San Francisco County Transportation Authority January 2017

New Recommended Positions

To view documents associated with the bill, click the bill number link.

Staff is proposing new support positions on Assembly Bill (AB) 1 (Frazier), AB 28 (Frazier) and SB 1 (Beall), and a new oppose position on AB 65 (Patterson), to be acted on at the February 14 Finance Committee meeting. This is the first briefing of the legislative session, and so all watch positions on other bills are also new recommendations. Additional detail on bills with new support/oppose positions are highlighted in the attached state legislative matrix.

At the January 5th Transportation Authority Board Meeting, Chair Peskin introduced a resolution of support for AB 87 (Ting). This resolution will be considered at the January 24th Board Meeting, and includes more detail about the bill and its impact on San Francisco.

Recommended	Bill #	Keywords and Comments		
Positions	Author			
Support	<u>AB 1</u>	Transportation funding.		
	<u>Frazier</u> D	This bill would create the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program to address		
		deferred maintenance on the state highway system and local roads. Estimated \$6 billion		
		annually. Similar to SB 1 (Beall).		
Support	<u>AB 28</u>	Department of Transportation: environmental review process: federal pilot program.		
	Frazier D	This bill would re-enact State authorization for Caltrans to accept delegated federal authority		
		to administer NEPA.		
Oppose	AB 65	Transportation bond debt service.		
	Patterson R	This bill would shift debt service payments for High-Speed Rail bonds from truck weight		
		fees to the state General Fund, intending to bring the High-Speed Rail project to an end.		
Support	<u>SB 1</u>	Transportation funding.		
	Beall D	This bill would create the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program to address		
		deferred maintenance on the state highway system and local roads. Estimated \$6 billion		
		annually. Similar to AB 1 (Frazier).		

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

January 2017

Bills of Interest

To view documents associated with the bill, click the bill number link. To view the bill text, click the TEXT link.

Staff is proposing new support positions on Assembly Bill (AB) 1 (Frazier), AB 28 (Frazier) and Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Beall), and a new oppose position on AB 65 (Patterson).

Bill #	Author	Description	Status	Position	Comments
<u>AB 1</u>	<u>Frazier</u> D	Transportation funding.	Assembly	Recommend	This bill would create the road
		Would create the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation	Print	Support	Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program
Introduced:	(Dist 11)	Program to address deferred maintenance on the state			to address deferred maintenance on the
12/5/2016		highway system and the local street and road system. The			state highway system and local roads. New
<u>Text</u>		bill would require the California Transportation			gas taxes, diesel taxes, registration fees,
		Commission to adopt performance criteria, consistent with			and other sources would generate \$6
		a specified asset management plan, to ensure efficient use of			billion annually.
		certain funds available for the program. The bill would provide for the deposit of various funds for the program in			See the attached MTC committee memo
		the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account, which			for more details. Also see related SB 1
		the bill would create in the State Transportation Fund.			(Beall).
AB 13	Eggman D	580 Marine Highway.	Assembly	Recommend	This bill seeks the development of the 580
		Would require the Department of Transportation to	Print	Watch	Marine Highway corridor to reduce truck
Introduced:	(Dist 13)	implement and oversee the 580 Marine Highway corridor			traffic between Oakland and Stockton.
12/5/2016	,	project to reduce traffic by facilitating a permanent shift in			Funding would be subject to future
<u>Text</u>		container traffic away from truck transport to marine			appropriation.
		transport between the Port of Oakland and the Port of			
		Stockton. The bill would require that the project be funded			
		by an appropriation in the Budget Act of 2017 of			
		\$85,000,000.			
<u>AB 17</u>	Holden D	Transit Pass Program: free or reduced-fare transit passes.	Assembly	Recommend	Re-introduction of AB 2222 (2016) to
T . 1 1	(D: + 41)	Would create the Transit Pass Program to be administered	Print	Watch	establish a transit pass program for free or
Introduced: 12/5/2016	(Dist 41)	by the Department of Transportation. The bill would			reduced transit fare passes to qualified
12/3/2010 <u>Text</u>		require the Controller of the State of California to allocate moneys made available for the program, upon appropriation			schools for use by pupils. The 2016 bill was sponsored by TransForm and
<u>TCXL</u>		by the Legislature, to support transit pass programs that			supported by a wide array of
		provide free or reduced-fare transit passes to specified			transportation groups and advocates. The
		pupils and students.			source for funding in AB 2222 was Cap
		1 1			and Trade auction revenues. The bill was
					retained in Appropriations due to
					uncertainty over that funding source.

