



Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee

Monday, February 10, 2014 at 10:00 a.m.

SACOG Rivers Rooms, 1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA

The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee may take up any agenda item at any time, regardless of the order listed. Public comment will be taken on the item at the time that it is taken up by the committee. We ask that members of the public complete a request to speak form, submit it to the clerk of the committee, and keep their remarks brief. If several persons wish to address the committee on a single item, the chair may impose a time limit on individual remarks at the beginning of the discussion. Action may be taken on any item on this agenda.

Roll Call: Directors Buckland, Davis, Hanley, Samayoa, Stallard, Wheeler, Yuill, Vice Chairs Ashby and Serna, and Chair Miklos

Public Communications: Any person wishing to address the Committee on any item not on the agenda may do so at this time. After ten minutes of testimony, any additional testimony will be heard following the action items.

1. Minutes of December 2, 2013 Meeting ◀
2. Local Transportation Fund Findings of Apportionment for Fiscal Year 2014/15
◀ (Mr. Taylor)
3. State Transit Assistance Allocation for Fiscal Year 2014/15 ◀ (Mr. Taylor)
4. Consideration of AB 1399 (New Market Tax Credit Program) ◀ (Mr. Johnson)
5. Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Update
 - A. 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Outreach Update (Ms. Hernández)
 - B. Inventory of Adopted and Proposed Land Use Plans (Ms. Lizon)
6. State Advocacy Update (Mr. Johnson)
7. Federal Advocacy Update (Mr. Johnson)
8. Cap-to-Cap 2014 (Mr. Johnson)
9. Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee Charge (Mr. Johnson)

Other Matters Adjournment

◀ Indicates Action

Prepared by:

Approved by

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

Steve Miklos
Chair

Next committee meeting: March 10, 2014

The Meridian Plaza Building is accessible to the disabled. If requested, this agenda, and documents in the agenda packet can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact SACOG for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting should contact SACOG by phone at 916-321-9000, e-mail (sacog@sacog.org) or in person as soon as possible and preferably at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Parking is available at 15th and K Streets

Auburn
Citrus Heights
Colfax
Davis
El Dorado County
Elk Grove
Folsom
Galt
Isleton
Lincoln
Live Oak
Loomis
Marysville
Placer County
Placerville
Rancho Cordova
Rocklin
Roseville
Sacramento
Sacramento County
Sutter County
West Sacramento
Wheatland
Winters
Woodland
Yolo County
Yuba City
Yuba County



**Item #14-2-1
Action**

Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee

January 31, 2014

Minutes of December 2, 2013 Meeting

Issue: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee met on December 2, 2013.

Recommendation: Approve the minutes of the meeting as submitted.

Discussion: Attached are the minutes of the December 2, 2013, Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee meeting for approval.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:ef

Attachment

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6247

1302001

**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DRAFT ACTION MINUTES

The SACOG Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee met on December 2, 2013 in the Sacramento & American Rivers rooms on the Third Floor of the Meridian Plaza Building located at 1415 L Street, Sacramento, CA at 10:00 a.m.

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Miklos called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Directors Ashby, Buckland, Stallard, Yuill, Vice Chair Serna, and Chair Miklos

Absent: Director Davis and Vice Chair Hanley

1. Minutes of November 4, 2013 Meeting

Upon motion by Vice Chair Serna, seconded by Chair Miklos, and carried unanimously, the minutes of November 4, 2013, Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee meeting were approved without any changes.

2. Overall Work Program Amendment #2

Upon motion by Chair Miklos, seconded by Director Yuill, and carried unanimously, the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommends that the SACOG Board of Directors approve the second amendment to the OWP.

3. Revised Sacramento County Local Transportation Fund Findings of Apportionment for Fiscal Year 2013/14

Upon motion by Director Ashby, seconded by Director Yuill, and carried unanimously, the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommends that the SACOG Board of Directors approve the revised Sacramento County Local Transportation Fund Findings of Apportionment for Fiscal Year 2013/14.

4. Federal Advocacy Update

The Committee received and reviewed this report, presented by Erik Johnson, SACOG staff.

5. State Advocacy Update

The Committee received and reviewed this report, presented by Erik Johnson, SACOG staff.

6. 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Update

6A. Regional Growth Projections

The Committee received and reviewed this report, presented by Gordon Garry, SACOG staff.

6B. Policy Framework for MTP/SCS Update Process

The Committee received and reviewed this report, presented by Kacey Lizon, SACOG staff.

7. SACOG Salutes Annual Awards Presentation

The Committee received and reviewed this report, presented by Monica Hernández, SACOG staff.

Adjournment

Chair Miklos adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m.



Government Affairs & Public Relations Committee

January 31, 2014

Local Transportation Fund Findings of Apportionment for Fiscal Year 2014/15

Issue: Review Fiscal Year 2014/15 Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Findings of Apportionment for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties.

Recommendation: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee makes a recommendation to the SACOG Board to approve the Findings of Apportionment for Local Transportation Funds for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties for Fiscal Year 2014/15.

Discussion: The Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires the Regional Transportation Planning Agency to annually adopt Findings of Apportionment, which allocate ¼ percent of sales tax revenue to eligible local agencies prior to March 1 of each year. The process requires each of the County Auditor-Controllers to submit their estimate for the ending fund balance for the current fiscal year (in this case FY 2013/14) plus their estimate of sales tax available to the TDA fund within their county for the next fiscal year (in this case FY 2014/15). The total amount available for apportionment in Fiscal Year 2014/15 by the four County Auditor-Controllers is approximately \$67.2 million.

TDA law allows SACOG and each of the counties to claim a portion of the revenue for administrative fees, which are shown on the attached spreadsheets. In FY 2013/14, the administrative fee was 1.117 percent and the planning fee was 3 percent; this rate has been maintained in FY 2014/15.

The attached Findings of Apportionments indicates the amount of LTF funds each claimant is eligible to receive. In accordance with the TDA laws, the LTF funds are apportioned on a pro-rata basis using population estimates published by the California Department of Finance for the most recent calendar year.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:GT:lo

Attachments

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6247
Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Gary Taylor, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6279

COUNTY OF YUBA
February 2014
FINDINGS OF APPORTIONMENT
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS (LTF)
Fiscal Year 2014/15

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| County's Estimated June 30, 2014 Balance | \$0 |
| Local Transportation Fund Income 2014-15 | 1,215,415 |
| Less: County Administrative Costs | -750 |
| Less: SACOG Administrative Costs | <u>-13,568</u> |
| Balance for Allocation | <u><u>\$1,201,097</u></u> |

| Jurisdiction | Population ^{1/} | % of Total Population County | Finding of Apportionment | Amount Available SACOG Planning | Amount Available to Jurisdiction ^{2/} |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Yuba County (Unincorporated) | 57,696 | 78.56% | \$943,620 | \$28,309 | \$915,311 |
| Marysville | 12,250 | 16.68% | \$200,349 | \$6,010 | \$194,339 |
| Wheatland | 3,493 | 4.76% | \$57,128 | \$1,714 | \$55,414 |
| TOTALS | 73,439 | 100.00% | \$1,201,097 | \$36,033 | \$1,165,064 |

1. Sources: Report E-5, Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, 1/1/2013

2/ Funds available for projects and programs under Article 4 and Article 8. All or a portion may be available to the Yuba County depending on outcome of unmet needs finding.

COUNTY OF YOLO
February 2014
FINDINGS OF APPORTIONMENT
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS (LTF)
Fiscal Year 2014/15

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| County's Estimated June 30, 2014 Balance | \$996,343 |
| Local Transportation Fund Income 2014-15 | 9,690,101 |
| Less: County Administrative Costs | -5,000 |
| Less: SACOG Administrative Costs | <u>-119,312</u> |
| Balance for Allocation | <u><u>\$10,562,132</u></u> |

| Jurisdiction | Population ^{1/} | % of Total Population County | Finding of Apportionment | Amount Available SACOG Planning | Amount Available to Jurisdiction ^{2/} |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Yolo County (Unincorporated) | 25,186 | 12.23% | \$1,291,355 | \$38,741 | \$1,252,614 |
| Davis | 66,471 | 32.27% | \$3,408,150 | \$102,245 | \$3,305,906 |
| West Sacramento | 50,460 | 24.50% | \$2,587,222 | \$77,617 | \$2,509,606 |
| Winters | 6,974 | 3.39% | \$357,576 | \$10,727 | \$346,849 |
| Woodland | 56,908 | 27.63% | \$2,917,829 | \$87,535 | \$2,830,294 |
| TOTALS | 205,999 | 100.00% | \$10,562,132 | \$316,864 | \$10,245,268 |

1. Sources: Report E-5, Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, 1/1/2013

2/ Funds available for projects and programs under Article 4 and Article 8. All or a portion may be available to the Yolo County Transportation District depending on outcome of unmet needs finding.

COUNTY OF SUTTER
February 2014
FINDINGS OF APPORTIONMENT
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS (LTF)
Fiscal Year 2014/15

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| County's Estimated June 30, 2014 Balance | -\$64,262 |
| Local Transportation Fund Income 2014-15 | 3,583,122 |
| Less: County Administrative Costs | -2,500 |
| Less: SACOG Administrative Costs | <u>-39,278</u> |
| Balance for Allocation | <u><u>\$3,477,082</u></u> |

| Jurisdiction | Population ^{1/} | % of Total Population County | Finding of Apportionment | Amount Available SACOG Planning | Amount Available to Jurisdiction ^{2/} |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Sutter County (Unincorporated) | 21,669 | 22.61% | \$786,063 | \$23,582 | \$762,481 |
| Live Oak | 8,341 | 8.70% | \$302,577 | \$9,077 | \$293,500 |
| Yuba City | 65,841 | 68.69% | \$2,388,442 | \$71,653 | \$2,316,789 |
| TOTALS | 95,851 | 100.00% | \$3,477,082 | \$104,312 | \$3,372,770 |

1. Sources: Report E-5, Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, 1/1/2013

2/ Funds available for projects and programs under Article 4 and Article 8. All or a portion may be available to the Sutter County depending on outcome of unmet needs finding.

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
February 2014
FINDINGS OF APPORTIONMENT
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS (LTF)
Fiscal Year 2014/15

Attachment D

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| County's Estimated June 30, 2014 Balance | \$2,000,000 |
| Local Transportation Fund Income 2014-15 | 49,778,673 |
| Less: County Administrative Costs | -17,000 |
| Less: SACOG Administrative Costs | <u>-578,178</u> |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| Balance for Allocation | <u>\$51,183,495</u> |
|------------------------|---------------------|

| Jurisdiction | Population ^{1/} | % of Total Population County | Finding of Apportionment | Pedestrians & Bicycles ^{2/} | Amount Available SACOG Planning | Amount Available to Jurisdiction ^{3/} |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Sacramento County (Unincorporated) | 564,657 | 39.05% | \$19,989,624 | \$399,792 | \$32,383 | \$1,025,468 |
| Citrus Heights | 84,345 | 5.83% | \$2,985,928 | \$59,719 | \$89,578 | \$2,836,631 |
| Elk Grove | 159,074 | 11.00% | \$5,631,436 | \$112,629 | \$168,943 | \$5,349,864 |
| Folsom | 72,294 | 5.00% | \$2,559,306 | \$51,186 | \$76,779 | \$2,431,340 |
| Galt | 24,185 | 1.67% | \$856,182 | \$17,124 | \$25,685 | \$813,373 |
| Isleton | 815 | 0.06% | \$28,852 | \$577 | \$866 | \$27,410 |
| Rancho Cordova | 66,927 | 4.63% | \$2,369,307 | \$47,386 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City of Sacramento | 473,509 | 32.75% | \$16,762,861 | \$335,257 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTALS | 1,445,806 | 100.00% | \$51,183,495 | \$1,023,670 | \$394,234 | \$12,484,085 |

SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT and PARATRANSIT

| Jurisdiction | Finding of Apportionment Less Ped & Bicycle | Population Within SRTD District ^{4/} | Allocation of Finding of Apportionment | SACOG Planning | Amount Available To Paratransit, Inc. | Amount Available To SRTD |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Sacramento County (Unincorporated) | \$19,589,832 | 94.6% | \$18,531,981 | \$567,306 | \$926,599 | \$17,038,076 |
| Rancho Cordova | \$2,321,921 | 100% | \$2,321,921 | \$71,079 | \$116,096 | \$2,134,745 |
| City of Sacramento | \$16,427,604 | 100% | \$16,427,604 | \$502,886 | \$821,380 | \$15,103,338 |
| TOTALS | \$38,339,357 | 100.00% | \$37,281,506 | \$1,141,271 | \$1,864,075 | \$34,276,160 |

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Regional Transit | \$34,276,160 |
| Paratransit | \$1,864,075 |
| SACOG | \$1,535,505 |
| Ped/Bike | \$1,023,670 |
| Other Jurisdictions | \$12,484,085 |
| Total | \$51,183,495 |

1. Sources: Report E-5, Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, 1/1/2013

2/ Amount available to jurisdictions for pedestrian and bicycle purposes (Article 3, Section 99233.3), unless found that such monies could be used to better advantage for the purposes of community transit services (Article 4.5), to operators of public transportation systems (Article 4), or for streets and roads (Article 8).

3/ Funds available for projects and programs under Article 4 and Article 8.

