

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA

February 1, 2006, 4:30 PM
Gateway Cities Cog Offices*
16401 Paramount Blvd.
Paramount, CA
*Note New Location

Item No.	Description	Recommended Action
I.	Call to Order – Self Introductions	
II.	Pledge of Allegiance	
III.	Approval of Meeting Minutes of December 7, 2005	Receive & File
IV.	Reports:	
1.	California Legislative Bond Initiatives	Discuss & Recommend
2.	Update on Gateway Service Changes <ul style="list-style-type: none">• June Service Changes• Line 577X By Alex Clifford, Gateway Service Sector General Manager	Receive & File
3.	Update – Prop. A & C Local Return Guidelines	Receive & File
4.	Update – I-5 JPA	Receive & File
5.	Update – I-710 Major Corridor Study	Receive & File
6.	Update – SR 91/I-605 Needs Assessment	Receive & File
7.	New Business/Date of Next Meeting	
8.	Adjournment	

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

Item III

Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of December 7, 2005

**Transportation Committee Minutes for
December 7, 2005**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Cerritos Senior Center 12340 South Street, Cerritos
December 7, 2005**

Call to order and roll call. The meeting was called to order by Councilman Gene Daniels at 4:44 p.m. Roll call was taken by self introduction.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Gene Daniels, Bill Pagett, Max Withrow, James Parker, Stan Carroll, Ken Farfsing, Fred Latham, Gary Milliman.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Bonnie Lowenthal, Don Knabe, Geraldine Knatz, Greg Nordback, Sam Pena, Elba Guerrero.

OTHERS PRESENT: Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG Executive Director; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Karen Heit, Gateway Cities COG; David Hershenson, MTA; Michael Sieckert, MTA Gateway Cities Sector; Brynn Kernaghan, Long Beach Transit, Sharad Mulchand, MTA, Alex Clifford, MTA, Manchi Yi, Montebello Bus Lines, Binti Harvey, City of South Gate, Patricia Chen, MTA, Lee Saage, URS, Ed Norris, City of Long Beach, Ray Harris, LA County, Wally Shidler, MTA, Jerry Wood, Gateway Cities COG.

A quorum was reached and the Minutes of the November 7, 2005 meeting were approved.

Patricia Chen, Project Manager from the MTA gave a presentation on the update of the MTA's Prop. A&C Local Return Guidelines. She explained that the update occurred every 2-3 years. MTA staff worked through the Public Works Directors Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) for the various subregions and the MTA TAC. The presentation to the Gateway Cities Transportation Committee is one of the last. MTA TAC will review the Guidelines January 5th and the Approval will be agendized on the January Board of Directors meeting.

Suggested revisions to the Guidelines include:

- Electronic Forms -+++++ A&B for each City with projects from prior years included.
- The eligible distant for bus stop improvements has been extended to 25 feet.
- Planning and coordination activities by COGs and JPAs are eligible providing the planning activity of eligible for Local Return funds.
- Advocacy for projects the are Local Return eligible is permitted.

Transportation Committee Minutes for

December 7, 2005

- Signal Synchronization projects will include bus priority modifications and loops.
- Safe Routes to School Grants may be matched with LRF.
- Safety improvements require a directly linked to transit safety.
- LRF can be used to advance grant fund providing the grant activity is LRF eligible.

Bill Pagett commented that the use of “loops” was too specific; “traffic detection devices” would accommodate different systems. He also noted that Safe Routes to School Grants will be for 100% of the project, no longer requiring a match. Jim Norris, commented that the MTA Streets and Freeways subcommittee recommended that upgraded street lighting along transit routes be eligible as a pedestrian improvement and that the installation of traffic signals that benefit transit be eligible. These recommendations will be represented as advocated by the Gateway COG if the Transportation Committee recommended to the Executive Committee.

Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy to MTA Director Bonnie Lowenthal, presented a draft motion by MTA Directors Knabe/Lowenthal/Roberts to continuing funding the Municipal Operators Service Improvement Program (MOSIP). The MOSIP program funds considerable service in the Gateway Cities area and the loss of the funding will severely impact municipal bus operators. The Transportation Committee moved to recommend the Executive Committee support the Motion.

Jerry Wood gave an update on the I-5 project. OCTA has extended the bid dates for construction on the Orange County Widening. The I-5 Freeway Agreements have been sent to Caltrans for execution. Work is proceeding on the I-5 geometrics from the Carmenita interchange to the I-605.

Richard Powers, Gateway COG Executive Director, presented an update on the I-710 Improvement Project; reporting little progress from last month. The funding is in place with few outstanding requirements. The mini-study is complete with comments from East Los Angeles and Commerce forthcoming. The near-term air quality strategies are in process.

Jerry Wood updated the progress of the SR 91/I-605 Needs Assessment – He related that the northbound 710 to eastbound SR-91 has counts as high as 2100 trucks per hour. The COG Board directed staff to proceed to a Major Corridor Study.

Alex Clifford, Gateway Sector General Manager, briefly announced the commencement of Line 577x; express service from El Monte to Long Beach, beginning December 19th.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

IV. Reports
1. California Legislative
Bond Initiatives

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Bonnie Lowenthal

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy

SUBJECT: Recommend Gateway Cities COG Position on the following Transportation Bond Initiatives: SB 1024 (Perata), Strategic Growth Plan (Schwarzenegger), AB 1783 (Nunez).

Issue

There are three infrastructure bond proposals that have been introduced in Sacramento, they are: SB 1024, AB 1783 and the Strategic Growth Plan. These initiatives have reviewed by SCAG, the League of Cities and the MTA Board of Directors. There are three comparison/analysis matrixes attached to this report from MTA, SCAG and the League of Cities.

SB1024 (Perata) – would authorize the issuance of nearly \$12 billion in general obligation bonds for various infrastructure improvements (transportation, flood control and housing).

SB1024 Proposed transportation allocations include:

- \$1.5 billion to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).
- \$2.3 billion to repay past Proposition 42 loans.
- \$2.5 for a newly created California Ports Infrastructure Security and Air Quality Improvement Account, of which \$2 billion would be allocated by the CTC to federally designated Trade Corridors of National Significance or other high volume corridors for highway and freight rail improvements; \$400 million would allocated to the Carl Moyer Program and \$100 million would be available for port, harbor and ferry security improvements.
- \$100 million to the Transportation Enhancement and Mitigation Account.