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

January 2017

Bill #	Author	Description	Status	Position	Comments
<u>AB 25</u>	Nazarian D	Tour buses.	Assembly	Recommend	This is a spot bill that expresses intent to
		Current law imposes various requirements on the operation	Print	Watch	develop legislation to foster safe operating
Introduced:	(Dist 46)	of tour buses, including, among other things, a requirement			tour buses.
12/5/2016		that a tour bus operator use a safety belt at all times when			
<u>Text</u>		operating the tour bus. This bill would state the intent of the			We do not typically take positions on spot
		Legislature to enact legislation relating to the safe operation			bills, but wait for the release of specific
		of tour buses.			language.
<u>AB 28</u>	Frazier D	Department of Transportation: environmental review	Assembly	Recommend	Would re-enact State authorization for
		process: federal pilot program.	Print	Support	Caltrans to accept delegated federal
Introduced:	(Dist 11)	Current federal law requires the U.S. Secretary of			authority to administer National
12/5/2016		Transportation to carry out a surface transportation project			Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).
<u>Text</u>		delivery pilot program, under which the participating states			
		assume certain responsibilities for environmental review and			Delegated authority allows for faster
		clearance of transportation projects that would otherwise be			environmental clearance. With its
		the responsibility of the federal government. Current law,			expiration, Caltrans is not able to approve
		until January 1, 2017, provided that the State of California			environmental documents, threatening the
		consents to the jurisdiction of the federal courts with regard			progress of large scale transportation
		to the compliance, discharge, or enforcement of the			projects statewide. Transportation
		responsibilities it assumed as a participant in the pilot			stakeholders across California have
		program. This bill would reinstate the operation of the latter			identified this as priority legislation.
AD CE	D-44 D	provision.	Λ 1-1	Recommend	Another in a series of bills intended to
<u>AB 65</u>	Patterson R	Transportation bond debt service. Current law provides for transfer of certain vehicle weight	Assembly Print		
Introduced:	(Dist 23)	fee revenues to the Transportation Debt Service Fund to	Finit	Oppose	bring the State's High-Speed Rail project to an end by shifting the debt service
12/13/2016	(Dist 23)	reimburse the General Fund for payment of current year			payments from truck weight fees to state
<u>Text</u>		debt service on general obligation bonds issued for			General Fund.
<u>TCAL</u>		transportation purposes, including bonds issued for			General i und.
		high-speed rail and associated purposes pursuant to the			
		Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the			
		21st Century (Proposition 1A of 2008). This bill would			
		specifically exclude from payment under these provisions			
		the debt service for Proposition 1A bonds.			

San Francisco County Transportation Authority January 2017

Bill#	Author	Description	Status	Position	Comments
<u>AB 87</u>	Ting D	Autonomous vehicles. This bill would provide that violation of the Autonomous	Pending referral to	Chain Peskin has	This bill arises from the debut by Uber of its autonomous (or "self-driving") vehicle
Introduced: 1/5/2017 Text	(Dist 19)	Vehicle statue is not an infraction and would instead, among other things, require the department to revoke the registration of a vehicle that is being operated in violation of those provisions. The bill would also authorize a peace officer to cause the removal and seizure of a vehicle operating on the public streets with a registration that has been revoked pursuant to these provisions and authorize the department to impose a penalty of up to \$25,000 per day for each autonomous vehicle operating in violation of these provisions.	committee	introduced a resolution to support AB 87 for consideration at the 1/24/17 SFCTA Board meeting	pilot program in San Francisco without approval from the DMV. In response, the DMV revoked the registrations of Uber's 16 autonomous vehicles to pull the unregulated cars off public streets. The measure is supported by San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee, San Francisco Supervisor Aaron Peskin, and WalkSF, as well as bicycle interests. See attached draft resolution for consideration by the SFCTA Board on January 24.
<u>SB 1</u>	Beall D	Transportation funding.	Senate	Recommend	This bill would create the road
Introduced: 12/5/2016 Text	(Dist 15)	Would create the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program to address deferred maintenance on the state highway system and the local street and road system. The bill would require the California Transportation Commission to adopt performance criteria, consistent with a specified asset management plan, to ensure efficient use of certain funds available for the program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.	Rules	Support	maintenance and rehabilitation program to address deferred maintenance on the state highway system and local roads. New gas tax, diesel tax, registration fee, and other sources would generate \$6 billion annually. See the attached MTC committee memo for more details. Also see AB 1 (Frazier).