TDA Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Estimate History

Attachment E

Fiscal Year 2014/15

Historical Total Allocations and Annual Percentage Increases by County

| County | 2014/15 | 2013/14 | 2012/13 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 | 2008/09 | 2007/08 | 2006/07 | 2005/06 | 2004/05 | 2003/04 | 2002/03 | 2001/02 | 2000/01 | 1999/00 |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Sacramento | 51,183,495 5.67% | 48,435,860 11.37% | 43,491,732 -11.83% | 49,325,832 22.46% | 40,279,017 5.72% | 38,100,863 -22.07% | 48,892,626 2.81% | 47,554,687 -18.13% | 58,087,354 7.03% | 54,272,800 9.67% | 49,486,669 7.07% | 46,219,438 7.60% | 42,955,672 -9.40% | 47,410,987 18.57% | 39,985,462 9.19% | 36,620,709 9.14% |
| Sutter | 3,477,082 -14.49% | 4,066,105 10.56% | 3,677,660 11.81% | 3,289,071 -39.06% | 5,397,367 143.08% | 2,220,430 67.51% | 1,325,557 -68.41% | 4,196,163 25.37% | 3,347,031 17.27% | 2,854,075 -17.59% | 3,463,067 6.06% | 3,265,152 19.36% | 2,735,563 -1.25% | 2,770,315 21.75% | 2,275,379 9.53% | 2,077,464 5.00% |
| Yolo | 10,562,132 4.31% | 10,126,174 6.90% | 9,472,817 16.59% | 8,125,229 26.16% | 6,440,455 -13.30% | 7,428,634 -4.78% | 7,801,694 -3.89% | 8,117,315 -17.13% | 9,794,726 21.53% | 8,059,786 30.33% | 6,184,066 3.07% | 5,999,824 27.73% | 4,697,425 -42.41% | 8,156,495 30.20% | 6,264,433 22.78% | 5,102,162 13.10% |
| Yuba | 1,201,097 -35.26% | 1,855,193 55.99% | 1,189,316 26.71% | 938,647 -2.04% | 958,233 -17.58% | 1,162,590 -15.96% | 1,383,375 -38.15% | 2,236,816 32.63% | 1,686,460 28.44% | 1,313,080 45.38% | 903,191 -14.51% | 1,056,454 -9.97% | 1,173,436 31.34% | 893,410 12.69% | 792,799 -14.70% | 929,447 3.82% |
| RTPA Totals | 66,423,806 3.01% | 64,483,332 11.50% | 57,831,525 -6.24% | 61,678,779 35.84% | 45,406,980 -7.17% | 48,912,517 -17.66% | 59,403,252 -4.35% | 62,104,981 -14.83% | 72,915,571 9.65% | 66,499,741 10.76% | 60,036,993 6.18% | 56,540,868 9.66% | 51,562,096 -12.95% | 59,231,207 20.10% | 49,318,073 10.26% | 44,729,782 9.26% |



Item #14-2-3
Action

Government Affairs & Public Relations Committee

January 31, 2014

State Transit Assistance Allocation for Fiscal Year 2014/15

Issue: Review Fiscal Year 2014/15 State Transit Assistance (STA) Allocation for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties.

Recommendation: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee makes a recommendation to the SACOG Board to approve the Allocation of State Transit Assistance for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties for Fiscal Year 2014/15.

Discussion: In January or February of each year, the State Controller's Office (SCR) releases the Department of Finance budgeted amount of State Transit Assistance according to Section 99312.7 of the Public Utilities Code. The budgeted amount of STA revenue for the four-county SACOG region for FY 2013-14 is \$8,947,818 of Section 99313 and \$4,079,895 of Section 99314 for a total of \$13,027,713. This represents a 6.6 percent decrease from the FY 2013-14 level of funding. In Placer and El Dorado counties, these funds are passed through the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies for each county.

The STA allocation is funded through a portion of the sales tax on diesel fuel and is a result of the gas tax swap of 2010 that removed the sales tax on gasoline, which used to be the source of STA funds out of the Public Transportation Account. These funds can only be used for transit purposes and are subject to variations in the price and usage of diesel fuel statewide. In FY 2013-14, the funds can be used for operating or capital purposes with no restrictions through the signing of Senate Bill 565 in 2011. The bill contains a waiver for the use of STA for operations that will continue through FY 2014-15. As there is often variation in the level of funding and the ability of operators to use the funds for operating purposes, transit operators are encouraged to use these funds for one-time capital expenditures.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

Attachments

MM:GT:lo

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6247
Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Gary Taylor, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6279

February 2014

Attachment A

SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Regional Share of Statewide PUC Allocation: \$391,972,000

ALLOCATION OF STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS (STA)

FY 2014-15

PUBLIC UTILITY CODE SECTION 99314

| TRANSIT OPERATOR | BASE ^{1/} | REVENUE | |
|---|---------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| | | % OF TOTAL | ALLOCATION ^{2/} |
| City of Elk Grove | \$1,956,190 | 2.6% | \$106,312 |
| City of Folsom | \$462,015 | 0.6% | \$25,109 |
| Sacramento Regional Transit District | \$66,040,505 | 88.0% | \$3,589,072 |
| Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority | \$1,425,990 | 1.9% | \$77,498 |
| City of Davis | \$2,600,278 | 3.5% | \$141,316 |
| Yolo county Transportation District | \$2,586,889 | 3.4% | \$140,588 |
| TOTAL | \$75,071,867 | 100.00% | \$4,079,895 |

1. Each operator's revenue basis is based on latest eligible allocations as reported by the State Controller's Office for State Transit Assistance funding.
2. Entire amount must be used for transportation planning and mass transportation purposes.

February 2014

Attachment B

SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Regional Share of Statewide PUC Allocation: \$391,972,000

ALLOCATION OF STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS (STA)

FY 2014-15

PUBLIC UTILITY CODE SECTION 99313

| JURISDICTION | POPULATION ^{1/} | POPULATION AS A % OF TOTAL | ALLOCATION ^{2/} |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| SACRAMENTO COUNTY | | | |
| Unincorporated | 564,657 | 31.01% | \$2,774,401 ^{3/} |
| Citrus Heights | 84,345 | 4.63% | \$414,423 |
| Elk Grove | 159,074 | 8.74% | \$781,599 |
| Folsom | 72,294 | 3.97% | \$355,211 |
| Galt | 24,185 | 1.33% | \$118,831 |
| Isleton | 815 | 0.04% | \$4,004 |
| Rancho Cordova | 66,927 | 3.68% | \$328,841 ^{4/} |
| Sacramento | 473,509 | 26.00% | \$2,326,553 ^{4/} |
| SUTTER COUNTY | | | |
| Unincorporated | 21,669 | 1.19% | \$106,469 |
| Live Oak | 8,341 | 0.46% | \$40,983 |
| Yuba City | 65,841 | 3.62% | \$323,505 |
| YOLO COUNTY | | | |
| Unincorporated | 25,186 | 1.38% | \$123,750 |
| Davis | 66,471 | 3.65% | \$326,600 |
| West Sacramento | 50,460 | 2.77% | \$247,932 |
| Winters | 6,974 | 0.38% | \$34,266 |
| Woodland | 56,908 | 3.12% | \$279,613 |
| YUBA COUNTY | | | |
| Unincorporated | 57,696 | 3.17% | \$283,485 |
| Marysville | 12,250 | 0.67% | \$60,189 |
| Wheatland | 3,493 | 0.19% | \$17,163 |
| TOTAL | 1,821,095 | 100.00% | \$8,947,818 |

1. Sources: Report E-5, Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, 1/1/2013
2. Entire amount must be used for transportation planning and mass transportation purposes.
3. Of this amount, 94.6% (the percent of Unincorporated Sacramento County's population which is within the Sacramento Regional Transit District) or \$2,624,583 is reserved in whole or part for either SRTD or Paratransit, Inc. The balance of \$149,818 may be used by the County or SRTD if the County has met all of its transit needs.
4. Entire amount is reserved for SRTD.
5. Sacramento Regional Transit District total = \$5,279,977.

TDA State Transit Assistance History

Attachment C

FY 2012-13

PUC Section 99313 Historical Total Allocations

| Jurisdiction | 2013/14 | 2012/13 | Revised 2011/12 | Original 2011/12 | 2009/10 | 2008/09 | 2007/08 | 2006/07 |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| SACRAMENTO COUNTY | | | | | | | | |
| Unincorporated | \$2,916,365 | \$3,126,946 | \$2,958,259 | \$2,421,958 | \$2,952,451 | \$1,222,579 | \$2,380,549 | \$4,830,280 |
| Citrus Heights | \$436,309 | \$468,531 | \$459,163 | \$375,922 | \$457,328 | \$189,259 | \$368,848 | \$754,109 |
| Elk Grove | \$811,110 | \$866,226 | \$749,778 | \$613,851 | \$738,649 | \$296,522 | \$555,486 | \$1,047,488 |
| Folsom | \$378,281 | \$405,893 | \$372,338 | \$304,837 | \$370,908 | \$154,023 | \$295,079 | \$586,021 |
| Galt | \$125,232 | \$133,172 | \$126,439 | \$103,517 | \$126,040 | \$51,085 | \$97,376 | \$197,751 |
| Isleton | \$4,213 | \$4,527 | \$4,283 | \$3,507 | \$4,272 | \$1,920 | \$3,688 | \$7,084 |
| Rancho Cordova | \$343,784 | \$367,023 | \$327,764 | \$268,344 | \$322,853 | \$128,672 | \$239,014 | \$3,901,590 |
| Sacramento | \$2,449,691 | \$2,631,088 | \$2,533,509 | \$2,074,210 | \$2,512,635 | \$1,016,703 | \$1,943,093 | \$475,044 |
| SUTTER COUNTY | | | | | | | | |
| Unincorporated | \$111,926 | \$121,282 | \$130,227 | \$106,618 | \$127,100 | \$51,469 | \$99,589 | \$204,982 |
| Live Oak | \$42,897 | \$48,109 | \$45,810 | \$37,505 | \$44,764 | \$17,668 | \$31,721 | \$58,440 |
| Yuba City | \$339,660 | \$367,398 | \$331,662 | \$271,535 | \$332,410 | \$135,202 | \$256,997 | \$502,788 |
| YOLO COUNTY | | | | | | | | |
| Unincorporated | \$131,619 | \$137,341 | \$122,827 | \$100,560 | \$122,582 | \$50,317 | \$96,638 | \$196,127 |
| Davis | \$338,370 | \$369,337 | \$346,893 | \$284,005 | \$344,726 | \$141,347 | \$274,423 | \$554,735 |
| West Sacramento | \$256,394 | \$275,455 | \$252,346 | \$206,598 | \$249,552 | \$97,560 | \$183,686 | \$346,359 |
| Winters | \$35,573 | \$37,116 | \$36,987 | \$30,282 | \$36,831 | \$14,980 | \$29,508 | \$60,063 |
| Woodland | \$289,444 | \$311,254 | \$298,525 | \$244,406 | \$294,556 | \$117,533 | \$224,997 | \$459,844 |
| YUBA COUNTY | | | | | | | | |
| Unincorporated | \$296,705 | \$317,944 | \$296,998 | \$243,156 | \$295,157 | \$118,686 | \$228,686 | \$436,527 |
| Marysville | \$62,959 | \$68,544 | \$67,049 | \$54,894 | \$67,049 | \$27,655 | \$53,114 | \$108,763 |
| Wheatland | \$18,044 | \$19,628 | \$18,541 | \$15,179 | \$18,530 | \$7,682 | \$14,754 | \$29,515 |
| Totals | \$9,388,576 -7% | \$10,076,814 6% | \$9,479,398 1% | \$7,760,884 | \$9,418,394 145% | \$3,840,862 -48% | \$7,377,246 -50% | \$14,757,510 |

TDA State Transit Assistance History

Attachment D

FY 2011-12

PUC Section 99314 Historical Total Allocations

| Jurisdiction | 2013/14 | 2012/13 | Revised 2011/12 | Orginal 2011/12 | 2009/10 | 2008/09 | 2007/08 | 2006/07 |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| City of Elk Grove | \$96,934 | \$207,361 | \$195,067 | \$91,570 | \$102,368 | \$76,264 | \$51,698 | \$33,753 |
| City of Folsom | \$44,561 | \$53,845 | \$50,653 | \$12,862 | \$13,982 | \$2,365 | \$5,395 | \$0 |
| Sacramento Regional Transit District | \$3,977,004 | \$4,157,004 | \$3,910,552 | \$3,958,632 | \$4,808,281 | \$2,712,383 | \$4,181,683 | \$6,875,853 |
| Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority | \$80,051 | \$70,134 | \$65,976 | \$59,292 | \$72,011 | \$29,855 | \$46,303 | \$86,199 |
| City of Davis | \$143,654 | \$151,455 | \$142,476 | \$122,230 | \$148,455 | \$67,100 | \$114,634 | \$217,721 |
| Yolo County Transportation District | \$213,026 | \$214,427 | \$201,715 | \$117,762 | \$143,020 | \$67,986 | \$95,753 | \$171,433 |
| Totals | \$4,555,230 -6.16% | \$4,854,226 6.30% | \$4,566,439 -13.65% | \$4,362,348 | \$5,288,117 78.90% | \$2,955,953 -34.25% | \$4,495,466 -39.13% | \$7,384,959 |



Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee

January 30, 2014

Consideration of AB 1399 (New Market Tax Credit Program)

Issue: Should SACOG support AB 1399, which would create a California New Market Tax Credit Program?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommend that the Board support AB 1399.

Discussion: In 2000, Congress established the New Market Tax Credit (NMTC) Program to attract investment to low-income communities. Since its inception, it has allocated \$36.5 billion in tax credits to communities across the country, with California receiving \$3.3 billion. Since that time, 14 states have established complementary state NMTC programs. AB 1399 would create a California program.