Concerns and Recommendations

The Goods Movement Category has no specific allocation formula which will be significant considering the magnitude of resources required to resolve the San Pedro Bay Ports issues. The same is potentially true of other areas of this bond proposal. Proportional allocation to Angeles County issues should be recommended to the Legislators. Safeguards to protect Prop. 42 bond proceeds should be addressed in this bond proposal. Recommend a support position with the aforementioned protections.

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) – Govt. Schwarzenegger proposes \$222 billion in investments for state infrastructure improvements (transportation, flood control and housing) for a period of 10 years. Proposed transportation allocations include:

- \$4 billion for Trade Infrastructure; \$1 billion for Air Quality Projects related to Port Emissions on a 1:1 (State: local) matching ratio. The remaining \$3 billion would be allocated to projects on a 1:4 State: local) matching ratio. The Business Transportation and Housing Agency would be charged with developing a list of projects to recommend to the CTC for funding from the \$3 billion allocation.
- \$1.5 billion for System Preservation on the State Highway System
- \$5.3 billion for Highway and Freeway projects
- \$300 million for various corridor improvements
- \$200 million for Intelligent Transportation Systems
- \$500 million for Intercity Rail
- \$200 million for pedestrian, bicycle, park n' ride improvements

Concerns and Recommendations

Unlike SB 1024, the SGP proposes new sources of revenue including container fees and highway tolls. SGP also assumes a portion of the General Fund, the commitment of which may change as representatives do over the 10-year period. The SGP contains a provision for the use of design build and provisions to protect Prop.42, both of which are of benefit to Gateway cities. An issue with this initiative is the imposition of a 1:1 match on port related air quality and the 1:4 match on other projects. These matches necessitate new revenues such as imposition of container fees or obtaining more federal funding. Either action may be difficult. Like SB 1024 there is no recommended formula or needs based suggestion for fund allocation.

AB 1783 (Nunez) This bill would authorize the issuance of various types of public financing to enhance the state's infrastructure. This bill does not specify a dollar amount but outlines principles to allocate major transportation investments and sets forth defined public policy goals, including:

- Preparing the state for population and demographic changes forecast for the next two decades.
- Reducing traffic congestion and mitigating the damaging consequences from the traffic on the environment.
- Improving state and local growth planning and encouraging "smart growth".
- Relying on regional planning to meet local state objectives.
- Investing in and supporting livable communities, sustainable development, and sound environmental practices.
- Investing in and supporting communities most in need of new economic opportunities.

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

- Making investments that are cost-effective and yield a fair return on the investment in sustained economic growth for the state.

Concerns and Recommendations

This issue does not have defined dollar amount, therefore the impact of the proposal is difficult to assess. The principles and goals will most likely serve as structure for the process of adopting some sort of major infrastructure financing plan. This measure references goods movement projects and more importantly the need to mitigate environmental impacts associated with increased highway and rail capacity.

Attachments

1. League of California Cities 2006 Infrastructure Proposals
2. MTA Comparison of Infrastructure Bond Proposals and Specific Work with Author Recommendations
3. SCAG Comparison of Adopted Priorities with Major State Infrastructure Bond Proposals

Support the Initiatives with the Following Recommendations

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee review the initiatives and make the following recommendations to the Board of Directors to forward to the Gateway Cities state legislative representatives.

1. Insure that all bond proceeds are proportionately allocated to Los Angeles County .
2. Bond proceeds should be allocated by County Transportation Commissions pursuant to local planning documents.
3. Allocation of goods movement funds be based on need and freight volumes.
4. Insure protection of Prop 42 Transportation Bond proceeds .
5. Lower State/Local match requirements for Air Quality and Goods Movement projects.
6. Encourage the use of public/private partnerships and design-build for infrastructure improvements.
7. Infrastructure projects that improve air quality should receive priority funding.
8. Provide funding for programs aimed at replacing older model, heavy polluting diesel trucks, such as the Gateway Cities Clean Air Program and the Sacramento based SECAT Program.

Transportation Committee Agenda
February 1, 2006

Comparison of Infrastructure Bond Proposals and Specific Work with Author Recommendations
MTA

Element or Program Area	Strategic Growth Plan (Transportation Only)	SB 1024 (Pierata) (Transportation Only)	AB 1783 (Núñez) (Transportation Only)	Specific Work with Author Recommendation
Sources of Funds (see footnotes for further details)	<u>Existing Sources \$46.3</u> State & Fed. Gas Taxes & Weight Fees \$268 Prop. 42 \$ 98 SAFETEA-LU \$108 Tribal Bonds \$ 18 <u>New Sources \$32.8</u> Gen. Ob. Bonds \$28 GARVEE Bonds \$ 38 HOT Lanes/Tolls \$ 28 Gas Tax/Weight Fee Bonds \$48 Design-Build \$ 18 <u>Leveraged Sources \$28.8</u> Public/Private Partnership: (Container Fees/Tolls/Railroads) \$48 Local Sales Tax \$ 98 Federal Disc. \$ 58 Total \$178	<u>Existing Sources \$2.3 B</u> Prop. 42 \$2.3 B <u>New Sources \$5.4 B</u> Gen. Ob. Bond: \$5.4 B	<u>Existing Sources</u> No existing sources included <u>New Sources (TBD)</u> Gen. Ob. Bond: amount to be determined <u>Leveraged Sources (TBD)</u>	<u>Existing Sources</u> Support Prop. 42, prevent further use of Sales Tax on Gas for State General Fund deficits <u>New Sources</u> Support Strategic Growth Plan & set a goal of \$98 for Southern California & \$98 for Los Angeles County; support statewide authorization of design-build contracting <u>Leveraged Sources</u> Support container fees & tolls, provided County Transportation Commissions & Authorities program the revenues
Proposition 42 – Suspension Clause: Enables use of Sales Tax on Gas for State General Fund deficits	Eliminates Prop. 42 suspension clause, preventing further use of Sales Tax on Gas for State General Fund deficits	No recommendation	No recommendation	Support Strategic Growth Plan to secure \$8.6 B of Statewide Sales Tax on Gas revenues for Transportation

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

Comparison of Infrastructure Bond Proposals and Specific Work with Author Recommendations
MTA

