuss policies such as goods movement. CALCOG is to convene a meeting in Washington, DC in March with Secretary McPeak and Washington lobbyists. Goal is to put together a united front on transportation issues. This meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, March 9<sup>th</sup>. Ideally, CALCOG members should attend and also participate in the reception for California Congressional Delegation.

## **Reimbursement of Local Funds on STIP Projects**

Orange County Transportation Authority proposed increasing the allowable time for reimbursement from 12 months to 36 months. There was a motion to support this proposal and make a recommendation to the CALCOG delegates.

## **Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) Funds**

CALCOG is recommending support of the concept of AB 2456 (Spitzer) which ensures that funds for planning, programming, and monitoring are allocated based on a fixed amount in relationship to revenues but agreed to work out the following details:

- How money flows
- The formula
- How money gets into the STIP

Additionally, the program should be called "Project Delivery and Development" from now on.

## **Transportation Financing Reform Protection and Expansion**

Proposed for the November 2006 ballot, this initiative would:

- Maintain an absolute firewall on Prop 42 and transportation revenues
- Eliminate oversight role of Dept. of Finance, and Personnel Board.
- Create stronger CTC which hires/fires Director of Caltrans
- Makes a more competitive labor market
- On the revenue side, every two years, the CTA would look at indices (weight fees, expanded fuel taxes including taxes on CNG and hydrogen) as a kind of surrogate for goods movement
- On a bi-annual basis, the proposal would go forward to adjust rates
- 6 year tenures of Commissioners

The revenue part of the initiative is the most controversial and will be difficult to move forward. We need to make sure we draft the initiative in a way that is not likely to drive well-funded opposition. CALCOG will continue to send out drafts of the initiative to everyone.

## **CALCOG Sponsored Growth Legislation**

In summary, this legislation would require all infrastructure investments to be compatible with regional transportation plans. For example, state and federal funded infrastructure would have to be in locations previously identified in these regional plans. It is important to stress that this legislation is *not* usurping local planning; the localities will have already identified places where infill should be, and the state will fund it. This legislation does not apply to state prisons, University of California on campus infrastructure, or to previously voter approved measures.

New Approach to Regional Housing Needs Assessment – The Commission on State Mandates is currently reviewing the reimbursability of RHNA. The State could decide that it won't pay for the mandate. The Courts would have to intervene, and even though local governments should prevail, the litigation could take years. Thus, CALCOG has decided to play an active role in this process so that we don't end up in court. .

### **2005 CALCOG Priority Actions**

- Transportation Financing (statewide revenue). It's in our policy statement, and will go to the CALCOG Delegates on November 18<sup>th</sup>.
- Legislation to implement CALCOG growth policy
- Housing
- Central Valley COGS concerned about TCM's and their permanence
- Transportation priorities to be discussed at 11-18 Delegates meeting

### **November 18<sup>th</sup> CALCOG Delegates Meeting, San Diego: 2:00-5:00PM**

We will create a conference call opportunity.

### **Calendar Changes**

COG Directors, Jan 24<sup>th</sup> (instead of Jan 10<sup>th</sup>)

Fall Delegates meeting in San Francisco, December 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> in conjunction with CTC meeting.

### **Late Breaking News**

CALCOG President Sandra Hilliard will finish her term this year, as she was not successful in her Yuba City Council Re-election bid. Gwen Regalia, ABAG will become the new president in December.



# CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNCILS OF GOVERNMENTS

## Priority Actions for 2005

Draft 11/10/04

1. Work with other public and private transportation interest to protect Proposition 42 and other transportation funds from being authorized to be diverted to other purposes. Increase transportation funding and local transportation financing authority including opportunities for user fee and privately financed projects. Improve cost effectiveness in development and delivery of transportation projects and transportation operations and maintenance expenditures in order to increase accountability and improve efficiency.
2. Together with other California transportation interests, unite California's congressional Delegation behind the California consensus position on the reauthorization of ISTEA/TEA 21 in a manner that preserves the successes of ISTEA and TEA 21 for regional agencies and improves the funding for California transportation projects and programs. The joint position emphasizes goods movement either through a new formula factor or other increased funding options, provides for expediting federal environmental review, and protects transit operating and new start funding. The legislation should also include opportunities for more funds to flow directly to regional agencies and reduce unnecessary state procedures which delay receipt of funds.
3. Sponsor legislation and seek support of Governor Schwarzenegger to require other state and federally funded infrastructure to be consistent with regional plans in the same manner in which transportation projects are currently required to be consistent with regional transportation plans and provide funding to Councils of Governments to prepare such plans.
4. Sponsor or support legislation to insure that planning, programming, and monitoring funds are available with reasonably consistent funding. Insure that federal transportation planning funds are available to regional agencies throughout the year and are not made unavailable due to delays in adoption of a state budget.
5. Support or sponsor legislation providing greater flexibility for local agencies to loan local transportation funds to the state to advance projects and to assist the state when it has cash flow difficulties by increasing the time in which local agencies may advance such funds and insuring that such loans can be paid back or credited to the local agencies with an amount comparable to interest on loans would yield.
6. Work with the League of California Cities and California State Association of Counties and other interests to improve state law regarding regional housing needs determinations, funding for that process, and funding for affordable housing to support regional planning priorities.