SACOG Interest

With the demise of redevelopment agencies, SACOG member jurisdictions have fewer options for financing projects. Consistent with SACOG's State Advocacy Principle to advocate for tools for community revitalization and infrastructure and to advocate for additional financing options, support for AB 1399 would provide a tool for financing many different types of development projects in low-income communities.

Success Nationally

According to the U.S. Treasury Department, every \$1 of federal investment generates \$8 in private investment. Other states have had similar success, with annual programs between \$6 and \$200 million.

How Federal New Market Tax Credits Work

The Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (CDFI), as part of the U.S. Treasury Department, administers the federal NMTC Program. There are four basic steps for NMTCs:

1. A Community Development Entity (a specialized, qualified lender) applies to a federal or state program for NMTCs;
2. The Community Development Entity offers the tax credits it receives to investors in exchange for equity in the CDE;
3. Using the equity, CDEs make loans and investments in low-income communities; and
4. Investors claim a tax credit worth 39 percent of their equity stake, spread over seven years.

How a California NMTC Program Could Work

AB 1399 proposes to mirror the federal program. This bill would direct the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC), an existing state entity, with allocating tax credits.

TCAC would be authorized to allocate up to \$40 million in tax credits annually for tax years 2015 through 2021, for a total allocation of \$200 million. Using the federal economic multiplier for the federal program, a \$200 million program could generate \$1.6 billion in private investment. Revenues for the \$200 million are not identified in the bill, but there are several potential sources, including excess tax credits

from the State Hiring Tax Credit, and state savings from the dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies and the freezing of the Enterprise Zone program. With the elimination of these two state-funded programs, local governments need assistance in redeveloping their communities and supporting job creation.

Status

AB 1399 is currently in the Senate Governance and Finance Committee awaiting a hearing. It was significantly amended since its last hearing, so there is no list of supporters of this specific version. Conceptually, the Assembly Democratic Blueprint for a Responsible Budget supports creating a NMTC program, and the League of California Cities has supported prior attempts to create a program.

Attachments

1. Text of AB 1399
2. Federal New Market Tax Credit Awards in California

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

Attachment

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6247

AMENDED IN SENATE SEPTEMBER 6, 2013

AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 22, 2013

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2013–14 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 1399

Introduced by ~~Committee on Jobs, Economic Development, and the Economy (Medina (Chair), Campos, Daly, Fong, Fox, Linder, Mansoor, Melendez, and V. Manuel Pérez)~~ Assembly Members Medina and V. Manuel Pérez

March 11, 2013

An act to ~~amend and renumber Sections 13997.2 and 13997.7 of, and to add the heading of Article 6 (commencing with Section 12100) to Chapter 1.6 of Part 2 of Division 3 of Title 2 of, the Government Code, and to amend Section 44559.1 of the Health and Safety Code, relating to economic development. add Section 26011.9 to the Public Resources Code, and to add and repeal Sections 17053.9 and 23622.9 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, relating to taxation, and making an appropriation therefor, to take effect immediately, tax levy.~~

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1399, as amended, ~~Committee on Jobs, Economic Development, and the Economy Medina. Economic development. Income taxation: credits: New Market Tax Credit.~~

The Personal Income Tax Law and the Corporation Tax Law allow various credits against the taxes imposed by those laws. Existing law also creates the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, which has specified duties in regard to low-income housing credits.

This bill would allow a credit under both laws, in modified conformity with a federal New Market Tax Credit, for taxable years beginning on

or after January 1, 2015, and before January 1, 2021, in a specified amount for investments in low-income communities. The bill would limit the total annual amount of credit allowed pursuant to these provisions to an amount equal to any portion not granted under a specified sales and use tax exclusion, not to exceed \$40,000,000 per calendar year, and would limit the allocation of the credit to a cumulative total of no more than \$200,000,000. This bill would impose specified duties on the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee with regard to the application for, and allocation of, the credit. The bill would require the committee to establish and impose reasonable fees upon entities that apply for the allocation of the credit and use the revenue to defray the cost of administering the program, as specified, thereby making an appropriation.

This bill would take effect immediately as a tax levy.

~~Existing law defines specified terms relating to economic development and authorizes the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, and its secretary, to expend specified funds.~~

~~This bill would renumber these provisions, instead authorize the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development and its director to expend these funds. This bill would authorize the Executive Director of the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank to expend these funds, but only if AB 1247, relating to the Small Business Assistance Act of 2013, is enacted and takes effect on or before January 1, 2014. This bill would also make conforming changes.~~

Vote: majority. Appropriation: ~~no~~-yes. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. Section 26011.9 is added to the Public Resources
- 2 Code, to read:
- 3 26011.9. The authority shall make a determination of the
- 4 amount of the one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) in
- 5 exclusions not granted in the assigned calendar year pursuant to
- 6 Section 26011.8. An amount equal to that amount shall be granted
- 7 in the subsequent calendar year through the New Market Tax
- 8 Credit Program pursuant to Sections 17053.9 and 23622.9 of the
- 9 Revenue and Taxation Code. This section shall not prevent a
- 10 taxpayer granted an extension pursuant to Section 6010.8 of the
- 11 Revenue and Taxation Code from applying for, and receiving a

1 refund for, taxes paid under Part 1 (commencing with Section
2 6001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

3 SEC. 2. Section 17053.9 is added to the Revenue and Taxation
4 Code, to read:

5 17053.9. (a) There is hereby created the California New
6 Markets Tax Credit Program as provided in this section and
7 Section 23622.9. The purpose of this program is to stimulate
8 economic development, and hasten California's economic recovery,
9 by authorizing tax credits for investment in California, including,
10 but not limited to, retail businesses, real property, financial
11 institutions, and schools. The California Tax Credit Allocation
12 Committee shall have responsibility for the administration of this
13 program as provided in this section and Section 23622.9.

14 (b) (1) For taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 2015,
15 and before January 1, 2021, there shall be allowed as a credit
16 against the "net tax," as defined in Section 17039, an amount
17 determined in accordance with Section 45D of the Internal Revenue
18 Code, as modified as set forth in this section.

19 (2) This credit shall be allowed only if the taxpayer holds the
20 qualified equity investment on the credit allowance date and each
21 of the six following anniversary dates of that date.

22 (c) Section 45D of the Internal Revenue Code is modified as
23 follows:

24 (1) (A) The references to "the Secretary" in Section 45D of the
25 Internal Revenue Code are modified to read "the committee."

26 (B) For purposes of this section, "committee" means the
27 California Tax Credit Allocation Committee as described in
28 subdivision (a) of Section 50199.7 of the Health and Safety Code,
29 or any successor thereto.

30 (2) Section 45D(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code is modified
31 by substituting for "(A) 5 percent with respect to the first 3 credit
32 allowance dates, and (B) 6 percent with respect to the remainder
33 of the credit allowance dates." with the following:

34 (A) Zero percent with respect to the first two credit allowance
35 dates.

36 (B) Seven percent with respect to the third credit allowance
37 date.

38 (C) Eight percent with respect to the remainder of the credit
39 allowance dates.

1 (3) *The provisions of Section 45D(b) of the Internal Revenue*
2 *Code is modified as follows:*

3 (A) *Section 45D(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code is modified*
4 *by substituting “3 years” for “5 years” and “3-year period” for*
5 *“5-year period.”*

6 (B) *Section 45D(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code is modified*
7 *by substituting “qualified low-income community investments in*
8 *California” for “qualified low-income community investments.”*

9 (4) *Section 45D(d)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating*
10 *to qualified low-income community investments, is modified to*
11 *include any capital or equity investment in, or loan to, any real*
12 *estate project located in a low-income community or any operating*
13 *business that, at the time the initial investment is made, has 250*
14 *or less employees and is located in a low-income community. The*
15 *real estate project or operating business shall meet all other*
16 *conditions of a qualified active low-income community business,*
17 *except as modified by paragraphs (5) and (6).*

18 (5) *The term “qualified active low-income community business,”*
19 *as defined in Section 45D(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code is*
20 *modified as follows:*

21 (A) *Section 45D(d)(2)(A)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code is*
22 *modified by substituting “any low-income community in*
23 *California” for “any low-income community.”*

24 (B) *Section 45D(d)(2)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code is*
25 *modified by substituting “any low-income community in*
26 *California” for “qualified low-income community investments.”*

27 (C) *Section 45D(d)(2)(A)(iii) of the Internal Revenue Code shall*
28 *not apply.*

29 (D) *The following shall apply in lieu of the provisions of Section*
30 *45D(d)(2)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to qualified*
31 *active low-income community business: “A ‘qualified active*
32 *low-income community business’ shall include an operating*
33 *business that, at the time the initial investment is made, has 250*
34 *or less employees and is located in a low-income community. The*
35 *operating business shall meet all other conditions of a qualified*
36 *active low-income business, except as modified by this paragraph*
37 *and paragraph (6).”*

38 (6) *Section 45D(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code is modified*
39 *to add the following: “When the United States Census Bureau*
40 *discontinues using the decennial census to report median family*

1 *income on a census tract basis, census block group data shall be*
2 *used based on the American Community Survey.”*

3 *(7) The following shall apply in lieu of the provisions of Section*
4 *45(D)(f)(1) 45D(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to*
5 *national limitation on amount of investments designated: “The*
6 *aggregate amount of credit that may be allocated in any calendar*
7 *year pursuant to this section and Section 23622.9 shall be an*
8 *amount equal to any unused portion of the one hundred million*
9 *dollars (\$100,000,000) in exclusions, authorized pursuant to*
10 *Section 6010.8, as determined by the California Alternative Energy*
11 *and Advanced Transportation Financing Authority and reported*
12 *to the committee, not to exceed forty million dollars (\$40,000,000).*
13 *The committee shall limit the allocation of credits permitted under*
14 *this section and Section 23622.9 to a cumulative total of no more*
15 *than two hundred million dollars (\$200,000,000). Any unused*
16 *credits shall be returned to the committee at the end of the third*
17 *year following allocation and the value of the unused credit shall*
18 *be available for allocation in the following calendar years.*
19 *Reallocation credits shall not count against the forty million dollars*
20 *(\$40,000,000) annual limit or the two hundred million dollars*
21 *(\$200,000,000) cumulative limit.”*

22 *(8) Section 45D(g)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating*
23 *to recapture event, is modified by adding the following:*
24 *“Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, a recapture*
25 *event shall not have occurred and an investment shall be*
26 *considered held by a community development entity upon its sale*
27 *or repayment, provided the qualified community development entity*
28 *reinvests an amount equal to the capital returned to or recovered*
29 *by the qualified community development entity from the original*
30 *investment, exclusive of any profits realized, in another qualified*
31 *low-income community investment within 12 months of the receipt*
32 *of that capital. A qualified community development entity shall*
33 *not be required to reinvest capital returned from a qualified*
34 *low-income community investment after the sixth anniversary of*
35 *the issuance of the qualified equity investment, the proceeds of*
36 *which were used to make the qualified low-income community*
37 *investment. The qualified low-income community investment shall*
38 *be considered held by the qualified community development entity*
39 *through the seventh anniversary of the issuance of the qualified*
40 *equity investment.”*

1 (9) Section 45D(i) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to
2 regulations, shall not apply.

3 (d) (1) The committee shall adopt guidelines necessary or
4 appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. The guidelines
5 shall not disqualify a low-income community investment for the
6 single reason that public or private incentives, loans, equity
7 investments, technical assistance, or other forms of support have
8 been or continue to be provided. The adoption of the guidelines
9 shall not be subject to the rulemaking provisions of the
10 Administrative Procedure Act of Chapter 3.5 (commencing with
11 Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government
12 Code.

13 (2) The committee shall establish and impose reasonable fees
14 upon entities that apply for the allocation pursuant to subdivision
15 (d) and use the revenue to defray the cost of administering the
16 program. The committee shall establish the fees in a manner that
17 ensures that (A) the total amount collected equals the amount
18 reasonably necessary to defray the committee's costs in performing
19 its administrative duties under this section, and (B) the amount
20 paid by each entity reasonably corresponds with the value of the
21 services provided to the entity.

22 (3) In developing guidelines the committee shall adopt an
23 allocation process that does all of the following:

24 (A) Creates an equitable distribution process that ensures that
25 low-income communities across the state have an opportunity to
26 benefit from the program.

27 (B) Sets minimum organizational capacity standards that
28 applicants must meet in order to receive an allocation of credits.

29 (C) Requires annual reporting by each community development
30 entity that receives an allocation. The report shall include, but is
31 not limited to, the impact the credit had on the low-income
32 community, the amount of moneys used, and the types of activities
33 funded through the equity investment. The reporting period shall
34 be for a period of eight years following the allocation of credits.

35 (D) Provides for the annual return of unused credits following
36 the third year after being awarded so that they may be reallocated
37 to other community development entities.

38 (e) In the case where the credit allowed by this section exceeds
39 the "net tax," the excess may be carried over to reduce the "net

1 tax” in the following year, and the seven succeeding years if
2 necessary, until the credit is exhausted.

3 (f) The committee shall annually report on its Internet Web site
4 the information provided by low-income community development
5 entities and on the geographic distribution of the credits.

6 (g) This section shall remain in effect only until December 1,
7 2028, and as of that date is repealed.