Element or Program Area	Strategic Growth Plan (Transportation Only)	SB 1024 (Perrata) (Transportation Only)	AB 1783 (Núñez) (Transportation Only)	Specific Work with Author Recommendation
Proposition 42 - Loan Repayments	Maintain current law requirement to repay \$2.3 B over 5 Years. FY 07 Budget proposal starts repayment at \$920 M	Repays \$2.3 B in Prop. 42 funds from the General Obligation Bond proceeds above	Specifies intent to repay, but does not provide details.	Support Governor's early repayment in FY 2007 Budget and Strategic Growth Plan approach overall
Goods Movement	\$3 B in State Bonds for Goods Movement projects must be matched by \$12 B in other funds such as local sales tax funds, container fees, tolls, and railroad investment \$1 B in State Bonds for Air Quality mitigations must be matched by \$1 B in other funds, such as local sales tax funds, container fees, tolls, and railroad investment	\$2.0 B for Goods Movement. CTC to determine matching fund requirements \$0.4 B for Air Quality Mitigation through Carl Moyer Program, Calif. Air Resources Board determines matching requirements and sub-allocates. (The State Carl Moyer discretionary grant program was created in FY 1999 to reduce emissions from vehicles and engines.) \$0.1 B for Security through California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank	Specifies intent to fund Goods Movement and Air Quality goals. AB 1783 would specifically allocate funds to the Carl Moyer program for air quality improvements. (The State Carl Moyer discretionary grant program was created in FY 1999 to reduce emissions from vehicles and engines.)	Support AB 1783 Carl Moyer program funding Conditionally support Strategic Growth Plan approach: Programming should be based on the number containers (both trucks and railroads) using the regional transportation system. Seek lower matching fund requirement for Goods Movement and Air Quality projects

Transportation Committee Agenda
February 1, 2006

Comparison of Infrastructure Bond Proposals and Specific Work with Author Recommendations
MTA

Element or Program Area	Strategic Growth Plan (Transportation Only)	SB 1024 (Perata) (Transportation Only)	AB 1783 (Núñez) (Transportation Only)	Specific Work with Author Recommendation
Preliminary Working List of Proposed Transportation Projects	<p>LA County gets less than 19% of \$6.5 B Statewide net (excluding \$1.5 B for the SHOPP - see below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I-405 Carpool Lane \$350 M I-5/Carmentita \$10 M I-10 Carpool Lanes \$280 M Intercity Rail \$230 M Park/Ride/Ped-Bike \$ 40 M ITS (inc. the OC) \$135 M LA County Total \$1255 M 	<p>\$1.5 B Total. LA County could expect 16.7% of these funds based on existing formulas.</p> <p>\$375 M (25%) of the funds programmed by CTC for interregional roads and intercity rail.</p> <p>\$1.125 B to be programmed by Counties and Regions based on formulas that favor rural State highway miles</p> <p>No system preservation funding identified</p>	<p>Specifies intent to fund highway capacity improvements and traffic congestion reduction, but does not provide details</p>	<p>Support legislative efforts to get an equitable share of these funds for Los Angeles County using population or needs based formulas and use Long Range Plan driven list of projects</p>
State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)	<p>\$1.5 billion for System Preservation (SHOPP)</p> <p>CTC would allocate</p>	<p>No system preservation funding identified</p>	<p>No system preservation funding identified</p>	<p>Seek application of North/South split</p>
Transit Capital	<p>Included above in STIP funding: would invest only in State's intercity rail program. (AMTRAK California)</p>	<p>\$1 billion to the High Speed Rail Authority. Allocation would be divided into \$200 million allotments for specified corridors</p>	<p>Specifies intent to fund public transportation including inner city passenger rail and transit for the elderly and disabled, but does not provide details</p>	<p>Support AB 1783 proposal to create a mass transit category. Funding should be allocated based on needs based transit formula like (State Transit Assistance)</p>
Transit Security	<p>None</p>	<p>Expected amendments would include \$500 million for transit security. 1/2 would be allocated based on risk and 1/2 would be allocated based on ridership consistent with Federal law.</p>	<p>Specifies intent to fund transportation security including port and mass transit security, but does not provide details.</p>	<p>Support SB 1024 proposal</p>

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

Comparison of Infrastructure Bond Proposals and Specific Work with Author Recommendations MTA

Element or Program Area	Strategic Growth Plan (Transportation Only)	SB 1024 (Perata) (Transportation Only)	AB 1783 (Núñez) (Transportation Only)	Specific Work with Author Recommendation
Environment Enhancement and Mitigation, Safety, and Safe Routes to Schools Programs	Captures new federal funding for Safety and Safe Routes to School Programs	\$100 M slated for Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation program	Funds Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation program and would specifically allocate new State Bond funds to augment Federal Safety and Safe Routes to Schools programs	Support SB 1024/AB 1783 approaches
Transit Oriented Development	No specific Transit Oriented Development, but tolls would benefit transit ridership and development indirectly	SB 1024 would provide funding for TODs, affordable infill housing, and regional housing and community growth programs	Proposes to fund affordable housing, financing of sustainable communities, infill development, and brownfields	Support SB 1024 and AB 1783, but seek to funds for Metro's TOD efforts

Notes:

The Strategic Growth Plan assumes several new funding sources, including:

- \$3.1 billion in new GARVEE bonds since the State can legally bond against federal funds. These bonds will likely occur in later years of the ten-year plan as construction spending ramps up.
- \$4 billion in new Gas Tax and Weight Fee Revenue bonds since the State can legally bond up to 25 percent of such revenues. This equates to about \$969 million in 2015, which will generate about \$14 billion in bond proceeds.
- \$50 million annual savings from design-build/design-sequencing authority totaling \$0.9 billion.
- \$5 billion in additional federal earmarks for national trade corridors will be sought and which bond and private moneys will leverage.

