

		2020 MTP/SCS Draft Preferred Scenario (in billions of 2018 dollars)			
		2019-2029	2030-2040	Total	Notes
Federal Funding	Federal Highway Administration funds including formula funds that pay for SACOG's regional funding programs (CMAQ & RSTP) and other federal discretionary programs funded through the Highway Trust Fund	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$2.0	Federal Highway and Transit Trust Funds are dependent on the 18.4 cent federal excise tax on fuel. Improvements to average fuel economy of passenger and freight vehicles have eroded the purchasing power of this funding source over time and required transfers from the general fund to maintain the accounts' solvency. The draft revenue forecast assumes the federal government will maintain solvency in the general fund, consistent with prior actions, and that federal funds will keep pace with inflation in the long-term.
	Federal transit programs that come to the region and/or directly to transit operators including formula funds and federal discretionary programs such as New Starts	\$0.7	\$0.9	\$1.6	
Federal Subtotal		\$1.7	\$1.9	\$3.6	
State Funding	Caltrans funding for state system expansion and preservation including SHOPP funding, highway maintenance, the Highway Bridge Program, and the Interregional Improvement Program	\$3.8	\$3.3	\$7.1	State transportation funding programs are dependent on transfers from the Federal Trust Fund and statewide diesel and gasoline taxes that feed the State Highway and Public Transportation Accounts. The increase over the 2016 MTP/SCS is due to an infusion of SB1 funds into the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). However, vehicle fuel efficiency improvements over time diminish the funding available to the program in the latter half of the MTP/SCS.
	State discretionary grant programs	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.7	State discretionary programs include the Active Transportation and other statewide competitive programs.
	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds that contribute to SACOG's regional funding programs	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.5	Funding for the STIP comes from a combination of revenues generated by state taxes on gasoline and diesel. Changes to the state's fuel taxes by SB1 have stabilized funding for the STIP, however funding has not kept pace with prior MTP/SCS forecasts and is likely to continue to decrease over time as consumption of gasoline and diesel decrease over time.
	State Transit Assistance program that flows directly to transit operators	\$0.3	\$0.2	\$0.5	The State Transit Assistance Program is primarily funded from state taxes on diesel fuel. However, SB1 created a State of Good Repair Program that directs some of the funding from the state's new taxes on gasoline to transit agencies to help maintain vehicles and facilities. Overall funding remains stable from the last MTP/SCS, but reduces in the latter half of the plan as fuel consumption decreases.
	State Cap and Trade Program	\$0.2	\$0.4	\$0.6	In July of 2017, the California legislature voted to extend the state's cap and trade program beyond 2020. However, auction proceeds are less than previously anticipated likely due to a large supply of emissions allowances that keep prices low. It's likely that this oversupply will reduce in future years and the program will generate additional revenue that will be distributed through its competitive programs. SACOG's share of these funds depends on the success of grant applications to programs including the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program and Low Carbon Transit Operations Program.
	Green Means Go Pilot Program	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.4	State funding to help implement a multi-year pilot program to lower greenhouse gas emissions in the six-county Sacramento region by accelerating infill development, reducing vehicle trips, and electrifying remaining trips.
State Subtotal		\$5.3	\$4.5	\$9.8	

		2020 MTP/SCS Draft Preferred Scenario (in billions of 2018 dollars)			
		2019-2029	2030-2040	Total	Notes
Local Funding	Non-SB1 fuel tax subventions	\$1.1	\$1.0	\$2.1	Includes the portion of the non-SB1 state excise taxes on gasoline that are allocated to local jurisdictions. Total funding available reduces over time as fuel consumption decreases.
	SB1 Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (Sec. 2031)	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$2.5	Includes the local streets and roads share of the SB1 excise tax on gasoline and registration fees.
	Local Transportation Fund (LTF)	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$2.4	The Local Transportation Fund is derived from 1/4 cent of the statewide sales and use tax that is dedicated to transportation purposes. Sales tax receipts following the recovery from the recession have exceeded previous forecasts, however the increase in this fund source is largely due to underestimating the share of LTF funds received by Placer and El Dorado Counties in the last MTP/SCS.
	Sacramento County Measure A	\$1.4	\$1.5	\$2.9	Similar to the Local Transportation Fund, sales tax receipts have outpaced the forecast of the previous MTP/SCS. While the draft forecast assumes slightly slower growth over the course of the plan compared to the previous MTP/SCS, total receipts in the last several years have been as much as 10% higher than we forecasted.
	Sacramento County New Measure A	\$0.6	\$1.5	\$2.0	The Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA) is responsible for the new sales tax measure in Sacramento County. SACOG will work with STA to determine how to account for the new measure in the MTP/SCS.
	Placer County Sales Tax	\$0.3	\$0.6	\$0.9	PCTPA is responsible for the planning assumptions for the new measure in Placer County. SACOG will coordinate with PCTPA to determine how to account for a potential Placer County tax in the plan. The reduced revenue in this plan update is due to districting of the sales tax measure that would limit the measure to a portion of the county.
	Locally derived streets and roads funding (developer fees, general fund contributions, special assessments, etc.)	\$3.1	\$3.0	\$6.1	Locally derived revenues are based on a combination of historic allocations reported to the state controller and growth in new land use developments forecast for the MTP/SCS. Less growth overall in population, housing, and employment affect the total locally derived funding available in the MTP/SCS. Additionally, local funding reported to the state controller has not kept pace with the forecasts in the prior MTP/SCS.
	Transit Fares	\$0.6	\$0.9	\$1.5	Transit fare revenues will be based on modeled ridership and forecasted average fares. The total transit fares ultimately included in the plan will depend on the phasing of transit service and expansion. The reduction in transit fare revenue in the draft forecast relates to phasing of transit service expansion later in the plan.
Local Subtotal		\$9.5	\$10.9	\$20.4	
TOTAL BASE REVENUES		\$23.7	\$23.6	\$47.3	
New Funding	System Pricing	\$0.0	\$1.0-3.5	\$1.0-3.5	Revenues generated through system pricing strategies including: Express Lanes: Express Lanes may be free to carpools and buses, but allow single drivers the choice to pay for the use of the lanes. The purpose of these lanes is to improve traffic management, reliability, and even throughput of the region's major freeways. Potential corridors include U.S. Route 50, Interstates 80 and 5, and State Routes 51 (Capital City Freeway), 99, and 65. Express lane concepts may include single, high-occupancy toll lanes or multilane configurations that add lanes or re-purpose existing lanes or shoulders. Tolls for the lanes can vary based on traffic levels and time of day. Pay as you go or mileage-based fees: Mileage-based or pay as you go fees charge roadway users based on the miles they travel on public roadways, rather than on the amount of fuel they purchase. Fees that are lower during off-peak hours or in less congested rural areas may be considered in order to manage the transportation network efficiently and promote geographic equity.
	TOTAL REVENUES WITH PRICING	\$16.6	\$18.2-\$20.7	\$34.8-\$37.3	