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

January 2017

Bill #	Author	Description	Status	Position	Comments
<u>SB 4</u>	Mendoza D	Goods Movement: allocation of federal funds: Goods	Senate	Recommend	This is one of several measures that
		Movement and Clean Trucks Bond Act.		Watch	comprise the Senate "California Rebuild"
Introduced:	(Dist 32)	This bill, subject to voter approval at the June 5, 2018,			Infrastructure package.
12/5/2016		statewide primary election, would enact the Goods			
<u>Text</u>		Movement and Clean Trucks Bond Act to authorize			
		\$600,000,000 of state general obligation bonds as follows:			
		\$200,000,000 to the California Transportation Commission			
		for projects and programs eligible for funding from the			
		Trade Corridors Improvement Fund; \$200,000,000 to the			
		State Air Resources Board for projects and programs			
		consistent with the Goods Movement Emission Reduction			
		Program; and \$200,000,000 to the State Air Resources			
		Board for projects and programs to expand the use of zero-			
		and near-zero emission trucks in areas of the state that are			
		designated as severe or extreme nonattainment areas for			
		ozone and particulate matter.			

Total Measures: 9

Attachments (2):

- 1. MTC Legislation Committee Memo Transportation Funding: AB 1 (Frazier)/SB 1 (Beall)
- 2. Draft Transportation Authority Resolution Supporting AB 87 (Ting)

Attachment 1



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Agenda Item 4b
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
TEL 415.778.6700
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Legislation Committee DATE: January 6, 2016

FR: Executive Director W. I. 1131

RE: <u>Transportation Funding: AB 1 (Frazier)/SB 1 (Beall)</u>

Background

2017 marks the third consecutive year the Legislature has been seriously grappling with how to increase state transportation funding. After Assembly and Senate leaders released a joint letter in November 2016 with Governor Brown announcing a commitment to address the subject in the upcoming legislative session, Assembly Member Frazier and Senator Jim Beall each introduced the first bill of their respective houses — Assembly Bill 1 and Senate Bill 1.

Recommendation: Support

Discussion

How Would Funds Be Spent?

As shown on Attachment 1, funding in the Chairmen's bills, is distributed to local street and road repairs, state highway maintenance, goods movement, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), public transit and active transportation. We estimate the Bay Area would receive *annual* formula funding boosts as follows (with additional funding available from the competitive goods movement, active transportation and transit capital competitive programs):

- Approximately \$390 million for local street and road maintenance with SB 1 providing about \$8 million more due to treatment of new gas tax revenue
- Approximately \$94 million in new STIP funds, including regional and interregional funds.
- A range of \$95-\$130 million for formula-based public transit funds, with range depending on auction revenue levels from Cap and Trade.

Notably, funding for the STIP, local roads and State Highway Operation & Protection Program (SHOPP) programs will grow by \$100 million per year starting in FY 2017-18—distributed according to a 44%/44%/12% formula, respectively—until reaching about \$500 million/year in FY 2021-22 and thereafter. This is a result of fewer weight fees being diverted from the State Highway Account.

