

TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATION & PUBLIC WORKS POLICY COMMITTEE HIGHLIGHTS

Friday, April 8, 2011

Doubletree Hotel, Grove Room, 222 N. Vineyard Avenue, Ontario

ATTENDANCE

Members: Glancy, Tom (V.Chair); Anderson, Jamie; Anderson, Harold; Bergson, Charles; Biery, James; Breault, Randy; Canavan, Jon; Cheng, Ann; Chu, Kansan; Craton, Mary; Cron, Dennis; Dillon-Knutson, Carole; Espinosa, Robert; Fergusson, Kelly; Fox, Marc; Fredericks, Alice; Freeland, Chris; Glancy, Thomas; Heller, Barbara; Hudson, Mike; Johnson, Richard; Lautenschleger, Joel; McGarvey, Robert; Overcashier, Lynn; Parra, Daniel; Pieper, Darold; Rad, Javan; Robertson, Deborah; Robinson, Jacques; Rodriguez, Ralph; Slowik, Matthew; Teaford, Bonnie; Ucovich, Miguel; Varney, Jay; Wilson, Fred

League Staff: Jennifer Whiting, Jeff Kiernan

i. Special Order of Business – Joint Budget briefing

The Revenue and Taxation, Transportation, Communication and Public Works, Administrative Services, and Environmental Quality Policy Committees came together for a joint briefing on major issues of the budget. Chris McKenzie, the League's Executive Director, gave a general overview of the first few months of the year. He explained that the Legislature and Governor don't like how Proposition 22 reads. The Governor says that California can't afford redevelopment any longer, and the League's counter argument is that California can't afford to lose redevelopment. Mr. McKenzie discussed legal options and strategies that cities have if redevelopment is eliminated. Dan Carrigg, the League's Legislative Director, followed by giving detailed information on the votes that have been taken regarding redevelopment and explained that the legislature has now returned to a traditional budget schedule. Michael Coleman, the League's Fiscal Policy Advisor, presented a PowerPoint on the current condition of the State Budget. Each of the League's lobbyists briefed the joint meeting on specific issue areas, including Transportation, Public Safety, Pension Reform, and Fees Paid by Local Agencies and Grant Programs. Mr. Coleman's PowerPoint presentation can be found at <http://www.californiacityfinance.com/PolicyComms110406p.pdf>, and a summary of the briefing from the lobbyists can be found at http://www.cacities.org/index.jsp?displaytype=11&story=28454&zone=loc§ion=advo&sub_s ec=advo_leg&tert=advo_leg_issues.

Following the presentation, staff received questions from policy committee members regarding the definitions of "unearned" pension benefits (future earnings); confirmation that COPS funding will not be available if the proposed tax extensions are not approved; what happens next on redevelopment if it survives; and retention of rights to sue if the alternate redevelopment proposal is approved.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Vice Chair Glancy welcomed the committee members and asked that they introduce themselves. Following introductions Vice Chair Glancy presented committee member Deborah Robertson with an award thanking her for her service as Chair in 2010.

II. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

III. Committee Work Program

The Work Program was accepted unanimously with no changes.

IV. Electric Vehicle Infrastructure: Part II

Dean Taylor, with Southern California Edison came to the committee to continue to update the League on electric vehicles. Mr. Taylor spoke about what utilities and cities are working on to make sure we're all ready for electric vehicles. About 30 automakers are ready to launch vehicles in the next year and most automakers predict that there will be between 450,000 and 1 million new electric vehicles in California by the end of the decade. In addition, the state has been providing incentives and investments through grants, goals and regulations over the last few years for electric vehicles and now those investments in the electric vehicle industry are beginning to pay off. From the utility end, it's critical to train our staff, work with and bring together stakeholders, and make sure we're doing customer education and outreach.

Mr. Taylor also explained that IOUs do not expect any major breakdowns in the grid as electric vehicles roll-out but are also using models to make sure there are not any problems or "localized impacts" that can be addressed, especially with proper advanced notice to make sure that upgrades are done by the time the vehicles arrive.

So what are the basic plan efforts that cities can do to get ready for EVs?

Streamline permitting process. 80 to 90% of people will be charging at home. Most of the work to date with EVs has been done to improve the residential charging experience. Mr. Taylor noted that what's different between an EV and a propane or natural gas car is that you have to do a number of things to get ready for the car, unlike other types of cars where you can just go to the dealership and buy the car. In many cases, the homeowner will need to do electrical system upgrades (akin to buying a hot tub) adding outlets, working with the utility to make sure the local system can handle the new EV. There are things that cities can do like online permitting. Many cities can do these permits over-the-counter, and some already are doing 24-hour types of services. One group of cities, the Tri-Cities (northern California) has been especially aggressive in the area of permitting. LA basin chapter of the ICCC has also been a leader on this.

Commercial charging stations are generally taking longer at this point, largely because of design, but in the Tri-City area and some others, the permit time has already been shortened to a week or two, instead of months.

Linking to websites for the public Mr. Taylor also noted that cities can link to educational websites on EVs including www.goelectricdrive.com and <http://www.sce.com/PowerandEnvironment/PEV/default.htm>

IOUs have also been providing educational information to cities to help with educational efforts, through newsletter articles, handouts and other information.

Participation with EV Readiness Coalitions Cities are encouraged to work with these coalitions for funding and information.

Think about Infrastructure planning. Where are people likely to travel, destinations are good places for EV chargers, also think about city locations (city hall, community centers) that might make sense to have chargers.

Have a point person in your city that's the person to call on EV issues

Other suggested efforts:

- Seek financing for EV infrastructure from the federal government, state Energy Commission (AB 118 funding) and local air boards (Bay Area AQMD is one) that have available funds.
- Purchasing EVs for your city's fleet
- Updating local building codes to make sure they are EV ready.