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

1/24/2006

STATE BOND PROPOSALS A comparison of SCAG's Adopted Priorities with Major State Infrastructure Bond Proposals

SCAG Adopted Priorities*	Benefit to the Region	S.B. 1024	Governor's Bond	Actions
Protect Proposition 42 Funds	Proposition 42 funds are designated for transportation purposes. By protecting these funds, we can protect dollars that should be used for investment into transportation infrastructure	\$2.3 billion in Prop 42 repayment provisions, but not permanent protection	Creates a constitutional amendment to permanently protect Prop 42 and accelerates repayment	Amend S.B. 1024 to ensure permanent protection of Proposition 42
Allocate the State's transportation funds to ensure an equitable distribution throughout the state	The SCAG region is home to approximately 50% of the State's population and we must supply the transportation demand for this population. By ensuring an equitable distribution of funds throughout the state, we are in a better position to provide for the transportation needs of our cities and counties	No project or formula allocations other than the State High Speed Rail for \$1 billion, of which approximately \$600 million is for the SCAG region.	Of the projects listed, 39% of the total flows to the SCAG Region	Amend both proposals to ensure that the distribution of funds statewide be based on population and, for goods movement related funds, on freight movement
Provide for leveraging in order to obtain private sector and other funding	To reduce reliance on diminishing State and Federal transportation funds, we must be able to use these funds to generate additional financing from other sources, which can exponentially increase the benefits realized from public transportation investment	Promotes Public-Private partnerships with relation to "transit villages", where housing, retail and office centers would be located within 1/4 mile of transit stations	A total of \$48 billion in new funding is proposed from leveraging existing funds and new bond funds to attract increased federal, private, and local funding	Amend S.B. 1024 to specify that bond funds should be leveraged to generate additional financing, and support emphasis on leveraging in the Governor's proposal
Appropriately fund goods movement and ports in SCAG Region	Goods movement has a profound effect on all sectors of the economy and the effects can be felt most readily here in the SCAG region. Due to the significant needs of the growing goods movement industry, we must ensure that planned goods movement projects are fully funded to reduce community impacts and congestion	\$2.1 billion for port/goods freight movement in and out of seaports, landports and airports	\$3 billion to expand Trade Corridors and improve infrastructure	Amend proposals to add goods movement allocations based on freight movement and place a greater emphasis on the use of leveraging any bonded funding
Facilitate Public/Private Partnerships to implement "business plan" approaches in developing infrastructure	By involving private sector support in transportation and infrastructure projects, we can further leverage public sector funds and, in some cases, produce additional revenues for reinvestment	Promotes Public-Private partnerships with relation to "transit villages," where housing, retail and office centers would be located within 1/4 mile of transit stations	Gives authority and encourages the use of Public-Private partnerships for revenue-backed projects.	Amend both proposals to add an emphasis on the use of Public-Private Partnerships for all revenue-backed projects, including projects that integrate transit, housing and business developments as indicated in SB1024

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

STATE BOND PROPOSALS
A comparison of SCAG's Adopted Priorities with Major State Infrastructure Bond Proposals

1/24/2006

<p>Provide financial incentives for cities and counties to encourage infill development and reward those who meet or exceed their fair share of housing</p>	<p>The "baby-boom" cohort, increasing immigrant population, increasing household size and lower per capita income all affect our housing demand. These changes necessitate variation in housing types offered as well as amenities to serve the changing population. We must create housing supply in order to meet the increasing demand.</p>	<p>\$675 million for local street improvements for local governments that meet their housing needs, affordable multifamily housing and cleanup of vacant sites designated for infill</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Amend both proposals to give priority funding to a city or county that meets or exceeds its fair share of housing under RHNA</p>
<p>Provide sufficient funding for regional growth planning</p>	<p>Regional growth planning is the critical component to provide coordinated plans and programs for long term development. These planning efforts can result in reduced reliance on public sector funds and an enhanced community development landscape</p>	<p>\$725 million for local agency growth planning, capital outlay to match the regional growth plan (RGP) and environmental mitigation and enhancements consistent with the RGP</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Amend both proposals to add an allocation formula for regional growth planning funds based on the MPO planning allocation formula. Local planning funds be distributed to regions based on the number of cities and counties within the region with priority given to those cities and counties implementing the RGP</p>
<p>Support IntraRegional high-speed rail that generates revenue</p>	<p>An IntraRegional High Speed Rail system would facilitate the development of a regional airport system and connect major activity and multi-modal transportation centers in Southern California. As our airports reach capacity constraints and congestion along major corridors increases, high speed ground transportation and airport linkages become even more critical.</p>	<p>\$1 billion for project specific environmental studies, planning and engineering in five high speed rail corridors</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Amend both proposals to allow a competitive high-speed rail grant program for major high speed ground transportation projects along major corridors in the state or in a region that has high congestion and point-to-point trips. Major high speed ground transportation projects should interconnect regional airport systems and provide revenue producing service</p>
<p>Provide priority to Transit Oriented Development (TOD) that includes housing and generates revenue to support transit projects</p>	<p>Transit Oriented Development providing integration of commercial, residential, and recreational land-uses with the transportation system would help increase land use intensities in areas with higher transit services and would maximize the Region's use of the transit system.</p>	<p>\$275 million for "transit village" projects within a 1/4 mile radius, including housing, retail and office centers</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Amend both proposals to provide priority to TOD projects that include housing, further implement the preferred growth strategy for the region, and generate revenue</p>
<p>Provide funding and incentives for environmental mitigation</p>	<p>Environmental mitigation must move simultaneously with transportation improvements in order to ensure the health of our communities</p>	<p>\$100 million for "Green" transportation projects, including landscaping, bike trails, greenbelts, etc... and \$200 million for diesel retrofit on vehicles used in port operation</p>	<p>\$1 billion for environmental mitigation at the ports</p>	<p>Support the Governor's proposal and encourage additional funding for environmental mitigation, including diesel retrofiting.</p>

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

1/24/2006

STATE BOND PROPOSALS A comparison of SCAG's Adopted Priorities with Major State Infrastructure Bond Proposals