8 SEC. 3. Section 23622.9 is added to the Revenue and Taxation
9 Code, to read:

10 23622.9. (a) There is hereby created the California New
11 Markets Tax Credit Program as provided in this section and
12 Section 17053.9. The purpose of this program is to stimulate
13 economic development, and hasten California’s economic recovery,
14 by authorizing tax credits for investment in California, including,
15 but not limited to, retail businesses, real property, financial
16 institutions, and schools. The California Tax Credit Allocation
17 Committee shall have responsibility for the administration of this
18 program as provided in this section and Section 17053.9.

19 (b) (1) For taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 2015,
20 and before January 1, 2021, there shall be allowed as a credit
21 against the “tax,” as defined in Section 23036, an amount
22 determined in accordance with Section 45D of the Internal Revenue
23 Code, as modified as set forth in this section.

24 (2) This credit shall be allowed only if the taxpayer holds the
25 qualified equity investment on the credit allowance date and each
26 of the six following anniversary dates of that date.

27 (c) Section 45D of the Internal Revenue Code is modified as
28 follows:

29 (1) (A) The references to “the Secretary” in Section 45D of the
30 Internal Revenue Code are modified to read “the committee.”

31 (B) For purposes of this section, “committee” means the
32 California Tax Credit Allocation Committee as described in
33 subdivision (a) of Section 50199.7 of the Health and Safety Code,
34 or any successor thereto.

35 (2) Section 45D(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code is modified
36 by substituting for “(A) 5 percent with respect to the first 3 credit
37 allowance dates, and (B) 6 percent with respect to the remainder
38 of the credit allowance dates.” with the following:

39 (A) Zero percent with respect to the first two credit allowance
40 dates.

1 (B) Seven percent with respect to the third credit allowance
2 date.

3 (C) Eight percent with respect to the remainder of the credit
4 allowance dates.

5 (3) The provisions of Section 45D(b) of the Internal Revenue
6 Code is modified as follows:

7 (A) Section 45D(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code is modified
8 by substituting “3 years” for “5 years” and “3-year period” for
9 “5-year period.”

10 (B) Section 45D(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code is modified
11 by substituting “qualified low-income community investments in
12 California” for “qualified low-income community investments.”

13 (4) Section 45D(d)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating
14 to qualified low-income community investments, is modified to
15 include any capital or equity investment in, or loan to, any real
16 estate project located in a low-income community or any operating
17 business that, at the time the initial investment is made, has 250
18 or less employees and is located in a low-income community. The
19 real estate project or operating business shall meet all other
20 conditions of a qualified active low-income community business,
21 except as modified by paragraphs (5) and (6).

22 (5) The term “qualified active low-income community business,”
23 as defined in Section 45D(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code is
24 modified as follows:

25 (A) Section 45D(d)(2)(A)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code is
26 modified by substituting “any low-income community in
27 California” for “any low-income community.”

28 (B) Section 45D(d)(2)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code is
29 modified by substituting “any low-income community in
30 California” for “qualified low-income community investments.”

31 (C) Section 45D(d)(2)(A)(iii) of the Internal Revenue Code shall
32 not apply.

33 (D) The following shall apply in lieu of the provisions of Section
34 45D(d)(2)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to qualified
35 active low-income community business: “A ‘qualified active
36 low-income community business’ shall include an operating
37 business that, at the time the initial investment is made, has 250
38 or less employees and is located in a low-income community. The
39 operating business shall meet all other conditions of a qualified

1 active low-income business, except as modified by this paragraph
2 and paragraph (6).”

3 (6) Section 45D(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code is modified
4 to add the following: “When the United States Census Bureau
5 discontinues using the decennial census to report median family
6 income on a census tract basis, census block group data shall be
7 used based on the American Community Survey.”

8 (7) The following shall apply in lieu of the provisions of Section
9 45(D)(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to national
10 limitation on amount of investments designated: “The aggregate
11 amount of credit that may be allocated in any calendar year
12 pursuant to this section and Section 17053.9 shall be an amount
13 equal to any unused portion of the one hundred million dollars
14 (\$100,000,000) in exclusions, authorized pursuant to Section
15 6010.8, as determined by the California Alternative Energy and
16 Advanced Transportation Financing Authority and reported to the
17 committee, not to exceed forty million dollars (\$40,000,000). The
18 committee shall limit the allocation of credits permitted under this
19 section and Section 23622.9 to a cumulative total of no more than
20 two hundred million dollars (\$200,000,000). Any unused credits
21 shall be returned to the committee at the end of the third year
22 following allocation and the value of the unused credit shall be
23 available for allocation in the following calendar years.
24 Reallocation credits shall not count against the forty million dollars
25 (\$40,000,000) annual limit or the two hundred million dollars
26 (\$200,000,000) cumulative limit.”

27 (8) Section 45D(g)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating
28 to recapture event, is modified by adding the following:
29 “Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, a recapture
30 event shall not have occurred and an investment shall be
31 considered held by a community development entity upon its sale
32 or repayment, provided the qualified community development entity
33 reinvests an amount equal to the capital returned to or recovered
34 by the qualified community development entity from the original
35 investment, exclusive of any profits realized, in another qualified
36 low-income community investment within 12 months of the receipt
37 of that capital. A qualified community development entity shall
38 not be required to reinvest capital returned from a qualified
39 low-income community investment after the sixth anniversary of
40 the issuance of the qualified equity investment, the proceeds of

1 *which were used to make the qualified low-income community*
2 *investment. The qualified low-income community investment shall*
3 *be considered held by the qualified community development entity*
4 *through the seventh anniversary of the issuance of the qualified*
5 *equity investment.”*

6 *(9) Section 45D(i) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to*
7 *regulations, shall not apply.*

8 *(d) (1) The committee shall adopt guidelines necessary or*
9 *appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. The guidelines*
10 *shall not disqualify a low-income community investment for the*
11 *single reason that public or private incentives, loans, equity*
12 *investments, technical assistance, or other forms of support have*
13 *been or continue to be provided. The adoption of the guidelines*
14 *shall not be subject to the rulemaking provisions of the*
15 *Administrative Procedure Act of Chapter 3.5 (commencing with*
16 *Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government*
17 *Code.*

18 *(2) The committee shall establish and impose reasonable fees*
19 *upon entities that apply for the allocation pursuant to subdivision*
20 *(d) and use the revenue to defray the cost of administering the*
21 *program. The committee shall establish the fees in a manner that*
22 *ensures that (A) the total amount collected equals the amount*
23 *reasonably necessary to defray the committee’s costs in performing*
24 *its administrative duties under this section, and (B) the amount*
25 *paid by each entity reasonably corresponds with the value of the*
26 *services provided to the entity.*

27 *(3) In developing guidelines the committee shall adopt an*
28 *allocation process that does all of the following:*

29 *(A) Creates an equitable distribution process that ensures that*
30 *low-income communities across the state have an opportunity to*
31 *benefit from the program.*

32 *(B) Sets minimum organizational capacity standards that*
33 *applicants must meet in order to receive an allocation of credits.*

34 *(C) Requires annual reporting by each community development*
35 *entity that receives an allocation. The report shall include, but is*
36 *not limited to, the impact the credit had on the low-income*
37 *community, the amount of moneys used, and the types of activities*
38 *funded through the equity investment. The reporting period shall*
39 *be for a period of eight years following the allocation of credits.*

1 (D) Provides for the annual return of unused credits following
2 the third year after being awarded so that they may be reallocated
3 to other community development entities.

4 (e) In the case where the credit allowed by this section exceeds
5 the “tax,” the excess may be carried over to reduce the “tax” in
6 the following year, and the seven succeeding years if necessary,
7 until the credit is exhausted.

8 (f) The committee shall annually report on its Internet Web site
9 the information provided by low-income community development
10 entities and on the geographic distribution of the credits.

11 (g) This section shall remain in effect only until December 1,
12 2028, and as of that date is repealed.

13 SEC. 4. This act provides for a tax levy within the meaning of
14 Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect.

15
16
17 **All matter omitted in this version of the bill**
18 **appears in the bill as amended in the**
19 **Senate August 22, 2013. (JR11)**
20

New Market Tax Credit Awards - California

| Awardee | City | Year | Amount |
|---|-----------------|------|------------------------|
| Bethany Square LLC | Santa Monica | 2005 | \$11,000,000 |
| Bethany Square LLC | Santa Monica | 2008 | \$10,000,000 |
| BEYOND THE BOTTOM LINE, LLC | San Fernando | 2009 | \$15,000,000 |
| Border Communities Capital Company, LLC | Carlsbad | 2002 | \$50,000,000 |
| Border Communities Capital Company, LLC | Carlsbad | 2009 | \$50,000,000 |
| BRIDGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, INC. | SAN FRANCISCO | 2010 | \$18,000,000 |
| CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE COMMUNITIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION | Walnut Creek | 2012 | \$35,000,000 |
| CALIFORNIA URBAN INVESTMENT FUND, LLC | OAKLAND | 2008 | \$20,000,000 |
| Central Valley NMTC Fund, LLC | Fresno | 2010 | \$35,000,000 |
| Central Valley NMTC Fund, LLC | Fresno | 2012 | \$30,000,000 |
| Chevron NMTC Fund LLC | San Francisco | 2005 | \$20,000,000 |
| Chevron NMTC Fund LLC | San Francisco | 2006 | \$50,000,000 |
| CIVIC SAN DIEGO ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT FUND | San Diego | 2012 | \$35,000,000 |
| Clearinghouse CDFI, The | Lake Forest | 2002 | \$56,000,000 |
| Clearinghouse CDFI, The | Lake Forest | 2005 | \$75,000,000 |
| Clearinghouse CDFI, The | Lake Forest | 2006 | \$37,000,000 |
| Clearinghouse CDFI, The | Lake Forest | 2008 | \$90,000,000 |
| Clearinghouse CDFI, The | Lake Forest | 2009 | \$100,000,000 |
| Clearinghouse CDFI, The | Lake Forest | 2010 | \$35,000,000 |
| Clearinghouse Community Development Financial Institution | Lake Forest | 2012 | \$80,000,000 |
| CT/KDF Community Development Partners, LLC | Newport Beach | 2006 | \$90,000,000 |
| Genesis LA CDE LLC | Los Angeles | 2005 | \$80,000,000 |
| Genesis LA CDE LLC | Los Angeles | 2006 | \$50,000,000 |
| Genesis LA CDE LLC | Los Angeles | 2009 | \$40,000,000 |
| Golden Pacific Partners, L.L. C. a Delaware limited liability company d/b/a Golden Boy Partners | El Segundo | 2010 | \$25,000,000 |
| Community Investments CDE, L.L.C. | | | |
| Impact Community Capital CDE, LLC | San Francisco | 2002 | \$40,000,000 |
| KHC New Markets CDE, LLC | Carlsbad | 2002 | \$134,000,000 |
| L.A. Charter School New Markets CDE, LLC | Los Angeles | 2011 | \$25,000,000 |
| LA Charter School New Markets CDE | Los Angeles | 2002 | \$36,000,000 |
| LA Charter School New Markets CDE | Los Angeles | 2007 | \$35,000,000 |
| LA Charter School New Markets CDE | Los Angeles | 2009 | \$50,000,000 |
| Lenders for Community Development | San Jose | 2002 | \$25,000,000 |
| Lenders for Community Development | San Jose | 2005 | \$25,000,000 |
| Los Angeles Development Fund | Los Angeles | 2007 | \$75,000,000 |
| Los Angeles Development Fund | Los Angeles | 2011 | \$50,000,000 |
| Low Income Investment Fund | San Francisco | 2007 | \$44,000,000 |
| Low Income Investment Fund | San Francisco | 2008 | \$50,000,000 |
| Low Income Investment Fund | San Francisco | 2009 | \$45,000,000 |
| Low Income Investment Fund | San Francisco | 2010 | \$21,000,000 |
| Low Income Investment Fund | San Francisco | 2011 | \$50,000,000 |
| Low Income Investment Fund | San Francisco | 2012 | \$55,000,000 |
| Lowe Economic Development Company, LLC | Los Angeles | 2009 | \$45,000,000 |
| MMA Financial Community Renewable Energy Initiative, LLC | San Francisco | 2007 | \$20,000,000 |
| National New Markets Fund, LLC | Los Angeles | 2006 | \$25,000,000 |
| National New Markets Fund, LLC | Los Angeles | 2007 | \$50,000,000 |
| National New Markets Fund, LLC | Los Angeles | 2008 | \$50,000,000 |
| National New Markets Fund, LLC | Los Angeles | 2010 | \$42,000,000 |
| National New Markets Fund, LLC | Los Angeles | 2011 | \$70,000,000 |
| National New Markets Fund, LLC | Los Angeles | 2012 | \$75,000,000 |
| Neighborhood Bancorp | National City | 2002 | \$5,000,000 |
| New Markets Community Capital, LLC | Los Angeles | 2002 | \$30,000,000 |
| New Markets Community Capital, LLC | Los Angeles | 2008 | \$40,000,000 |
| New Markets Community Capital, LLC | Los Angeles | 2009 | \$55,000,000 |
| New Markets Community Capital, LLC | Los Angeles | 2011 | \$20,000,000 |
| New Markets Community Capital, LLC | Los Angeles | 2012 | \$25,000,000 |
| Northern California Community Loan Fund | San Francisco | 2008 | \$21,000,000 |
| Northern California Community Loan Fund | San Francisco | 2009 | \$18,000,000 |
| Northern California Community Loan Fund | San Francisco | 2010 | \$21,000,000 |
| Northern California Community Loan Fund | San Francisco | 2012 | \$20,000,000 |
| Oakland Renaissance NMTC, Inc. A California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation | Oakland | 2012 | \$20,000,000 |
| Opportunity Fund Northern California | San Jose | 2008 | \$35,000,000 |
| Opportunity Fund Northern California | San Jose | 2009 | \$30,000,000 |
| Opportunity Fund Northern California | San Jose | 2011 | \$25,000,000 |
| Opportunity Fund Northern California | San Jose | 2012 | \$30,000,000 |
| Revolution Community Ventures LLC | San Diego | 2006 | \$35,000,000 |
| Rural Community Assistance Corporation | West Sacramento | 2002 | \$8,000,000 |
| San Francisco Community Investment Fund | San Francisco | 2010 | \$35,000,000 |
| San Francisco Community Investment Fund | San Francisco | 2011 | \$45,000,000 |
| The Mechanics Bank Community Development Corporation | Richmond | 2003 | \$26,000,000 |
| Wells Fargo Community Development Enterprises, Inc. | San Diego | 2008 | \$90,000,000 |
| Wells Fargo Community Development Enterprises, Inc. | San Diego | 2009 | \$90,000,000 |
| Wells Fargo Community Development Enterprises, Inc. | San Diego | 2010 | \$42,000,000 |
| Wells Fargo Community Development Enterprises, Inc. | San Diego | 2011 | \$65,000,000 |
| WNC California Community Services Fund II, LLC | Irvine | 2010 | \$53,000,000 |
| WNC National Community Development Advisors, LLC | Irvine | 2002 | \$50,000,000 |
| WNC National Community Development Advisors, LLC | Irvine | 2006 | \$40,000,000 |
| WNC National Community Development Advisors, LLC | Irvine | 2008 | \$35,000,000 |
| Total | | | \$3,283,000,000 |



Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee Information

January 30, 2014

2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Update

Issue: Staff is conducting early outreach for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).