Less Revenue, but Still Robust Proposals

The bills would raise from \$6 billion to \$6.2 billion per year once all new revenue mechanisms are in effect by year five, approximately \$1.4 billion less than the joint proposal released last August. The reduced funding results primarily from smaller gasoline and diesel fuel excise tax increases. The emphasis on "fix-it-first" for local roads and state highways is retained though these are the programs that see their funding reduced; transit funding and active transportation funding programs are maintained at the same levels seen in August. Other key changes include:

- About half of weight fee revenue is restored gradually over five years, which frees up approximately \$500 million annually to continue to offset General Fund debt service, an ongoing concern of the Brown Administration. (Note: SB 1 restores 10 percent each year up to a minimum of 50 percent, which is roughly equivalent to \$530 million based on FY 2016-17 estimated weight fee revenue. AB 1 restores \$100 million per year, up to \$500 million by FY 2021-22.)
- The bills contain more detailed provisions for goods movement funding, detailing specific categories to be funded from the Trade Corridor Investment Fund (TCIF), which would receive approximately \$600 million per year from a diesel excise tax increase of 20-cents/gallon.

Reduced Funding Volatility and Significantly Increased STIP Funding

As with the prior bills authored by Assembly Member Frazier and Senator Beall, AB 1 and SB 1 would eliminate the annual adjustment in the excise tax, a policy that has resulted in huge volatility in transportation revenue and decimated the STIP over the last two years. The bills restore the variable rate to 17.3-cents/gallon (a 7.5-cent/gallon increase from the current rate), where it was originally set when the gas tax swap was enacted in 2011, and requires the Board of Equalization to adjust it based on the Consumer Price Index on July 1, 2019 and every three years thereafter. This periodic indexing applies to the gasoline and diesel fuel excise taxes as well as the diesel sales tax rate.

How do the Bills Differ?

- The goods movement provisions in the bills are substantially different. AB 1 would distribute all federal and new state freight funds competitively through the California Transportation Commission, and allow the state to nominate projects as well. SB 1 calls out local road and rail capital and capacity enhancements as eligible and lists dollar amounts for distribution as shown below. (Such amounts would be adjusted proportionately depending on the total amount of funding to the TCIF each year.)
 - o Competitive program for projects nominated by regional and local agencies and ports (\$360 million)
 - o Railroad-highway grade crossings (\$70 million)
 - Border related improvements nominated by San Diego and Imperial County agencies, which are disqualified from the competitive program above (\$150 million).
- SB 1 raises the sales tax on diesel fuel by an additional 0.5% (approximately \$38 million/year) for purposes of intercity and commuter rail, with projects to be selected by Caltrans. SB 1 also reserves \$3 million annually before distributing funds for state and local roadway maintenance to the various Institutes of Transportation Studies within the University of California.

- SB 1 adds a workforce training provision, requiring that all projects funded with new transportation revenue will be required to engage in a pre-apprenticeship program for individuals, including low-income/disadvantaged individuals. SB 1 also requires Caltrans to develop a plan to increase participation from small and disadvantaged businesses.
- SB 1 imposes a \$100/year zero emission vehicle registration fee, whereas the registration fee for such vehicles in AB 1 remains at \$165/year, as proposed in 2016. This difference is relatively minor in terms of revenue impact; it would lower annual revenues from \$21 million to \$13 million.

Recommendation

Staff recommends a "support" position on these bills. Of course we are mindful to be flexible as amendments can be expected as the bills advance and other funding proposals may emerge. One particular item we would like to see modified is broadening the opportunity for Bay Area cities, transit districts, and MTC with voter-approved transportation measures to qualify for funding. The bill currently restricts this program to counties.