<p>Promote CEQA streamlining, in accordance with SCAG's CEQA reform policies, to expedite project delivery</p>	<p>The CEQA reform policies established by the Regional Council implement the preferred Regional Growth Strategy, promote housing production and support planning practices</p>	<p>May attach S.B. 832, which includes provisions to voluntarily streamline CEQA studies for certain in-fill development and smart growth projects</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Amend both proposals to include SCAG's CEQA reform policies (as adopted by the Regional Council), including voluntary implementation, ease of housing developments in appropriate and strategic areas, the promotion of regional planning, results that are preferable to current conditions or "no-plan", regional level impact analysis, results in the functional equivalent of a full EIR and limitation to areas identified in the RGP</p>
<p>Give priority to projects that meet RTP performance measures</p>	<p>Performance measures quantify goals and provide a way to evaluate progress over time. Performance measures are also used to evaluate projects and ensure that funding works to meet established goals. By maintaining consistent performance measures for transportation funding, we can ensure the goals set out in our regional plans are intact.</p>	<p>No specific performance measures, but supports projects that implement a Regional Growth Plan, use Transit Oriented Development principles and execute other provisions of the bill</p>	<p>Performance measures specified, including cost-effectiveness, substitutability, reduced congestion, improved mobility, land use, safety and geographical balance considerations</p>	<p>Ensure that both proposals to establish performance measures for projects that are consistent with the RTP, in order to provide consistent criteria for selection and prioritizing</p>
<p>Support Design-Build and Design-Sequencing procurement procedures to expedite project delivery</p>	<p>The amount of time needed to deliver a project has direct effects on its overall cost. By creating vehicles to make project delivery more efficient, we can realize cost savings and release obligated public funds for use on other projects</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Promotes Design-Build and Design-Sequencing and gives authority to Public-Private partnerships</p>	<p>Support the Governor's emphasis on Design-Build and Design-Sequencing and amend SB1024 to allow for expedited project delivery</p>
<p>Support initiatives that call for local governments and regions to plan for a 20 year site inventory based on natural increases in population and job growth and that allow neighboring jurisdictions, by agreement, to share responsibilities for increasing the housing supply (RHNA)**</p>	<p>By allowing collaboration and cooperation among local and regional government, a more responsive and comprehensive 20 year inventory can be produced. Further, through responsibility sharing, housing supply can be more effectively increased in areas that can support such supply.</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Amend proposals to add an alternative approach to RHNA that supports housing planning on a 20 year basis, promotes housing near employment centers and implements the regional growth plan (RGP)</p>
<p>*Adopted priorities are contained in the Regional Transportation Plan and/or the Legislative Program</p>				
<p>**RHNA Settlement Agreement (September 24, 2004)</p>				

League of California Cities		2006 INFRASTRUCTURE PROPOSALS	
Funding Targets		Governor	Nuñez / AB 1783
Transportation		Perata / SB 1024	
Proposition 42	Protecting Prop. 42 permanently through a constitutional amendment to eliminate the option for future governors and legislatures to suspend funding.	\$2.3 billion to repay Prop. 42 loans from FY 2003-04 and 2004-05	Repayment of Prop. 42 loans from FY 2003-04 and 2004-05.
Goods Movement/Ports/Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pursuing public-private partnerships to complete projects such as high occupancy toll lanes, regular toll lanes, truck lanes and freight movement facilities where a predictable revenue stream will be created to repay capital investments. \$2 billion (\$1 billion in bonds to be matched by \$1 billion in funding from other sources) to reduce goods-movement related pollution. \$18.9 billion to expand trade corridors and regional priorities. \$2 billion for port improvements and environmental mitigation. 	<p>\$2.5 billion to relieve traffic and improve security and air quality at California ports.</p>	<p>Goods movement and community and environmental mitigation for planning, design, engineering, and environmental activities related to highway capacity improvements, freight rail system improvements, and environmental mitigation.</p>

Transportation Committee Agenda
 February 1, 2006

Funding Targets		Governor	Perata / SB 1024	Núñez / AB 1783
Transportation (continued)				
Public Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$4.5 billion to expand existing transit rail and to add new urban commuter rail and intercity passenger rail. • \$471 million to improve transit and rail services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1 billion for an incremental approach to a possible High Speed Rail System. Funds would go toward environmental work, right-of-way acquisition, and grade separations. • \$425 million for inflill incentive grants for capital outlay for infrastructure that includes water and sewer hook-ups, related transportation improvements, and the development or rehabilitation of urban parks.* (Also applies to water and parks – see below.) 	Public transportation, including investments in inner-city passenger rail systems and transit for the elderly and disabled and other capital programs eligible for funds under the Public Transportation Account	
Transportation Security	\$297 million to expand the Freeway Service Patrol	Transportation security – ports and mass transit		
Congestion Relief	\$18.9 billion for capacity expansion on major corridors of the highway system by using strategies such as adding auxiliary lanes, using technology to assist drivers, and improving interchanges.	Regional Coordinating Partnerships for congestion relief.		

Funding Targets		Governor	Perata / SB 1024	Núñez / AB 1783
Transportation (continued)				
Transportation Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using design-build contracting and design-sequencing construction to deliver projects more quickly and efficiently. \$21.2 billion for major projects on state interregional routes and to expand and complete the High occupancy Vehicle lane system. \$28.9 billion for rehabilitation and preservation of the state highway system. \$7.9 billion for safety and operational improvements on the state highway system. \$3 billion for transportation technology and Intelligent Transportation Systems. \$943 million to expand park and ride opportunities and bicycle and pedestrian routes. 	\$1.5 billion for regions to fund high priority projects.		
Environmental Quality				
Brownfields				Clean-up of brownfields and urban infill development.
Open Space and Habitat Preservation			\$200 million for grants from the Secty. of Resources for acquisition of wildlife habitat, open space and easements on agricultural land, as mitigation for the policies adopted in a region's growth plan.	Acquisition, preservation, and restoration of open space, agricultural land and habitat.

Transportation Committee Agenda
 February 1, 2006

Funding Targets		Governor	Perata / SB 1024	Núñez / AB 1783
Environmental Quality (continued)				
Clean Air/Environment			\$100 million is for the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program.	Clean Air and Schoolbus Safety Fund, for retrofit and replacement of school buses.
Housing, Planning, and Land Use				
Housing Need and Rehabilitation Funding			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$200 million to rehabilitate multi-family housing in designated infill areas. • \$425 million in additional transportation funds for improving streets to local governments that meet their share of the regional housing need. 	Multifamily housing units under the state's existing Multifamily Housing Program.
Housing Assistance Programs				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing for individuals/households moving from emergency shelters or transitional housing or those at risk of homelessness and the Emergency Housing Assistance Program • California Homebuyer's Downpayment Assistance Program and the CalHome Program. • Farmworker housing programs.