Members of the committee noted that building inspectors are seeing issues regarding discrepancies between what electricians write out on the permit and what contractors install when the building officials go visit the property for a final inspection.

In addition, several Fire Chiefs noted that they're also seeing problems with EVs in accidents. EVs are structurally safe but because they have a live electric current, they are causing fires when an EV is involved in an accident. Fire Chiefs are working on how to address the issue.

V. Proposition 26 Update

League staff updated the committee on the work of the City Attorney's Working Group on Proposition 26. The final white paper was not complete at the time of the meeting, but is expected to be available on the League website by the end of April.

VI. State Legislative Action Items

- **AB 83** – The committee was asked to review AB 83, which would create an exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for installation of new recycled water pipelines less than eight miles in length within a paved public street, highway, or right-of-way.

The committee participated in an hour-long debate on this issue, with many options and points of view discussed.

In support of the bill, committee members pointed out that recycled water pipeline is expensive and anything that encourages the use should be supported, that most water is being wasted and flowing into marshland, project timelines could be shortened, and that the League should support streamlining.

In opposition to the bill, committee members noted that at times it seems that utilities have more control over streets than cities do and that it is important to protect pristine land. Other members thought the savings' estimates were overstated and that cities need to maintain control of the streets. Others noted that CEQA provides cities the information they need to make informed decisions and is needed on some projects.

Ultimately, the committee voted to recommend an oppose unless amended position. The amendments are as follows:

- Projects are limited to the right-of-way and maintained areas and roads
 - The local jurisdiction must consent to the CEQA waiver.
- **AB 345** – The committee was asked to review AB 345, which would require CalTrans to consult with groups representing users of streets, roads, and highways, before adopting rules and regulations prescribing uniform standards and specifications for official traffic control devices.

Committee members voiced concerns about the bill, noting that CTCDC is a technical committee that has major impacts and that cities already represent all users of the road. They encourage non-motorized users to engage in General Plan discussions.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend an oppose unless amended position.

- **AB 441** – The committee was asked to review AB 441, which would require that the CA Transportation Commission (CTC) include health issues in the guidelines promulgated by the commission for the preparations of regional transportation plans. The bill also requires that the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research develop guidelines that contain advice on how local and regional agencies can incorporate health issues into local or regional general plans.

Committee members raised concerns regarding the bill leading to contradictory policies with nowhere to work out differences. Others noted that these issues will already be addressed through the Sustainable Communities Strategies in compliance with SB 375.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend an oppose unless amended position.

- **SB 907** – The committee was asked to review SB 907, which would create the Master Plan for Infrastructure Financing and Development Commission (Commission), the mission of which would be to develop and recommend a plan to be presented to the Governor and Legislature that provides for financing, building, and maintaining the infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of Californians from the present year to the year 2050, and to establish a process for periodically adjusting and adapting the plan in coming years to meet changing circumstances.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend an oppose position, noting that there are already state and local commissions that address these same issues. The committee indicated they may be open to the Commission if other similar commissions are dissolved.

- **AB 1215** – The committee was asked to review AB 1215, which would require a new motor vehicle dealer to use electronic programs provided by the dealer’s first-line service provider to register any vehicle sold or leased and to disclose any document processing charge or electronic registration or transfer charge. The bill also increases the amount of the document processing fee charged by vehicle dealerships from \$55 to \$75, and allows the dealership to pass on the actual cost they are charged by their vendors who provide the secure communication link between the dealership and the Department of Motor Vehicles. These provisions will become effective July 1, 2012.

Committee members felt that, overall, the bill would benefit cities and were supportive of the issue. However, they also raised concerns that the current language of the bill did not accomplish the stated goal of the bill. As such, they supported the amendments proposed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission discussed in the staff analysis. One committee member raised a concern about the increase in fees for the purchaser.

The committee voted to recommend a support if amended position (1 no vote). The amendments are as follows:

- Shorten the allowable time period for driving without plates.
- Increase penalties for driving without a license plate.
- Provide for better identification of expiration of temporary registration.

- **Proposed State Industrial Stormwater Permit**

Staff presented the State Water Resources Control Board Draft Industrial Storm Water Permit. Committee members questioned whether the League was overreacting to the draft permit by recommending an oppose position. Committee members also raised concern about the State Water Resources Control Board not providing economic analysis for communities to know about the cost associated with the draft permit. Finally, committee members also raised concern with the effluent limits in the permit and the lack of a city's ability to meet those limits and then face expensive fines. Chris Freeland made a motion to oppose the Draft Permit, Robert McGarvey seconded the motion. The motion to oppose passed unanimously.

- **Business Advertisements on CalTrans Signs**

The committee received an initial briefing from League staff on business advertisements on CalTrans signs and discussed the possibility of sponsoring legislation in the future. Overall comments from the committee were positive and agreed that the policy should be universal and not limited to rural areas. The committee raised several questions to be addressed in future meetings including:

- How should competition be handled?
- Should an eligible business be located within a certain distance from the offramp?
- How to limit visual pollution? (Look at billboard regulations).
- Can CalTrans maintain more signs? (Graffiti, etc.)

VII. Federal Legislative Update

League staff briefed the committee on the status of the federal transportation reauthorization, as SAFETEA-Lu has now been extended to the end of the federal fiscal year (September 30).

Committee members were also encouraged to send letters asking for full funding of the Community Development Block Grant program.

VIII. Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment

League staff informed the committee that the final 2010 Update is now available at www.savecaliforniastreet.org. The LSR Needs Assessment Committee is now working to raise funding for the next two cycles of updates.

IX. Next Meeting: FRIDAY, June 17, 2011, Sacramento Convention Center