Known Positions

Support

See Attached

Oppose

See Attached

Steve Heminger

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Programs Funded by AB 1 (Frazier) and SB 1 (Beall) and New Vehicle and Fuel-Based Tax/Fee Provisions
- Attachment B: AB 1 (Frazier) Transportation Funding Support & Opposition

SH: rl

J:\COMMITTE\Legislation\Meeting Packets\Legis2017\01 Legis Jan 2017\4b SB 1 Beall AB 1 Frazier Support v2.docx

Agenda Item 4b Attachment A

Programs Funded by AB 1 (Frazier) and SB 1 (Beall)

	AB 1 (Frazier)	SB 1 (Beall)
Local Streets & Roads	\$ 2,027	\$ 2,068
State Highways	\$ 1,433	\$ 1,474
Transit Improvements	\$ 563	\$ 563
Intercity and Commuter Rail	\$ -	\$ 38
Trade Corridors	\$ 600	\$ 600
State-Local Partnership Program	\$ 200	\$ 200
State Transportation Improvement Program	\$ 594	\$ 594
State Highway Operation & Protection Program	\$ 162	\$ 162
Active Transportation Program	\$ 80	\$ 80
Advanced Mitigation Program *	\$ 30	\$ 30
Education, Research & Workforce Training**	\$ 5	\$ 2
Totals	\$ 5,694	\$ 5,810

New Vehicle and Fuel-Based Tax/Fee Provisions

	AB 1 (Frazier)	SB 1 (Beall)
Gas tax restoration	7.5 cents/gallon	7.5 cents/gallon
New gas tax increase ¹	12 cents/gallon	12 cents/gallon
Diesel excise tax increase	20 cents/gallon	20 cents/gallon
Sales tax on diesel increase	3.5% increase	4% increase
Vehicle registration fee	\$38/year	\$38/year
Zero emission vehicle fee	\$165/year	\$100/year

AB 1 (Frazier) Transportation Funding Support & Opposition

Support

Apex Group

Associated General Contractors of California

Bay Area Council

California Alliance for Jobs

California Association of Councils of Government

California Business Roundtable

California Construction & Industrial Materials Association

California State Association of Counties

California State Association of Counties

California State Council of Laborers

California Transit Association

Caterpillar Inc.

DeSilva Gates Construction

Granite Construction

Griffith Company

International Union of Operating Engineers – CA/NV

League of California Cities

League of California Cities

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce

Northern California Carpenters Regional Council

Orange County Business Council

Politico Group

Silicon Valley Leadership Group

Skanska

Smith Watts & Hartmann

Solano Transportation Authority

Southern California Contractors Association

Southern California Leadership Council

Southern California Partnership for Jobs

State Building & Construction Trades Council of California

Teichert Construction

Transportation Agency for Monterey County

Transportation California

United Contractors

United Contractors

Vulcan Materials Company

Opposition

None on file



RESOLUTION SUPPORTING ASSEMBLYMAN TING'S ASSEMBLY BILL (AB) 87 TO CURB ILLEGAL SELF-DRIVING CARS

WHEREAS, San Francisco has adopted a Vision Zero policy to ensure the safety of our public realm for pedestrians, cyclist and vehicle passengers and drivers; and

WHEREAS, It has been well-documented that the scantily regulated Transportation Network Company (TNC) vehicles and "autonomous" or "self-driving" vehicles pose serious safety threats to the general public; and

WHEREAS, Assemblyman Phil Ting has taken initial steps to protect the public by introducing California Assembly Bill (AB) 87, which codifies the Department of Motor Vehicles' (DMV) ability to revoke the vehicle registration for autonomous vehicles that violate the DMV's Autonomous Vehicle Tester Program and fine the TNCs that operate said vehicles, as well as give local law enforcement jurisdiction to impound said vehicles; and

WHEREAS, AB 87 sends a clear message to TNCs that there are consequences for operating outside of the law by prohibiting TNCs from obtaining a permit to legally test autonomous vehicle technology on California roads for a minimum of two years; and

WHEREAS, Assemblyman Ting has also committed to developing standards for the DMV requiring disclosure of basic information to the general public about autonomous vehicles operating on local roads, including when permits are issued; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority strongly supports AB 87 and urges the California State Legislature to adopt it, in order to further the goals of Vision Zero and protect the safety of the general public; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority commits to working with the City and County of San Francisco and the California State Legislature to ensure that DMV disclosure standards





and local controls are put in place to ensure public transparency and proper regulation of the growing number of TNC vehicles on our already-congested city streets.