Funding Targets Governor Perata / SB 1024 Nuñez / AB 1783	
Housing, Planning, and Land Use (continued) Land Use/Planning and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$275 million to promote projects that locate housing, retail and office centers within 1/4th of a mile from transit stations. • \$100 million for grants for local agencies to improve up front planning necessary for urban infill development. • \$50 million to clean up vacant sites in urban areas so they can be made useful to accommodate future growth.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financing for local and regional planning partnerships. • Financing of sustainable communities (green development projects). • Incentives, including grants to local governments, which will promote better land use decisions and increase the production of affordable housing.

News Articles
RE: State Infrastructure Initiatives

**We are providing this to you for
background information.**

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

From the Los Angeles Times

Governor's Building Plan Raises Concerns

Democrats say his infrastructure proposal would erode lawmakers' and local governments' power to make decisions on key policy issues.

By Jordan Rau
Times Staff Writer

January 24, 2006

SACRAMENTO — A power struggle is emerging over Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's \$222-billion public works package. Democratic leaders say legislators and local governments would be required to cede too much influence in deciding how to remake California's roads, jails and waterways.

The issue is expected to be one of the main points of contention as lawmakers today begin considering Schwarzenegger's proposal for the biggest building effort in four decades.

Schwarzenegger has said he wants to ensure that the effort — which would be paid for through \$68 billion in state borrowing as well as federal aid, user fees and existing gas taxes — does not become politicized by lawmakers insisting that all districts have projects funded no matter the need.

"We're all clear ... that we should build what is necessary for the state of California, not having each legislator say, 'Well, I need this street to be built in my neighborhood, and I need this little bridge there, and I need this and I need that,' " Schwarzenegger said earlier this month.

Democratic leaders, who suggested months before Schwarzenegger that a large investment needed to be made in the state's physical foundations, agreed that lawmakers should not select every project.

But under the governor's plan, enormous multibillion-dollar ventures — such as deciding how to move goods more quickly through California's ports and setting fees on water users — would be determined by state agencies — without being included in the annual budget approved by the Legislature.

Democrats complain that they could be bypassed on politically sensitive policy decisions. Those include whether to build new dams and who should pay for them; how best to funnel water through the state; and what portion of public safety money should be spent on prison cells versus rehabilitation programs.

In addition, Democrats say Schwarzenegger's plan contains disturbing echoes of previous grand proposals from the governor that also would have sidelined lawmakers. Concerns about turning Sacramento into an autocracy helped doom his California Performance Review, which aimed to streamline state government, as well as Proposition 76, last

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

year's failed initiative to limit state spending.

After his special election defeats, Schwarzenegger pledged to work with legislators instead of trying to go around them.

"It just seems to be a long step backward, creating not only new bureaucracies but unprecedented central government support," said Senate President Pro Tem Don Perata (D-Oakland). "I don't think it flies."

Perata said he was inclined to move forward instead with public works proposals that legislators have already submitted.

Both the Legislature and state voters must approve the general plan before borrowing can occur; lawmakers hope to place the first phase of the plan on the June ballot.

"We have existing proposals, my own included, that have been vetted over the course of the year and serve the same purposes as the governor's proposal but do so in a much more facile and fair manner and are much more likely to get the consensus necessary to get on the ballot," Perata said.

Assembly Speaker Fabian Nuñez (D-Los Angeles) said lawmakers should be the ones to decide the state's priorities, especially when they involve major efforts such as unclogging California's congested ports.

"I'm not sold on the idea that we approve a general plan and then a government agency is going to determine priorities," Nuñez said. "I think priorities have to be determined here.... When people go to vote for this, they ought to know what they are voting for."

Much of Schwarzenegger's public works spending plan, including \$47.5 billion for schools, would be distributed through existing methods that lawmakers agree with.

But under the governor's plan, state agencies would play an enlarged role in proposing the specific projects to receive \$26 billion in bond money intended to build or improve roads, bridges, ports and bike paths.

The nine members of the California Transportation Commission, a quasi-independent agency, would make the final decisions after considering any alternatives that regional officials suggest.

Legislative officials said that process would minimize the role of local nonprofits and governments to nominate projects, as they do now.

But the administration says most projects would have to have been included in a regional transportation plan before they could be endorsed, so locals would have a say.

Lawmakers also are bristling at Schwarzenegger's proposal to leave out of the budget \$2

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

billion in grants that will be given to local governments to relieve overcrowded jails. The administration says many of those decisions would be based on very pragmatic concerns, such as which jails have rooms that can be converted into treatment centers, for example.

The governor's \$10-billion water bond proposal is an area of particular concern. Senate officials say that state water agencies would be given the authority to decide such politically sensitive issues as whether to build a canal to route water around the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta to agricultural and urban areas in Central and Southern California. California voters rejected such a project, known as the Peripheral Canal, in 1982.

"People who are not elected from the Department of Resources make all these decisions and allocate all these billions of dollars," said state Sen. Sheila Kuehl (D-Santa Monica), chairwoman of the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee.

"If there's no real approval process involving the Legislature, then you have no oversight," Kuehl said. "We're constantly being surprised by [other] projects being funded in the wrong way, or too much, or things being funded and that never start."

H.D. Palmer, spokesman for the state Department of Finance, said the administration is not considering any contentious projects such as a Peripheral Canal. But he said that keeping projects out of the state budget "is kind of an insurance program against pork barreling."

"It wasn't that long ago that the ability to get enough votes to pass the state budget depended on which members of the Legislature were able to get special projects funded in their district," Palmer said. "Since these bond funds would be appropriated in an ongoing or continuous manner, you essentially eliminate the potential for critical improvements in infrastructure throughout California being held hostage by a small handful of projects."

But it is not only Democrats who have concerns about the amount of leeway given to state agencies in parts of the plan. Senate Republican leader Dick Ackerman of Irvine said he was concerned that the transportation projects would not be selected through the State Transportation Improvement Program, which uses set formulas to distribute money to different areas of the state.

"I think it's a fairer process," Ackerman said.

Schwarzenegger and lawmakers also have substantial disagreements on the focus of the entire package.

Majority Democrats are pressing to include affordable housing and seismic safety improvements to hospitals in the bond package. Republicans — whose support is necessary to place the borrowing package on the ballot — are insisting on easing the environmental rules governing the construction.

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

People in both parties have raised concerns about the level of debt the state would undertake. Republicans have called for less reliance on borrowing, and Democrat Nuñez said Monday that he believed the Legislature had the will to approve only about half the debt Schwarzenegger has proposed.