Recommendation: None, this is for information only.

Discussion: In the summer of 2013, staff came to the Board committees with an Outreach and Communications Plan (Attachment A) for the 2016 MTP/SCS. The Outreach and Communications Plan is a working document that can be added to and augmented to meet diverse needs as they arise. Included in the Outreach and Communications Plan was the development of a “sounding board” of cross-sectoral stakeholders (Attachment B) at the senior and executive level. The purpose of the sounding board is to provide feedback to the Board and staff on issues, research and analysis, and implementation themes being considered within the MTP/SCS. The last meeting of the sounding board was in October 2013. The sounding board provided feedback on the growth projections and implementation focus of the 2016 MTP/SCS. The next meeting of the sounding board will occur in February. Staff will brief the committee on the agenda of the sounding board meeting, as well as provide the date and location.

Outreach with the MTP/SCS sounding board is not required by state or federal statutes for public outreach for the 2016 MTP/SCS. The required public workshops will occur in fall 2014, and updates on the workshops will be provided in advance of the fall 2014 workshops. Staff anticipates working closely with local jurisdiction staff on local outreach and communications to residents.

In addition to the early outreach meetings, staff is beginning required outreach to Tribal governments in the SACOG region. Per SACOG’s adopted Public Participation Plan, which identifies state and federal requirements for public outreach, SACOG is required to conduct government-to-government outreach with Tribal governments. The established Tribal governments in the region are: Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, United Auburn Indian Community, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Staff is working with Placer County Transportation Planning Agency on outreach with the United Auburn Indian Community and with El Dorado County Transportation Commission on outreach to the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MH:lo
Attachments

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Coordinator, (916) 340-6247
Kacey Lizon, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6265
Monica Hernández, Associate Public Information Coordinator, (916) 340-6237

2016 MTP/SCS OUTREACH PLAN

Working document that can be added to throughout the engagement process

BOARD MEMBER, JURISDICTION STAFF & PUBLIC AGENCY COMMUNICATIONS

- Regular communication and updates will occur at all SACOG board committee meetings and at board meetings as needed
 - Timing: Ongoing
- Regular communication and opportunity for feedback from the Planners Committee, Transit Coordinating Committee, Regional Planning Partnership, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, with membership drawn from member jurisdictions and partner agencies
 - Timing: Ongoing
- Meetings with and communications to member jurisdiction staff on the process, requesting information, providing information for review and feedback
 - Timing: Ongoing
- Regional Managers Meetings
 - Timing: Quarterly
- Meetings with state and federal agencies
 - Timing: As needed to align with planning calendar and as dictated by statutory requirements
- Presentations to various public agency staff and boards in the region.
 - Timing: As coordinated by SACOG staff or by request

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

In addition to ongoing communications outlined above, staff will use methods such as those listed below to engage communities across the region about the 2016 MTP/SCS update:

- A comprehensive stakeholder list including stakeholders who participated in the previous MTP/SCS process will be updated and utilized.
 - Timing: Ongoing
- A one-stop request for information on the 2016 MTP/SCS update will be on the SACOG website for access to key input and feedback points for the public, key decision points for the Board, technical information, and meeting/workshop information.
 - Timing: Winter 2014, dependent on board adoption of 2016 MTP/SCS Framework
- Early engagement for cross-sectoral stakeholder group
 - Timing: Commenced Fall 2013, and ongoing approximately quarterly
- To maintain a consistent message, a PowerPoint presentation will be prepared to highlight both background on the MTP/SCS and the process for the update. The presentation will be used by various staff at presentations throughout the region coordinated by staff and/or by request from stakeholders and board members.
 - Timing: March 2014
- Stakeholder meetings, member and partner agency coordination, and public communications on policy issues and areas of research for the 2016 MTP/SCS
 - Timing: 2013-2015
- Staff will collaborate with key partners to publicize and present a greenhouse gas target-setting public workshop (contingent on actions of the California Air Resources Board).
- Staff will provide updates and gather feedback from SACOG advisory groups
- Public Workshops
 - Timing: Fall 2014
 - Staff will conduct at least eight public workshops in the region
 - Workshops held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.

- Stakeholder meetings, member and partner agency coordination, and public communications on development of draft plan and next steps
 - Timing: Summer 2014-Fall 2015
- Elected Official Information Meetings on draft Sustainable Communities Strategy
 - Staff will conduct at least six elected official information meetings on the draft Sustainable Communities Strategy/Alternative Planning Strategy (SCS/APS) in the update, one in each county with representatives of the county board of supervisors and city councils that represent a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the incorporated areas of that county. Meetings held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.
 - Timing: Fall/Winter 2015
- At least three public hearings on the draft SCS/APS. Any meetings held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.
 - Timing: Fall/Winter 2015
- Tribal consultation will occur in alignment with the outreach and communication principles, and as guided by the adopted Public Participation Plan. Outreach will occur on a government-to-government basis. For the Tribal Governments with land within Placer and El Dorado counties, tribal consultation will occur through collaboration with the Regional Transportation Planning agencies (RTPAs) in those counties.
 - Timing: Commenced January 2014, ongoing and in coordination with PCTPA and EDCTC

MASS COMMUNICATIONS

To supplement the ongoing routine media coverage of transportation issues, the following strategies will be used to inform and engage interested stakeholders

- A series of articles in the electronic newsletter on the content of the current MTP/SCS, what projects have begun or been completed in the interim, and an overview of the planning process with opportunities for feedback noticed in a timely manner
 - Timing: Beginning Winter 2014
- On the MTP/SCS website general information and a timeline for the update, including but not limited to why the update is taking place, contact information, meeting locations. The website will be easily accessible and updated as needed. The link to the MTP/SCS website will be prominent on the SACOG homepage.
 - Timing: January 2014
- Press releases and media outreach as needed.
- White papers and issue briefs may be developed on specific policy issues as the MTP/SCS Update process evolves, or new information or technical analysis needs to be communicated
- Staff will continue to reach out to community newsletters, social media, blogs and other similar publications outside of traditional media that work with SACOG in its media outreach.
 - Timing: Ongoing
- Staff will develop and place a number of op-ed pieces by board members as appropriate.

Staff contacts:

Kacey Lizon, Project Manager, klizon@sacog.org (916) 340-6265

Monica Hernández, Communications Coordinator, mhernandez@sacog.org, (916) 340-6237

Jennifer Hargrove, Land Use Coordinator, jhargrove@sacog.org, (916) 340-6216

Clint Holtzen, Transportation Coordinator, choltzen@sacog.org, (916) 340-6246

| Title | Agency/Organization | City | Jurisdiction | Sector |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------|--------------------------|--|
| Executive Director | WALKSacramento | Sacramento | Region | Active Transportation |
| Program Director | Woodland Bike Campaign | Woodland | Yolo | Active Transportation/Biking |
| Advocate | CA League of Womens Voters | Sacramento | Region | Active Transportation/ Transit/Seniors |
| Deputy Director of Housing Policy | CA Department of Housing & Community Development | Sacramento | State | Affordable Housing |
| Policy Director | Housing California | Sacramento | State | Affordable Housing |
| Board Member | Sac Housing Alliance | Sacramento | Region | Affordable Housing |
| District Director | US Department Housing & Urban Devolopment | Sacramento | Region | Affordable Housing |
| President/CEO | Nehemiah Corp | Sacramento | Region | Affordable Housing Developer |
| Executive Director | Capay Valley Vision | Esparto | Capay Valley | Agriculture |
| Agricultural Commissioner | El Dorado County | Placerville | El Dorado | Agriculture |
| Agricultural Commissioner | Placer County | Auburn | Placer County | Agriculture |
| Agricultural Commissioner | Sacramento County | Sacramento | Sacramento County | Agriculture |
| Ag Commissioner | Sutter County | Yuba City | Sutter County | Agriculture |
| Agricultural Commissioner | Yolo County | Woodland | Yolo County | Agriculture |
| Agricultural Commissioner | Yuba County | Marysville | Yuba County | Agriculture |
| Executive Director | BREATHE CA | Sacramento | Region | Air Quality |
| Board Member | American Insititute of Architects, Central Valley | Sacramento | Region | Architecture, design, development |
| Executive Director | Asian Resources | Sacramento | Sacramento City | Community Based Organization |
| Executive Director | Mutual Assistance Network | Sacramento | Sacramento City & County | Community Based Organization |
| Executive Director | Ubuntu Green | Sacramento | Sacramento City | Community Based Organization |
| President/CEO | Valley Vision | Sacramento | Region | Community Based Organization |
| Branch Manager | FREED-Center for Independent Living | Marysville | Yuba & Sutter Couties | Disabled Community |
| Advocate/Community Organizer | Resources for Independent Living | Sacramento | Region | Disabled Community |

| Title | Agency/Organization | City | Jurisdiction | Sector |
|---|--|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| President/CEO | Sacramento Black Chamber of Commerce | Sacramento | Region | Economic Development |
| President/CEO | El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce | Placerville | El Dorado County | Economic Development |
| Predisident/CEO | El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce | El Dorado Hills | El Dorado Hills | Economic Development |
| Executive Director | Greater Sacramento Urban League | Sacramento | Region | Economic Development |
| President | Rainbow Chamber | Sacramento | Region | Economic Development |
| Senior Vice President, Public Policy & Economic Development | Sac Metro Chamber of Commerce | Sacramento | Region | Economic Development |
| President/CEO | Sacramento Asian-Pacific Chamber of Commerce | Sacramento | Region | Economic Development |
| President/CEO | Sacramento Hispanic Chamber of Commerce | Sacramento | Region | Economic Development |
| Senior Vice President | SACTO | Sacramento | Region | Economic Development |
| Director | Center for Strategic Economic Research | Sacramento | Region | Economic Development/Regional Data |
| Economic Development Executive, Greater Sacramento Region | PG & E | Sacramento | Region | Energy |
| Supervisor, Electric Transportation | SMUD | Sacramento | Region | Energy |
| Executive Director | ECOS | Sacramento | Region | Environment |
| Community Partnerships & Innovation Director | Sac Tree Foundation | Sacramento | Region | Environment |
| Conservation Program Coordinator | Sierra Club | Sacramento | Region | Environment |
| External Affairs Manager | The Nature Conservancy | Sacramento | Region | Environment |
| Public Information Officer | Sacramento Metro Fire | Sacramento | Sacramento County | Fire |
| President/Co-founder | Domus Development | Sacramento | State | For-Profit Affordable Housing Developer/Infill Developer |

| Title | Agency/Organization | City | Jurisdiction | Sector |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Manager of Environmental Policy | CA Trucking Assn | Sacramento | State | Goods/Freight |
| Manager of Enviro Policy | CA Trucking Assn | | | Goods/Freight |
| Project Director | Cordova Hills, LLC | Sacramento | Sacramento | Greenfield Developer |
| Health in All Policies coordinator | CA Department of Public Health | Sacramento | State | Health & Built Environment/Active |
| Community Benefits Director | Sutter Health | Sacramento | Region | Health Care Provider |
| Program Manager | Sierra Health Foundation | Sacramento | Region | Health Foundation |
| Program Manager | The CA Endowment | Sacramento | State/So Sacramento City & County | Health Foundation |
| Director, Local Government Affairs | UC Davis | Davis | Region | Higher Education |
| Associate Vice Chancellor: Workforce & Economic Development | Los Rios Community College District | Sacramento | Sacramento County | Higher Education/TOD |
| Executive Director | Capitol Health Network | Sacramento | Sacramento County | Human Services |
| Predisident/CEO | Community Link | Sacramento | Sacramento County | Human Services |
| Capitol Area Development Manager | CADA | Sacramento | Sacramento | Infill Development |
| Public Information Officer | CA Highway Patrol | West Sacramento | Region | Law Enforcement |
| Managing Principal | Economic & Planning Systems (EPS) | Sacramento | Region | Market Rate Developer |
| Vice President | Richland Homes | Roseville | Region | Market Rate Developer |
| President | StoneBridge | Sacramento | Sacramento | Market Rate Developer |
| Principal & President | MacKay & Somps | Roseville | Region | Market Rate Development |
| Executive Director | Region Builders | Sacramento | Region | Market Rate Development |
| Director of Governmental & Legislative Affairs | North State Building Industry Association | Roseville | Region | Market Rate Development |
| Founding Partner/Legal Counsel | Taylor Wiley | Sacramento | Sacramento | Market Rate Development Attorney |
| Executive Director | Mutual Housing California | Sacramento | Yolo & Sacramento Counties | Non-profit Affordable Housing Developer |

| Title | Agency/Organization | City | Jurisdiction | Sector |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Public Health Officer | Sacramento County | Sacramento | Sacramento County | Health |
| Director of Litigation, Advocacy & Training | CA Rural League Assistance, Inc. | Marysville | Yuba, Sutter, El Dorado counties | Rural Social Equity |
| Senior Planner | Area 4 Agency on Aging | Sacramento | Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo & Yuba counties | Seniors/Aging |
| Deputy Director | Opening Doors | Sacramento | Region | Social Equity |
| Director | UCD Center for Regional Change | Davis | Region | Social Equity |
| Counsel | Western Poverty Law Center | Sacramento | State | Social Equity |
| President | CA Capital/CDFI | Sacramento | Region | Social Equity/Economic Development |
| Associate Professor | UC Davis | Davis | Region | Social Equity/Equitable SB 375 Investment |
| Legal Counsel | Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians | Shingle Springs | Sovereign Nation | Tribal Government |
| Government Affairs | United Auburn Indian Community | Auburn | Sovereign Nation | Tribal Government |
| Tribal Liaison | Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation | Brooks | Sovereign Nation | Tribal Government |
| Executive Director | Regional Water Authority | Sacramento | Region | Water |
| Program Director | Health Education Council | West Sacramento | Region | Youth & family health |
| Executive Director | Yolo Children's Alliance | Davis | Yolo | Youth Services |



