



Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee

May 28, 2009

SB 406 (DeSaulnier) – Regional Planning Funding

Issue: Should SACOG take a position to support SB 406, which would encourage regional blueprint planning by: providing a new local funding source for Blueprint planning and implementation, and charge an interagency council with coordination and reporting responsibilities?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommend to the Board a position of support for SB 406 as it would provide the option for additional resources for regional and local blueprint planning and implementation consistent with SACOG's 2009 state advocacy principles.

Discussion: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee considered SB 406 at its May meeting and directed staff to respond to several questions, which are answered below. An overview of the bill, presented to the committee in May, is attached.

What fee increase bills were introduced this year relative to the work of SACOG?

AB 286 (Salas) would extend existing law authorizing counties to adopt and impose annual fee on motor vehicle registration (\$1 non-commercial, \$2 commercial) for prosecuting vehicle theft crimes. SB 205 (Hancock) would authorize countywide transportation agencies to impose, upon a majority vote of the electorate, an annual fee of up to \$10 on motor vehicles registered in the jurisdiction for transportation related programs and projects. SB 676 (Wolk) would authorize local governments to increase existing vital record fees. AB 639 (Torlakson) would authorize local governments to impose telephone user surcharges. AB 87 (Davis) would authorize grocery and convenience stores to impose fees per bag on all carryout bags. SB 260 (Wiggins) would increase fees for each gallon of motor vehicle oil sold.

What authority does SMAQMD have for a fee increase in our region? How much have they already used their authority?

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District has existing authority to impose an annual fee of up to \$6 on motor vehicles registered in Sacramento County. They currently impose the full \$6 fee. There have been discussions about introducing legislation to increase this authority, but none has been introduced to date.

How will the funds be distributed, specifically by dollar amount and percentage?

The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) does not have the ability to collect and impose fees that are not round dollar numbers. If SB 406 were enacted, the options would either be \$1 or \$2. If the fee adopted was \$1, then the entire amount, minus 5% to the Planning Advisory Assistance Council in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), would go to the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Council of Governments (COG), or county transportation commission. The MPO could keep it all for blueprint planning purposes. Nothing prevents the MPO from giving any portion or all of the \$1 to cities and counties, which could be part of a resolution adopting a fee. If the adopted fee was \$2, the MPO would receive \$1 and the other \$1 would go to local jurisdictions as a grant for implementation of a regional blueprint planning (minus the 5 percent to OPR). Again, the MPO can keep its \$1, but nothing prevents the MPO from giving a portion or all of its \$1 to the local jurisdictions.

What are the allowable activities associated with the generated revenue?

The surcharge may be imposed only if a resolution is adopted and all revenue received shall be used solely to develop and implement a sustainable communities strategy (or alternative planning strategy) or a regional blueprint plan to identify land use strategies to reduce the use of motor vehicles in its jurisdiction and thereby reduce emissions into the environment from motor vehicles.

What will the grant process look like for local governments?

As long as the bill requirements are met, the MPO has the discretion to establish the grant process and set criteria.

SB 406 will be heard again in Appropriations on May 26. Supporters include California Association of Councils of Governments, Association of Bay Area Governments, California League of Conservation Voters, and American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Opponents include California New Car Dealers Association, San Diego Association of Governments, and California Taxpayers Association.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Executive Director

Attachments

Key Staff: Rebecca Sloan, Director of External Affairs & Member Services, (916) 340-6224
Erik Johnson, Public Information Coordinator, (916) 340-6247