"We're more fiscally conservative," Nuñez said with a grin.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-rail21jan21,1,1621055.story>

From the Los Angeles Times

Gov. Calls for Big Investment in L.A. Rail System

The bond proposal gets a warm reception from officials worried about growing freight traffic.

By Patrick McGreevy

Times Staff Writer

January 21, 2006

Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's \$222-billion infrastructure bond proposal includes a significant investment in improving Los Angeles' congested rail system, he said Friday.

Though his proposal is still in its early stages, local officials are reacting enthusiastically because Los Angeles County's rail lines are becoming increasingly clogged by freight traffic coming from the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach as well as the growing Metrolink commuter rail line.

Union Station is the hub of the region's rail network, with 126 trains using the station every workday. The governor's plan calls for spending \$290 million on improvements, such as adding tracks and eliminating rail crossings.

"This will relieve traffic congestion, make it safer on our roads, and make it more convenient for people to use this great rail system," Schwarzenegger said in a visit to Los Angeles on Friday.

The governor's proposal is subject to negotiations with state legislators, who could make significant changes or decide not to put anything on the ballot.

To reduce delays at Union Station, the proposal calls for extending two existing tracks southward from Union Station and provide a new connection into the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway mainline on the west side of the Los Angeles River.

The plan calls for \$36 million to be spent to provide a third rail line on an eight-mile stretch of track north of La Mirada.

The governor's proposal also has something in it for Southern California motorists stuck waiting for slow-moving trains to pass at rail crossings: grade separations allowing cars

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

and trucks to pass unimpeded underneath railroad tracks at busy intersections.

He proposed spending \$214 million on five grade separations where streets cross train tracks: Rosecrans Avenue/Marquardt Avenue, Lakeland Road, Los Nietos Road/Norwalk Boulevard, Pioneer Boulevard and Passons Boulevard.

Congestion along Los Angeles' rail lines has become an increasing concern in recent years. Last year, Metrolink's Inland Empire-to-Los Angeles route recorded major delays, which officials say is because the commuter line had to share the rails with freight trains.

Some commuters have also complained about lengthy waits at rail crossings as trains passed. More than 35,000 trains, many of them longer than a mile, course through the region every year, according to 2003 statistics.

The Republican governor was joined Friday by Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, a Democrat, in urging bipartisan support in the state Legislature for putting the bond measure on the ballot this year.

Villaraigosa said he has some of his own ideas for things to include, but he likes what the governor is proposing and hopes some version close to it can be put before voters.

"I can tell you: L.A.'s transportation needs are substantial and complex and that they won't be remedied overnight," the mayor said. "We need to take the long view. It's important to make a substantial investment in transportation infrastructure."

The governor says that his entire infrastructure plan will help reduce traffic congestion by 18% over the next 10 years, even though Southern California's population is expected to increase by 2 million during that period. It will do that, in part, by funding more than 1,200 miles of new highway and carpool lanes in congested areas and adding 600 miles of mass transit.

Some transportation experts, however, are skeptical that even a major freeway improvement campaign will significantly improve commutes in some heavily congested areas.

After hearing the governor provide new details on specific projects to get traffic flowing in Los Angeles, Villaraigosa promised to use his political capital to push state legislators to put the measure on the ballot in June or, if more time is needed, in November at the latest.

"You go to a Little League game, or a job site, a family birthday party, and the first topic that everybody talks about and that's on everybody's mind is how bad the traffic was," Villaraigosa said.

The mayor praised specific projects outlined in the governor's proposed Strategic Growth Plan, including \$350 million for construction of a carpool lane on the northbound San

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

Diego Freeway through the Westside and into the San Fernando Valley.

The details of the plan spelled out by the governor impressed business leaders who attended Friday's event, including Bill Allen, president and chief executive of the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corp.

Allen said it is crucial for the state to improve Southern California's rail system, not just to ease stress on commuters. The improvements also will have a positive effect on the economy of an area that includes two of the busiest ports in the world, he said.

"We really are America's loading dock here in Southern California," Allen said.

The governor's plan is garnering criticism from other candidates for governor, including Democrats Phil Angelides and Steve Westly.

Angelides, the state treasurer, said it is stunning that only 4.5% of the money proposed by the governor for transportation would go to urban mass transit.

"The fact is, if you look at the plan, it's really a regurgitation of 20th century ideas and not 21st century innovations," Angelides said.

Westly, the state controller, is concerned there is no guarantee the money will be spent wisely and as promised, so he has proposed a bond oversight committee, said campaign spokesman Nick Velasquez.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-diego20jan20,1,6927208.story>

From the Los Angeles Times

Gov. Says Road Bond Won't Shortchange San Diego

By Tony Perry
Times Staff Writer

January 20, 2006

SAN DIEGO — Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger on Thursday brought his road show to two of the busiest roads in the region and promised to make them better if his \$222-billion infrastructure bond proposal is adopted.

Although the overall pitch may have been generic, the governor tailored his comments to the local audience as he stood at a site overlooking the interchange of Interstate 15 and California 56.

San Diego, the governor noted, has the best of nearly everything: sunny weather, clean beaches and great recreational facilities.

"I'm here to talk about something that will make this place even better," he said at the

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

news conference with local officials.

San Diego and Imperial counties would get more than \$670 million from the bond measure to add freeway lanes, park-and-ride facilities, inner-city rail projects and other traffic-easing programs. Interstates 15 and 5, San Diego's major north-south commuter corridors, would be priorities, the governor said.

"I think San Diego was shortchanged for many years" in the divvying up of state funds, he said, echoing a long-standing complaint of area officials.

San Diego Mayor Jerry Sanders, in his State of the City address last week, was only the latest official to argue that San Diego does not get as much state support as other regions.

The reasons are political and historic. San Diego has not had the political clout in Sacramento enjoyed by Los Angeles and San Francisco. And the region's reluctance to spend local funds has come back to haunt it.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-bonds15jan15,1,1609612.story>

From the Los Angeles Times

Bond Fight's Purse Is Big

With \$222 billion at stake, the governor's plan to rebuild the state's infrastructure has sparked an epic struggle for a piece of the action.

By Robert Salladay

Times Staff Writer

January 15, 2006

SACRAMENTO — Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's \$222-billion plan to refurbish California's crumbling foundations has produced a free-for-all in the Capitol, as lobbyists and lawmakers jostle to get a piece of it.