Item #14-2-5B
Information

Government Affairs & Public Relations Committee

January 31, 2014

Inventory of Adopted and Proposed Land Use Plans

Issue: What is the status of the land use forecast update for the 2016 MTP/SCS update and what is the process moving forward?

Recommendation: This item will be forwarded to the committee prior to the meeting.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:JH:lo

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6247
Kacey Lizon, MTP/SCS Manager, (916) 340-6265
Jennifer Hargrove, MTP/SCS Coordinator (916) 340-6216

1400701



Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee Information

January 30, 2014

State Advocacy Update

Issue: Update on state advocacy issues related to SACOG.

Recommendation: None, this is for information only.

Discussion:

Governor’s Budget Proposal

The January CEO Update included a preliminary report on the Governor’s 2014-15 Budget Proposal. The key budget takeaway relative to transportation is that while expenditures are proposed above 2013-14 levels overall, they are lower in certain key areas such as road maintenance, and that any increases in funding are due to one-time expenditures. Ongoing transportation revenues (primarily from the gas tax) are lower than in 2013-14, and are likely to continue to decline.

The Governor’s proposed budget estimates that gas tax revenues will decline in 2014-15, which translates into less for maintenance of state highways and local streets and roads. The table below shows three-year transportation expenditures for the key state transportation accounts.

| Expenditures (in thousands) | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 (proposed) |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Local assistance – grants | 53,257 | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| State operations | 3,020 | 3,644 | 3,561 |
| California Transportation Commission Sub-Total | \$56,277 | \$28,644 | \$28,561 |
| Public Transit Account | 417,495 | 389,752 | 373,091 |
| PTMISEA (Prop. 1B transit grant funds) | 752,893 | 298,988 | 823,949 |
| State Transit Assistance Sub-Total | \$1,170,388 | \$688,740 | \$1,197,040 |
| Aeronautics | 4,109 | 5,269 | 8,915 |
| Highway Transportation | 10,565,439 | 11,373,099 | 9,932,806 |
| Mass Transportation | 970,291 | 1,132,431 | 694,876 |
| Transportation Planning | 162,182 | 219,723 | 221,738 |
| Caltrans Sub-Total | \$11,702,021 | \$12,730,522 | \$10,858,335 |
| Administration | 10,181 | 22,100 | 25,065 |
| Program Management | 1,200 | 1 | 1 |
| Public Information | 68 | 500 | 500 |
| Fiscal and Other External Contracts | 6,339 | 3,750 | 3,750 |
| Blended System Projects | - | - | 32,000 |
| Capital Outlay | 213,082 | 593,299 | 1,328,715 |
| High-Speed Rail Authority Sub-Total | \$230,870 | \$619,650 | \$ 1,390,031 |
| Transportation Account Totals | \$ 12,948,252 | \$ 14,067,556 | \$13,473,967 |

Transportation Revenue

As the Board heard from representatives of Transportation California, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and Regional Transit last August, California is facing a significant revenue shortfall and backlog of transportation needs. In November, Transportation California and the California Alliance for Jobs asked the Attorney General to prepare title and summary for a potential ballot measure to increase the vehicle license fee by 1 percent for transportation purposes. On January 27, these groups decided to indefinitely delay this proposal, primarily based on the lack of voter support in recent polling.

The Governor's budget does propose one new transportation-related revenue source: cap-and-trade revenues. \$50 million would be appropriated to Caltrans for competitive grants for integrating rail systems and intercity rail connections to High-Speed Rail, \$250 million to the High-Speed Rail Authority for high-speed rail construction, and \$100 million to the Strategic Growth Council for local assistance for Sustainable Communities.

The Governor proposes that the Sustainable Communities funding be competitively awarded to projects benefitting disadvantaged communities and reducing GHG emissions. Eligible uses may include: increasing transit ridership, active transportation (walking/biking), affordable housing near transit stations, preservation of agricultural land, and local planning that promotes infill development and reduces the number of vehicle miles traveled.

SACOG and the Transportation Coalition for Livable Communities has been looking for a much higher funding level, as well as allowing regions to have a role in directing how these funds are allocated. We are hoping that there will be more clarity on the specific uses eligible for these funds, the role of regions in prioritizing expenditures, and the potential funding levels in future years.

Redevelopment Replacement

Last year, the Legislature did not pass the legislation that SACOG has been seeking for the last two years, but it did send one SACOG-supported Infrastructure Financing District reform bill to the Governor, AB 662, which he vetoed. His only objection was to unintended costs to the General Fund. He said his administration will work with the author's office to modify the language and send it back for his signature next year.

As part of his budget proposal, the Governor detailed support for an expanded Infrastructure Financing District program, but it is more limited than the legislation SACOG has supported in the past, and it adds a clear condition that Infrastructure Financing Districts can be formed in former Redevelopment Areas only if the local governments have received a finding of compliance from the Department of Finance, have complied with State Controller audit findings, and have concluded any lawsuits with the Department of Finance. With approximately 100 active lawsuits between local governments and the Department of Finance currently pending, many jurisdictions across the state would be unable to use this new authority.

In February, staff expects the Administration to propose legislation to do the following:

- Expand the types of projects that IFDs can fund to include military base reuse, urban infill, transit priority projects, affordable housing, and associated necessary consumer services. The goal is to maintain the IFD focus on projects which have tangible quality-of-life benefits for the residents of the IFD project area.
- Allow cities or counties that meet specified benchmarks to create these new IFDs, and to issue related debt, subject to receiving 55-percent voter approval.

- Allow new IFD project areas to overlap with the project areas of the former RDAs, while strictly limiting the available funding in those areas to dollars available after payment on all of the former RDA's approved obligations.
- Maintain the current IFD prohibition on the diversion of property tax revenues from K-14 schools, which will ensure any usage will have no state General Fund impact, and require entities that seek to establish an IFD to gain the approval of the county, cities, and special districts that would contribute their revenue, including residual revenue, to the IFD.

Water

SACOG staff continues to work with the North State Water Alliance (Regional Water Authority, Northern California Water Association, Mountain Counties Water Resources Association, Metro Chamber and SACOG), as well as individual jurisdictions in the region on water issues. This month, staff is bringing the Land Use and Natural Resources Committee a revised version of the educational handout distributed at the January Board meeting. Staff is also working on a special meeting of regional city and county executives and elected officials to discuss regional responses to short- and long-term water issues.

Scoping Plan

The Air Resources Board is updating its scoping plan for AB 32 implementation. The scoping plan describes all of the activities required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. One of the activities included in the scoping plan is the Sustainable Communities Strategies regional greenhouse gas reduction targets. Staff is monitoring very closely whether the Air Resources Board intends to modify the SCS targets, which would have implications for the update to the next MTP/SCS.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:EJ:lo

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6247
Raef Porter, Senior Analyst, (916) 340-6261



Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee

**Item #14-2-7
Information**

January 31, 2014

Federal Advocacy Update

Issue: Update on federal advocacy.

Recommendation: This is an information only item. There will not be a staff presentation.

Discussion: Attached is a monthly update from SACOG's Federal Policy Services consultant, Transportation for America.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

Attachment

MM:EJ:ef

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6247

Monthly Report to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments January 6, 2014

WHAT TO WATCH

STATE OF THE UNION

During the President's State of the Union, he talked about a proposal to clear away "red tape" and encourage better coordination among federal agencies to speed construction costs. The President also called on Congress to pass the WRDA bill that has been in conference since late November and a reauthorization of MAP-21.

DEBT CEILING

Treasury Secretary Lew has indicated that Treasury will need to start using accounting gimmicks to avoid the debt ceiling starting February 7th unless a deal is reached to raise the debt limit. Secretary Lew has also indicated that accounting gimmicks and extraordinary measures can only be used for a month. Therefore, the debt limit must be raised by the end of February.

President Obama and Congressional Democrats have indicated they will not negotiate over the borrowing limit, while Republicans have said publicly that they would like to extract some policy concessions for raising the borrowing limit. However, Republican leadership has acknowledged they will have to pass a clean debt ceiling increase because of the unified Democratic front they face. Adding to their calculation is election year politics where they may have two options: a clean debt limit increases or risk default. It is likely the majority of the votes needed to pass a debt limit increase in the House will come from Democrats.

FY2014 APPROPRIATIONS

On January 18, the President signed into law an appropriations measure covering FY2014, which had been approved by bipartisan majorities in both chambers, averting any possibility of a government shutdown until the end of the fiscal year on September 30.

Among the highlights:

- The popular TIGER discretionary grant program is funded at \$600 million. This represents a return to the historic high of FY2010 spending on this program, and stands in sharp contrast to the House proposal from last year that eliminated all funding for the program. There is also a set-aside within TIGER for planning grants that can total as much as \$35 million – a program that many communities in the SACOG region may be well positioned for;
- The Federal Transit Administration's Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grants (New Starts/Small Starts) program for public transit construction projects is funded at \$2.13 billion, which is above the MAP-21 authorization levels of \$1.9 billion. In contrast, this program received \$1.86 billion in funding in FY2013 after sequestration was taken into account and \$1.6 billion in the FY11 budget deal;
- Amtrak's capital program is funded at \$1.05 billion and its operating program is funded at \$340 million in FY14. The FY2014 capital program is \$148 million above the FY2013 post-sequestration funding level. While the operating program is \$101 million less than FY2013 post sequestration funding levels, it is just \$33 million below Amtrak's requested



Transportation for America

amount for this year. Amtrak continues to break annual ridership levels. In 2013, Amtrak served 32.1 million riders, representing its tenth annual ridership record in 11 years that allows for the passenger railroad to cover 88 percent of its operating costs;

- The final agreement does not contain any dedicated money for high-speed rail, and the Senate's \$100 million for intercity passenger rail projects on top of Amtrak was not included in the deal. However, the House agreed to drop its provision that would have prohibited any federal funding being spent on California's high speed rail project and passenger rail projects are eligible for the \$600 million in TIGER grants;
- The final bill includes funding for the transit-oriented development (TOD) planning pilot program, which was authorized in MAP-21 at \$10 million per year (FY2013 and FY2014). FTA has yet to write guidance for or obligate funds for this program.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

In efforts to bring attention to the impending shortfall in funding facing the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) Secretary Foxx announced the U.S. Department of Transportation will begin posting monthly on its website exactly how much money the HTF has left and update that number every month until the fund can sustain itself or until it runs out. Secretary Foxx argued that providing this information to the public would increase transparency and accountability.

In their first post, U.S. DOT estimates that based on current spending and revenue trends the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund will encounter a shortfall as early as this summer and certainty before the end of the fiscal year. The Highway Account began FY2014 with approximately \$1.6 billion in cash. A \$9.7 billion transfer from the General Fund was processed shortly after the start of the fiscal year (\$10.4 billion authorized by MAP-21 but reduced to \$9.7 billion by sequestration). U.S. DOT highlights that the surface transportation program continues to outlay at a greater pace than receipts are coming in. As a result, the cash balance has dropped by nearly \$4.3 billion since the General Fund transfer occurred. As of the last week of December 2013, the Highway Account cash balance was \$8.5 billion.

For the Mass Transit Account, U.S. DOT estimates that based on current spending and revenue trends that account will have a balance of approximately \$440 million at the end of FY2014. The Mass Transit Account began FY2014 with approximately \$2.5 billion in cash. A \$2 billion transfer from the General Fund to the Mass Transit Account was processed shortly after the start of the fiscal year (\$2.2 billion authorized by MAP-21 but reduced to \$2 billion by sequestration). As of the last week of December 2013, the Mass Transit Account cash balance was \$3.8 billion.

RECENTLY INTRODUCED BILLS

- **S. 1957, Partnership to Build America Act (companion to H.R. 2084)**
 - Introduced by Senator Michael Bennet (D-CO)
 - 10 cosponsors, including 6 Republicans and 4 Democrats
 - Creates an infrastructure fund with repatriated corporate profits to help fund infrastructure projects owned by a state or local government.
- **H.R. 3893, Responsible Rail and Deferring Deficiency Act**
 - Introduced by Congressman Denham (R-CA)
 - 14 cosponsors, all Republicans in California delegation are cosponsors
 - Would prevent any federal funding from being used for high speed rail in California



- **H.R. 3978, New Opportunities for Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Funding Act**
 - Introduced by Congressman Albio Sires (D-NJ)
 - 4 cosponsors, including 2 Republicans and 2 Democrats
 - Creates a low-interest long-term loan program for communities to build biking and walking network. Requires 25% of the funding to be spent in low-income communities. The funding is an \$11 million set aside from the TIFIA.

CONGRESSIONAL UPDATE

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

Chairman Shuster, the Chair of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, has indicated that he would like to pursue a bill that is bipartisan and hopes to hold a markup in late spring or early summer so that the full House can consider the bill before Congress recesses for the month of August. Many in DC believe this be an aggressive time for this bill because of Congress' current slow pace to reauthorize programs and Shuster having his own primary election to contend with in May. Chairman Shuster has held the first in what he has said will be a series of hearings surrounding reauthorization.

Chairman Shuster announced on January 16th the creation of a special panel focused on the use of and opportunities for public-private partnerships across all modes of transportation.

Congressman John Duncan (R-TN) will chair the panel and other members of the panel include:

Candice Miller (R-MI)
Lou Barletta (R-PA)
Tom Rice (R-SC)
Mark Meadows (R-NC)
Scott Perry (R-PA)
Michael Capuano (D-MA)
Peter DeFazio (D-OR)
Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-DC)
Rick Larson (D-WA)
Sean Patrick Maloney (D-NY)

It is expected that the panel will hold a series of hearings over the next six months. At the conclusion of the six months, the panel will likely issue a report looking at the current use of public-private partnerships and recommendations for greater deployment of public-private partnerships as a funding source for transportation and infrastructure projects. The select panel is similar to the panel the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee created surrounding recommendations to improve freight movement last year.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

The WRDA conference continues with the conversations limited to House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman Shuster and Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Chairman Boxer who are working through the last remaining differences between the House and Senate bills. The timeline for the conference to wrap up has continued to slip.



LETTER TO CHAIRMAN CAMP REQUESTING HEARING ON THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

House Ways and Means Committee Democrats, in a letter led by Congressman Earl Blumenauer (D-OR), sent a letter to Chairman Camp (R-MI) to hold hearings to explore new funding options for the Federal Highway Trust Fund program. The letter highlighted the impending \$21.2 billion shortfall in revenues the HTF faces at the end of the fiscal year and how this will impact transportation programs this summer when the HTF's available cash on hand is expected to fall below \$4 billion, which is the minimum amount necessary to maintain a sufficient balance to meet week-to-week obligations.

RECENT HEARINGS

- House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, "Building the Foundation for Surface Transportation Reauthorization", January 14, 2014. The hearing was the first one held by the T&I Committee as it starts its efforts to reauthorize the surface transportation bill that expires on October 1st of this year. The members of the T&I Committee did not provide much insight into preferred policies or revenue options for the next surface transportation authorization. All four witnesses consistently stated that a strong federal partner is paramount for America to have the best transportation system that allows for them to compete globally and provide a quality of living for its citizens. Addressing a question about legislation introduced in the House (H.R. 3486) to devolve the HTF to state control Governor Falin responded by saying, "States can't pick up the load by themselves. We need to have a national vision for a national transportation system." While not specifically talking about options to resolve the Highway Trust Fund's financial challenges, the Members regularly spoke about the issue. Representative Eleanor Holmes Norton (Ranking Member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee) stated that she believes the HTF is outdated and we must either create a new mechanism to fund the program or retool the HTF away from a gas centric revenue model. No witness firmly stood behind this statement, but all four said that all options should be considered and debated by the committee, and a decision to move forward should be made. The ideal length of a surface transportation authorization was discussed a few times with the witnesses agreeing that they would prefer a multi-year authorization because it provides certainty for state and local partners for both funding levels and policies. It was argued that having this information allows states and locals to maximize investments and adequately plan for development. Discussion led to modal funding at one point and all witnesses agreed that an economically competitive region is one that has an integrated and connected multi-modal system. Witnesses included:
 - The Honorable Mary Falin, Governor, State of Oklahoma; on behalf of the National Governors Association
 - Mr. Stuart Levenick, Group President, Caterpillar Inc.
 - The Honorable Kasim Reed, Mayor, City of Atlanta; on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Mayors
 - Mr. Lawrence Hanley, International President, Amalgamated Transit Union
- House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Material, "A Review of the Challenges Facing California High Speed Rail", January 15, 2014. While the California High Speed Rail project has been slowed by legal issues in the recent past, the Subcommittee Chairman, Jeff Denham (CA-10, Republican), who has opposed the project since joining Congress in 2011, used this hearing to raise issues with the project with federal and state officials. The hearing



Transportation for America

consisted of two witness panels: the first was composed of Representatives from California, whose support for the project was split by political party. The second was where Chairman Denham centered his ire, lashing out at the FRA Deputy Administrator for what he considers lack of response to his desire that the agency stop or halt the project. Denham raised many legal questions for the Congressional Research Service's attorney and probed for answers from Mr. Richard on project status and statutory reasoning for some of the California High Speed Rail Authority's actions. The result of the hearing is Chairman Denham's introduction of the Responsible Rail and Deterring Deficiency Act (H.R. 3893) the following day. The bill would suspend all federal funds for this project unless California can raise sufficient non-federal funds to ensure the project's viability. Witnesses included:

- The Honorable Kevin McCarthy (CA-23)
 - The Honorable Zoe Lofgren (CA-19)
 - The Honorable Loretta Sanchez (CA-46)
 - The Honorable Jim Costa (CA-16)
 - The Honorable Doug LeMalfa (CA-01)
 - The Honorable David Valadao (CA-21)
 - Ms. Karen Hedlund, Deputy Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration
 - Mr. Dan Richard, Chairman of the Board, California High Speed Rail Authority
 - Ms. Alissa Dolan, Congressional Research Service
- Senate Banking Committee, "Progress Report on Public Transportation Under MAP-21", January 16, 2014. The hearing focused primarily on the implementation of MAP-21's new safety and transit asset management requirements. A majority of Senators who attended were from rural states (South Dakota, Idaho, Nebraska, Montana, and West Virginia), and they pushed Administrator Rogoff to make sure that final safety and asset management rules are not burdensome to small, bus-only transit operators. Senator Reed (D-RI) asked about the impact on transit agencies if the Highway Trust Fund shortfall is not addressed, to which Mr. Rogoff responded that FTA would have to begin reimbursing transit agencies at reduced rates or in some cases hold payments until cash became available. In response to a question from Senator Menendez (D-NJ), Mr. Rogoff committed to soliciting applications for the TOD Planning Pilot Program this spring. Witnesses included:
 - The Honorable Peter Rogoff, Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation
 - Mr. David Wise, Director of the Physical Infrastructure Team, U.S. Government Accountability Office
 - House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, "Improving the Effectiveness of the Federal Surface Transportation Safety Grant Programs" January 28, 2014. This hearing was focused on the effectiveness of the safety programs, especially related to implementing the changes made by MAP-21. However, the insolvency of the HTF dominated the conversation with witnesses reiterating that solving the federal funding issue was paramount. The point was made by a number of the witnesses that uncertainty about funding prevents states from accurately planning for future safety needs and projects, especially for projects that require a multi-year commitment. Witnesses included:
 - The Honorable Christopher Hart, Vice Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board
 - Douglas Danko, Chairman, American Traffic Safety Services Association



Transportation for America

- Sgt. Thomas Fuller, New York State Police, on behalf of the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
- Kendall Poole, Director, Tennessee Governor's Highway Safety Office, on behalf of the Governors Highway Safety Association
- Peter Sweatman, Director, University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute, on behalf of Intelligent Transportation Society of America

FLOOD INSURANCE

Included in the omnibus signed into law on January 17th, was a provision to prevent the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) from raising flood rates on grandfathered National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) properties for the rest of Fiscal Year 2014.

Grandfathered properties under this provision are homes and businesses that were built to code and were subsequently re-mapped into a higher risk area on a new flood map.

This week the Senate passed legislation to delay scheduled rate increases for the federal flood insurance program. There was strong bipartisan support with the legislation passing by a vote of 67-32, signaling widespread concern from both parties about the politically dangerous price hikes on homeowners. Both Senators Feinstein and Boxer voted in favor of the legislation. Members are concerned that the Biggert-Waters Federal Flood Insurance Reform Act raises flood rates too quickly and too high, even as members acknowledge that the problems plaguing the National Flood Insurance Program stem from offering policies at suppressed prices. The program is currently \$24 billion in debt.

The legislation passed by the Senate would reverse provisions in the Biggert-Waters Federal Flood Insurance Reform Act that ramp up the price of discounted coverage. Specifically, the legislation would delay the increases under Biggert-Waters for: 1) Homes and businesses that are currently grandfathered; 2) Properties that purchased a new policy after July 6, 2012; and 3) Properties sold after July 6, 2011. Additionally, the legislation passed by the Senate delays rate increases until: 1) FEMA completes the affordability study required by Biggert-Waters, proposes a draft affordability framework for Congressional review and Congress has a chance to give FEMA affordability authority; and 2) FEMA certifies the agency has implemented a flood mapping approach that utilizes sound scientific and engineering methodologies to determine varying levels of flood risk in all areas participating in the NFIP. This legislation also required FEMA to propose a draft regulatory framework to address any affordability issue identified in the study and give Congress the time to vote on allowing the regulations to move forward.

On January 27, 2014, a Statement of Administrative Policy (SAP) was issued on the legislation highlighting the Administration's concern that delaying implementation of Biggert-Waters would further erode the financial position of the NFIP. The SAP also highlighted the Administration's concern that a delay would reduce FEMA's ability to pay future claims made by all policyholders. Finally, the SAP indicated the Administration recognizes that many policyholders may be challenged financially by the new rates and remains committed to working with Congress to develop approaches that ensure economically distressed policyholders are not unduly burdened while maintaining the financial stability of the NFIP.

MAP-21 IMPLEMENTATION

FINAL ACTIONS

- Categorical Exclusions.** Under a joint rulemaking issued by FHWA and FTA on January 13, 2014, new categorical exclusions for projects within an existing operational right-of-way and projects receiving less than \$5 million in federal funding or with a total estimated cost of more than \$30 million and federal funds comprising less than 15 percent of the total estimated project cost. Existing operational right-of-way refers to the right-of-way that has been distributed for an existing transportation facility or is maintaining a transportation purpose, including roadway, bridges, interchanges, culverts, drainage, fixed guideways, mitigation areas, clear zone, traffic control signage, landscaping, any rest areas with direct access to a controlled access highway, areas maintained for safety and security of a facility, parking facilities with direct access to an existing transportation facility, transit power substations, transit vending structures and transit maintenance facilities. Additionally, portions of the right-of way that have not been distributed or that are not maintained for transportation purposes not in the existing right-of-way. A project that requires a federal permit, authorization or other approval and does not receive any federal funding, does not qualify. For example, a project that receives a federal grant, loan, loan guarantee, line of credit, and projects receiving funds authorized for the Federal Lands Access Program, the Federal Lands Transportation Program and the Tribal Transportation Program do not qualify. Federal Transit Administration is hosting a webinar on the new CEs, February 4th at 1:30. To participate - <https://connectdot.connectsolutions.com/ftafinalruleforcategorialexclusions/>.