Schwarzenegger's proposal would span a decade and cover hundreds of ideas to "rebuild California." But despite the huge cost, there is not enough money to fulfill every wish list for repairing the state's freeways, schools, waterways and prisons.

"It's going to be your standard legislative slugfest," said Barry Broad, a labor lobbyist in Sacramento, where lawmakers will begin negotiating details of the plan this week.

"Everyone is going to want their pet project put in, including me."

Hospitals say they need at least \$30 billion for repairs before the next big earthquake. Environmentalists would like \$500 million for nonpolluting school buses and money for new parks. Democratic lawmakers want \$500 million to improve security on buses and subways, and \$1 billion for a high-speed train from San Francisco to Los Angeles. Broad's clients would like better wages and benefits for port truckers.

There are nine bills in the Legislature that would implement the governor's plan to pay

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

for new and refurbished roads, build hundreds of schools, make levee repairs and put up new prisons and courthouses, among other projects.

Schwarzenegger would finance the work by asking voters to approve \$68 billion in bond measures over the next five elections, supplementing that money with new fees, existing taxes and federal funds.

Lawmakers, who must pass any infrastructure plan before it goes to the ballot, said they would need several months to negotiate the details. At the same time, they'll be working on their own rebuilding plans, which they hope to integrate into Schwarzenegger's.

How the billions are earmarked will be the biggest power struggle in the Capitol this year.

The governor's program contains no provisions for repairing any of California's 470 acute-care hospitals. After the 1994 Northridge earthquake, the state required hospitals to retrofit or rebuild to withstand a major quake by 2008; additional requirements kick in by 2030.

Assembly Speaker Fabian Nuñez (D-Los Angeles) has his own infrastructure proposal that includes an unspecified amount to help nonprofit hospitals, particularly those in low-income and rural areas. Because there are so many other projects on the table, hospitals could get far less than the \$30 billion they estimate they'll need.

Jan Emerson, spokeswoman for the California Hospital Assn., said the state should instead consider eliminating the 2008 deadline and let hospitals work toward the tougher 2030 requirements to ensure that they can be fully operational after a major earthquake. Lawmakers "wouldn't be able to give hospitals enough to make a difference," Emerson said, acknowledging the numerous demands on available bond money, "and then there would be a perception that they had resolved the problem this year but really hadn't."

Schwarzenegger's program also offers nothing for the new parklands that environmentalists want. The governor has suggested spending more than \$200 million on existing state parks, from fixing leaky bathrooms to restoring trails.

In March 2000, California voters approved \$1.2 billion to buy and repair public parks. They followed up with \$2.6 billion more in March 2002. But most of that money has been spent. In addition, California needs about \$900 million in repairs to parks, according to the state parks department.

Schwarzenegger's plan does include \$2 billion to control pollution around California's busy ports, which may include helping transportation companies buy cleaner-burning trucks. Environmental groups say more money is needed.

Lawmakers won't be negotiating over just money. Democrats and environmentalists don't want the governor to weaken environmental protections to speed up building projects —

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

something Republican lawmakers said they would insist on as a requirement for their votes. The governor needs Republican votes for a bond measure to pass the Legislature.

Environmentalists would like to see the governor include "smart growth" projects that would encourage, for example, new housing in blighted city centers to stem suburban sprawl that is eating up farmland.

"Mindless building without planning is just a recipe for more traffic and more pollution," said Bill Magavern, a lobbyist with the Sierra Club.

Housing advocates and Democrats want billions to help provide inexpensive housing for farmworkers and other poor people. The total need for public housing and emergency shelters "conceivably could be as much as \$30 billion over 10 years," said Julie Snyder, policy director for the Sacramento nonprofit group Housing California. "We don't think it makes much sense to look at 10 years worth of transportation projects ... and ignore where people are actually going to live," Snyder said. "The roads make no difference if there is no home at the end of it."

The governor wants to spend \$107 billion on transportation. Big projects under consideration include new lanes for the clogged 710 Freeway from the Port of Long Beach northward, and a tunnel under the Angeles National Forest to help carry traffic from Palmdale to Glendale.

There will be jockeying over high-speed rail as well. State Senate President Pro Tem Don Perata (D-Oakland) has suggested adding \$1 billion to the infrastructure plan to buy rights of way and to study the environmental effects of high-speed service from San Francisco to Los Angeles.

The governor's plan would freeze government support for high-speed rail entirely. And Schwarzenegger wants the Legislature to withdraw a ballot measure scheduled for November that would sell \$9 billion in bonds for a statewide high-speed train, which would eat into his ability to borrow for other building projects.

The list goes on: Perata wants \$500 million for security cameras and communication equipment to bolster security on buses and subways. He also is suggesting \$125 million for seismic repairs on small bridges and \$100 million to encourage housing and business development near transit stations, to reduce vehicle traffic.

The Sierra Club is recommending \$500 million for new nonpolluting school buses, and money for a satellite weather system for farmers, so they can conserve irrigation water, among other ideas.

Some government and independent studies put the actual cost at \$500 billion to fix the state's infrastructure and prepare for an estimated 15 million new residents in the next two decades.

Transportation Committee Agenda

February 1, 2006

Assemblyman John Laird (D-Santa Cruz), a member of a newly formed committee to consider the governor's plan, said that available money for public housing, libraries and parks was running out. "Many of us would like to see some pieces of those items included in whatever the final outcome will be," he said.

Schwarzenegger's plan is not the only thing on lawmakers' minds this year. Many are running for reelection, as he is, or looking for new jobs because of term limits. But the governor is asking for quick action; he wants the entire 10-year package approved and at least a portion of it put on the ballot this year.

"We're concerned that this proposal could eat up all of the bond money for the next 10 years, and the timetable may not allow for the best decision-making," said the Sierra Club's Magavern.

Schwarzenegger and legislators say they all want a focused, long-term plan that addresses the state's biggest problems thoughtfully. "We all are in sync that it shouldn't become a Christmas tree," Schwarzenegger said recently, "that we should build what is necessary for the state of California, not having each legislator say, 'Well, I need this street to be built out in my neighborhood, and I need this little bridge there, and I need this and I need that.' "

Perata made it clear last week that he feels Schwarzenegger has left some important things out of his infrastructure plan, and that he expects many changes. "Most of us feel all things are not weighted equally," Perata said, "and therefore we will have to make tough choices."