BILL TRACKER

Introduced in House of Representatives

| Bill No. | Title | Lead Sponsor(s) | Summary | Status |
|----------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| HR 787 | Infrastructure Jobs and Energy Independence Act | Murphy | Generates revenue through sale of oil/gas leases; 60% goes to fund highways, transit, and water projects | 4 cosponsors; referred to House Committees (Natural Resources; Judiciary; Energy & Commerce; Rules; Budget; T&I) |
| HR 949 | Invest in American Jobs Act of 2013 | Rahall | Enhancements to Buy America provisions for highways, transit, rail, Amtrak, wastewater, FEMA, other infrastructure | 58 cosponsors; referred to House Committees (T&I; Financial Services) |
| HR 974 | MOVE Freight Act of | Sires | Establishes competitive grant | 18 cosponsors; |



Transportation for America

| Bill No. | Title | Lead Sponsor(s) | Summary | Status |
|----------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| | 2013 | | program to fund freight improvements; makes MAP-21's National Freight Network multimodal; makes voluntary state freight plans mandatory | referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 1544 | National High Performance Rail Transportation-Oriented Development Act | Petri/Lipinski | Requires DOT to provide incentives to rail projects that capture value from transportation-oriented development | 1 cosponsor; referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 2084 | Partnership to Build America Act | Delaney | Creates infrastructure fund to finance projects funded by repatriated profits | 51 cosponsors; referred to House Committees (T&I and Ways & Means) |
| HR 2428 | SAFE Bridges Act | Rahall | Authorizes \$2.75 billion for bridge repair annually | 26 cosponsors; referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 2468 | Safe Streets Act | Matsui | Requires states and MPOs to adopt "complete streets" policies | 7 cosponsors; referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 2553 | National Infrastructure Bank Act | DeLauro | Establishes an infrastructure bank | 83 cosponsors; referred to House Committees (Energy & Commerce, T&I, Financial Services, Ways & Means) |
| HR 2968 | Commute Less Act | Sires | Requires employer-based commuter programs in planning process; requires "employer advisory council" for transportation management areas | 1 cosponsors, Referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 3040 | Safe Freight Act | Michaud | Prohibits the operation of a freight train or light locomotive engine used in the movement of freight unless it has a crew of at least two individuals, one of whom is certified by the FRA as a locomotive operator and the other as train conductor | 53 cosponsors. Referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 3182 | Safe and Secure Border Infrastructure Act | Peters (CA) | Creates a safe and secure border infrastructure grant program available to MPOs located along the international border with Canada and Mexico to construct transportation infrastructure improvements at existing and new international | 2 cosponsors. Referred to House T&I Committee |



Transportation for America

| Bill No. | Title | Lead Sponsor(s) | Summary | Status |
|----------|---|----------------------|--|---|
| | | | crossings | |
| HR 3486 | Transportation Empowerment Act | Graves (GA) | Decreases federal gas tax over 5 years to 3.7 cents and converts federal program into block grant to states | Companion to S. 1702; 36 cosponsors; referred to House Committees (T&I, Budget, Ways and Means) |
| HR 3494 | Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act | Blumenauer/ Coble | Requires USDOT to establish motorized and nonmotorized safety performance measures for planning and programming | Companion to S. 1708; 45 cosponsors; referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 3551 | Railway Inspection and Transparency Act | Andrews | Directs the FRA to require each railroad to arrange for an independent inspection by a professional engineer of all railroad bridges biennially, and all railroad signals and switches at semiannually | Referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 3597 | Safety, Efficiency, Accountability in Transportation Projects Through Public Inspection Act | Edwards | Requires public employees to perform construction inspections on all surface transportation projects receiving federal funding | Referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 3620 | Local HIRE Act | Bass | Allows States to establish local hiring bid specifications or consider the hiring of local workers in the evaluation of bids and proposals for transportation projects | 5 cosponsors. Referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 3634 | Commuter Rail Passenger Safety Act | Maloney | Allows installation of positive control systems to be eligible for railroad rehabilitation and improvement direct loans and loan guarantees, and extends the railroad safety technology grants program for FY2014-2018 | 12 cosponsors. Referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 3636 | Update, Promote, and Develop America's Transportation Essentials Act | Blumenauer | Phases in a 15 cent gas and diesel tax increase starting in 2014, and indexes the gas tax to inflation | Referred to the House Ways & Means Committee |
| HR 3638 | Road Usage Fee Pilot Program Act | Blumenauer | Directs the Secretary of Treasury to establish a competitive grant program to study mileage-based fee systems | Referred to House Committees (Ways & Means, T&I, Energy & |



Transportation for America

| Bill No. | Title | Lead Sponsor(s) | Summary | Status |
|----------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | Commerce) |
| HR 3893 | Responsible Rail and Deferring Deficiency Act | Denham | Would prevent any federal funding from being used for California High Speed Rail | 14 cosponsors, Referred to House Committee on T&I |
| HR 3978 | New Opportunities for Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Act | Sires | Creates a low-interest long-term loan program for communities to build biking and walking network. Requires 25% of the funding to be spent in low-income communities. The funding is an \$11 million set aside from the TIFIA. | 4 cosponsors, Referred to House T&I Committee |
| HR 3872 | State Transportation and Infrastructure Financing Act | Hanna | Revises and reauthorizes the state infrastructure bank program for FY2013 and FY2014 | 2 cosponsors, Referred to House T&I Committee. House companion to S 1553 |

Introduced in Senate

| Bill No. | Title | Lead Sponsor(s) | Summary | Status |
|----------|---|------------------------|--|--|
| S 163 | A bill to prohibit GHG Emission Reduction regulations | Vitter | Prohibits any regulation of carbon dioxide or other GHG emission reduction in the US until China, India, and Russia implement similar reductions | 1 cosponsor. Referred to EPW Committee |
| S 332 | Climate Protection Act | Sanders | Requires EPA Administrator to impose a carbon pollution fee on any manufacturer, producer, or importer of a carbon polluting substance | 1 cosponsor. Referred to EPW Committee |
| S 387 | American Infrastructure Investment Fund | Rockefeller/Lautenberg | Authorizes \$10 billion infrastructure bank and \$600 million TIGER grant program | 1 cosponsor. Referred to Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee |
| S 823 | Project of National and Regional Significance | Whitehouse | Authorizes \$500 million annually for Projects of National and Regional Significance | Referred to Senate EPW Committee |
| S 880 | Safe Highways and Infrastructure Preservation Act | Lautenberg | Prohibits a state prescribing or enforcing any regulation that allows a property-carrying unit longer than 53 feet, except for a fire-fighting unit, to operate on the National Highway system | 2 cosponsors. |



Transportation for America

| Bill No. | Title | Lead Sponsor(s) | Summary | Status |
|----------|--|--------------------|---|---|
| S 1264 | Clean Vehicle Corridors Act | Casey | Requires DOT to designate at least 5 Clean Vehicle Corridors to encourage the addition of cleaner alternative fuel options and supporting infrastructure throughout the corridor | Referred to EPW Committee |
| S 1435 | Clean Ports Act | Gillibrand | Declares that federal preemption of state and local law shall not apply to the authority of state, local government, or multistate authorities from adopting requirements for motor carriers providing services at port facilities related to environmental pollution, traffic congestion, and highway safety | 1 cosponsor. Referred to Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee |
| S 1462 | Railroad Safety and Positive Control Extension Act | Thune | Extends deadline until December 31, 2020 for Class I railroads and entities providing regularly scheduled public rail transportation from submitting positive train control (PTC) implementation plans, and directs USDOT to revise and extend PTC regulations for Class II & III railroads | 12 cosponsors. Referred to Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee |
| S 1504 | Off-system bridges | Casey/Blunt | Increases the amount of STP funds that need to be used for off-system bridges from 15% of the former bridge program apportionment to 25% of the former bridge apportionment program | 1 cosponsor; referred to Senate EPW Committee |
| S 1553 | State Infrastructure Bank Reauthorization Act | Ayotte | Revises and reauthorizes the state infrastructure bank program for FY2013 and FY2014 | Referred to Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee |
| S 1702 | Transportation Empowerment Act | Lee | Decreases federal gas tax to 3.7 cents and converts federal program into block grant to states | Companion to H.R. 3486; 3 cosponsors; referred to Senate Finance Committee |
| S 1708 | Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act | Merkley/ Ayotte | Requires USDOT to establish motorized and nonmotorized safety performance measures for planning and programming | Companion to H.R. 3494; 9 cosponsors; referred to Senate Commerce Committee |
| S 1716 | The Building and Renewing Infrastructure for Development and Growth in Employment (BRIDGE) Act | Warner/ Blunt | Establishes an Infrastructure Financing Authority with \$10 billion for loans, loan guarantees and other credit instruments for surface transportation and water projects | 9 cosponsors; referred to Senate Commerce Committee |



Transportation for America

| Bill No. | Title | Lead Sponsor(s) | Summary | Status |
|----------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| S 1957 | Partnership to Build America Act | Bennet | Creates infrastructure fund to finance projects funded by repatriated profits | Companion to H.R. 2084; 10 cosponsors; referred to the Senate Finance Committee |



Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee

January 30, 2014

Cap-to-Cap 2014

Issue: Report on Metro Chamber Annual Cap-to-Cap Program.

Recommendation: This is an information only item. There will not be a staff presentation.

Discussion: SACOG will be participating in the Metro Chamber Annual Cap-to-Cap Program May 3 -7. Attached is a list of the Cap-to-Cap Teams and their volunteer leadership. Individual teams are meeting monthly to develop issues papers for recommendation of approval by the Metro Chamber Board. SACOG Board members are encouraged to participate in individual policy team meetings in February, March and April.

SACOG staff is currently working with the Chamber's policy teams to provide input on the issue papers and advocacy positions associated with SACOG's Federal Advocacy Principles and agency programs and activities including: air quality, land use and natural resources, flood protection, water resources, transportation, food and agriculture, and community development.

SACOG staff will attend Cap-to-Cap and be available to support SACOG Board members in policy teams and advocacy meetings. Staff will provide an update on Cap-to-Cap preparations at the April committee meetings.

Approved:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RS:lo

Attachments

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6247
Rebecca Sloan, Director of External Affairs, (916) 340-6224

2014 Capitol-to-Capitol

Date: 5/3/2014 TO 5/7/2014

Event Description:

SUTTER HEALTH PRESENTS:
CAP TO CAP 2014

**REGISTER HERE**

In its 44th year, the Metro Chamber's Capitol-to-Capitol effort has grown to be the largest travel program in the chamber's history and continues to be the largest lobbying effort of its kind in the nation. Cap-to-Cap, as it's commonly known, provides a unique opportunity for business and community leaders to align around issues concerning the six-county Sacramento region and to work directly with congressional delegates to organize broad-base support for critical initiatives. Participants also value the chance to network and do business with other peer leaders from the region.

SPONSORSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

For all sponsorship information, please contact Phil MacDougall at pmacdougall@metrochamber.org.

For all event & registration information, please contact Mindy Johnston at 916.319.4261 or mjohnston@metrochamber.org

THANK YOU TO OUR SPONSORS

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| PRESENTING SPONSOR | Sutter Health |
| WHIP SPONSOR | Dignity Health |
| EVENT SPONSORS | Aerojet Rocketdyne Capitol Impact LLC Sacramento Association of REALTORS UC Davis/UC Davis Health System |

| Team | Staff Contact | Co-Chairs |
|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| Air Quality | Kevin Greene | Bill Mueller |
| (Cleaner Air Partnership) | (916) 321-9154 | Larry Greene |
| | | |
| Civic Amenities | Matt Yancey | Erika Bjork |
| | (916) 321-9153 | Bill Blake |
| | | Michael Smith |
| | | |
| Clean & Green Technology | Matt Yancey | Todd Lindstrom |
| | (916) 321-9153 | Doug Esposito |
| | | |
| Community Development | Matt Yancey | Bill Knowlton |
| | (916) 321-9153 | |
| Economic Development | Matt Yancey | Robin Trimble |
| | (916) 321-9153 | David Diepenbrock |
| | | |
| Flood Protection | Kevin Greene | Ric Reinhardt |
| | (916) 321-9154 | Chris Elliott |
| | | Scott Shapiro |
| | | |
| Food and Agriculture | Dennis Rogers | Mary Kimball |
| | (916) 321-9115 | David Shabazian |
| | | Tim Johnson |
| | | |
| Health Care | Dennis Rogers | Ron Groepper |
| | (916) 321-9115 | Michelle Odell |
| | | Richard Robinson |
| | | |
| Homeland Security | Kevin Greene | Larry Davis |
| | (916) 321-9154 | |
| Innovation | Matt Yancey | Rob White |
| | (916) 321-9153 | |
| Land Use & Natural Resources | Kevin Greene | John Costa |
| | (916) 321-9154 | Yasha Saber |
| | | |
| Transportation | Kevin Greene | Fran Halbakken |
| | (916) 321-9154 | Jeff Mathews |
| | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Water Resources | Kevin Greene | John Woodling |
| | (916) 321-9154 | Derrick Whitehead |
| | | Sean Bigley |
| | | Deanne Greene |
| | | |
| Workforce & Education | Dave Butler | Willy Duncan |
| | (916) 552-6800 *105 | Chris Holben |
| | | Dave Butler |
| | | |
| Young Professionals | | Erica Taylor |
| | | Jim Alves |
| | | Daniel Kaufman |
| | | Verna Sulpizio |



**Item #14-2-9
Information**

Government Affairs & Public Relations Committee

January 31, 2014

Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee Charge

Issue: What is the charge of the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee?

Recommendation: This is an information only item. There will not be a staff presentation.

Discussion: In March 2013, the Board of Directors adopted the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee Charge. A copy is attached for your information.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:EJ:lo

Attachment

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6247

**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CHARGE**

Purpose: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee shall develop recommendations for the full SACOG Board of Directors relative to issues regarding advocacy, intergovernmental affairs, communication, Overall Work Program, budget and audits, human resources, legal, and purchasing.

Activities: Activities of the Committee may include, but are not limited to:

- Recommending State and Federal Advocacy Principles and positions on legislation affecting SACOG and its members.
- Recommending the Overall Work Program, which reflects not only the requirements of state and federal laws and regulations, but also the allocation of overall resources for the agency, including program priorities, funding, and staffing.
- Providing guidance on outreach regarding key decisions to member jurisdictions, other local agencies, stakeholder groups, and the general public.
- Overseeing the human resources functions of the organization, by providing direction to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and Chief Operating Officer (COO)/General Counsel regarding negotiations with the SACOG Employees Association, changes to the Personnel Rules, changes to the Employee Handbook, changes to the Classification Plan and salary schedule, and evaluation of the CEO and COO/General Counsel.
- Overseeing the financial operations of SACOG.
- Providing input and recommendations relating to legal issues.
- Recommending contract awards.
- Serving as the Board of Directors of the SACOG Financing Corporation, which was created to own real property when SACOG participated in the purchase of 1415 L Street in Sacramento.

Membership: The current chair of the SACOG Board of Directors shall appoint the members of the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee.

Term of Committee Members: Members of the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee shall serve for a term of one year.

Officers: The current chair of the SACOG Board of Directors shall designate one of the Committee members to serve as Committee chair, and members to serve as vice chairs.