



**TRANSPORTATION, WATER &
INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**

**April 8, 2019
9:00 A.M.**

651 Pine Street, Room 101, Martinez

Supervisor Karen Mitchoff, Chair
Supervisor Candace Andersen, Vice Chair

**Agenda
Items:**

Items may be taken out of order based on the business of the day and preference of the Committee

1. Introductions
2. Public comment on any item under the jurisdiction of the Committee and not on this agenda (speakers may be limited to three minutes).
3. **Administrative Items, if applicable.** (John Cunningham, Department of Conservation and Development)
4. **REVIEW record of meeting for February 11, 2019, Transportation, Water and infrastructure Committee Meeting.** This record was prepared pursuant to the Better Government Ordinance 95-6, Article 25-205 (d) of the Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Any handouts or printed copies of testimony distributed at the meeting will be attached to this meeting record. (John Cunningham, Department of Conservation and Development).
5. **CONSIDER Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account Project List for unincorporated Contra Costa County, and DIRECT staff as appropriate including bringing the report to the full Board of Supervisors with a recommendation from the Transportation, Water, and Infrastructure Committee.** (Nancy Wein, Public Works Department)
6. **ACCEPT report on 2018 Bike-to-Work Day and DIRECT staff as appropriate, including 1) recommending measures that will increase the County's participation in future Bike-to-Work Days and 2) bringing this report to the full Board of Supervisors.** (Robert Sarmiento/Jody London, Department of Conservation and Development)
7. **REVIEW the Proposition 1 grant application, and DIRECT staff as appropriate including sending the application to the full Board of Supervisors with a recommendation to approve and authorize the Public Works Director, or designee, to execute grant application documents to secure grant funding with the California State Coastal Conservancy, not to exceed \$200,000, for the Montarabay Green Infrastructure and Drainage Project.**(Carl J. Roner, Department of Public

Works)

8. **CONSIDER report on Local, State, Regional, and Federal Transportation Related Legislative Issues and take ACTION as appropriate.** (John Cunningham, Department of Conservation and Development)
9. The next meeting is currently scheduled for Monday, May 13, 2019.
10. Adjourn

The Transportation, Water & Infrastructure Committee (TWIC) will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities planning to attend TWIC meetings. Contact the staff person listed below at least 72 hours before the meeting.

Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the County to a majority of members of the TWIC less than 96 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at the County Department of Conservation and Development, 30 Muir Road, Martinez during normal business hours.

Public comment may be submitted via electronic mail on agenda items at least one full work day prior to the published meeting time.

For Additional Information Contact:

John Cunningham, Committee Staff
Phone (925) 674-7833, Fax (925) 674-7250
john.cunningham@dcd.cccounty.us

Glossary of Acronyms, Abbreviations, and other Terms (in alphabetical order): Contra Costa County has a policy of making limited use of acronyms, abbreviations, and industry-specific language in meetings of its Board of Supervisors and Committees. Following is a list of commonly used abbreviations that may appear in presentations and written materials at meetings of the Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee:

AB Assembly Bill	HOT High-Occupancy/Toll
ABAG Association of Bay Area Governments	HOV High-Occupancy-Vehicle
ACA Assembly Constitutional Amendment	HSD Contra Costa County Health Services Department
ADA Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990	HUD United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
ALUC Airport Land Use Commission	IPM Integrated Pest Management
AOB Area of Benefit	ISO Industrial Safety Ordinance
BAAQMD Bay Area Air Quality Management District	JPA/JEPA Joint (Exercise of) Powers Authority or Agreement
BART Bay Area Rapid Transit District	Lamorinda Lafayette-Moraga-Orinda Area
BATA Bay Area Toll Authority	LAFCo Local Agency Formation Commission
BCDC Bay Conservation & Development Commission	LCC League of California Cities
BDCP Bay-Delta Conservation Plan	LTMS Long-Term Management Strategy
BGO Better Government Ordinance (Contra Costa County)	MAC Municipal Advisory Council
BOS Board of Supervisors	MAF Million Acre Feet (of water)
CALTRANS California Department of Transportation	MBE Minority Business Enterprise
CalWIN California Works Information Network	MOA Memorandum of Agreement
CalWORKS California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids	MOE Maintenance of Effort
CAER Community Awareness Emergency Response	MOU Memorandum of Understanding
CAO County Administrative Officer or Office	MTC Metropolitan Transportation Commission
CCTA Contra Costa Transportation Authority	NACo National Association of Counties
CCWD Contra Costa Water District	NEPA National Environmental Protection Act
CDBG Community Development Block Grant	OES-EOC Office of Emergency Services-Emergency Operations Center
CEQA California Environmental Quality Act	PDA Priority Development Area
CFS Cubic Feet per Second (of water)	PWD Contra Costa County Public Works Department
CPI Consumer Price Index	RCRC Regional Council of Rural Counties
CSA County Service Area	RDA Redevelopment Agency or Area
CSAC California State Association of Counties	RFI Request For Information
CTC California Transportation Commission	RFP Request For Proposals
DCC Delta Counties Coalition	RFQ Request For Qualifications
DCD Contra Costa County Dept. of Conservation & Development	SB Senate Bill
DPC Delta Protection Commission	SBE Small Business Enterprise
DSC Delta Stewardship Council	SR2S Safe Routes to Schools
DWR California Department of Water Resources	STIP State Transportation Improvement Program
EBMUD East Bay Municipal Utility District	SWAT Southwest Area Transportation Committee
EIR Environmental Impact Report (a state requirement)	TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership & Cooperation (Central)
EIS Environmental Impact Statement (a federal requirement)	TRANSPLAN Transportation Planning Committee (East County)
EPA Environmental Protection Agency	TWIC Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee
FAA Federal Aviation Administration	USACE United States Army Corps of Engineers
FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency	WBE Women-Owned Business Enterprise
FTE Full Time Equivalent	WCCTAC West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee
FY Fiscal Year	WETA Water Emergency Transportation Authority
GHAD Geologic Hazard Abatement District	WRDA Water Resources Development Act
GIS Geographic Information System	
HBRR Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation	



Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

Subcommittee Report

TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

3.

Meeting Date: 04/08/2019
Subject: Administrative Items, if applicable.
Submitted For: TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE
COMMITTEE,
Department: Conservation & Development
Referral No.: N/A
Referral Name: N/A
Presenter: John Cunningham, DCD **Contact:** John Cunningham
(925)674-7833

Referral History:

This is an Administrative Item of the Committee.

Referral Update:

Staff will review any items related to the conduct of Committee business.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):

CONSIDER Administrative items and Take ACTION as appropriate.

Fiscal Impact (if any):

N/A

Attachments

No file(s) attached.



Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

Subcommittee Report

TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

4.

Meeting Date: 04/08/2019

Subject: REVIEW record of meeting for February 11, 2019, Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Meeting.

Submitted For: TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE,

Department: Conservation & Development

Referral No.: N/A

Referral Name: N/A

Presenter: John Cunningham, DCD

Contact: John Cunningham
(925)674-7833

Referral History:

County Ordinance (Better Government Ordinance 95-6, Article 25-205, [d]) requires that each County Body keep a record of its meetings. Though the record need not be verbatim, it must accurately reflect the agenda and the decisions made in the meeting.

Referral Update:

Any handouts or printed copies of testimony distributed at the meeting will be attached to this meeting record. Links to the agenda and minutes will be available at the TWI Committee web page: <http://www.cccounty.us/4327/Transportation-Water-Infrastructure>

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):

Staff recommends approval of the attached Record of Action for the February 11, 2019, Committee Meeting with any necessary corrections.

Fiscal Impact (if any):

N/A

Attachments

2-11-19 TWIC Sign-In Sheet

2-11-19 TWIC Mtg Minutes

Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee Meeting
Monday, February, 11, 2019
SIGN-IN SHEET

Signing in is voluntary. You may attend this meeting without signing in. (If front is filled, please use back.)

Name	Representing	Phone	EMAIL
John Cunningham	TWIC / CC DCD	677-7833	
Alicia Nichols	TWIC BOS - Bangia	252-4500	XXXXXXXXXX
Wynonah	PW - Comm Projects	313-2180	
Frank Di Massa	PW - Capita Projects	7-2473	
Tanya Dettle	Health Service	335-3214	tdette@onehealth.org
Gretchen Logan	TPM	925-786-6973	
Lele Seligson	TPM		
Yuan Zhang	SunPower	857-609-1774	
Tody Lomax	DOD	674-925-7871	
Kevin Johnston	SunPower	831-247-6356	
Michael Kant	CC HS	925-313-6587	mkant@icwaith.org

DRAFT



TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

February 11, 2019
9:00 A.M.
651 Pine Street, Room 101, Martinez

Supervisor Karen Mitchoff, Chair
Supervisor Candace Andersen, Vice Chair

Agenda Items:

Items may be taken out of order based on the business of the day and preference of the Committee

Present: Candace Andersen, Vice Chair

Attendees: Alicia Nuchols, Office of Supervisor Diane Burgis

Warren Lai, CCC Department of Public Works

Frank Di Massa, CCC Department of Public Works

Tanya Drlik, CCC Health Services

Gretchen Logan, IPM

Cece Sellgren, IPM

Yuan Zhang, SunPower

Jody London, CCC Dept of Conservation/Dev.

John Cunningham, CCC Dept of Conservation/Dev.

Michael Kent, CCC Health Services

Kevin Johnston, SunPower

1. Introductions
2. Public comment on any item under the jurisdiction of the Committee and not on this agenda (speakers may be limited to three minutes).

There was no public comment under this item.

3. CONSIDER Administrative items and Take ACTION as appropriate.
4. Staff recommends approval of the attached Record of Action for the November 8, 2018, Committee Meeting with any necessary corrections.

The Committee APPROVED the meeting record.

5. REVIEW, REVISE as appropriate, and ADOPT the 2019 Calendar.

The Committee APPROVED the 2019 Calendar.

6. CONSIDER recommendations on referrals to the Committee for 2019, REVISE as necessary, and DIRECT staff to bring the list to the full Board of Supervisors for approval.

The Committee APPROVED the 2019 referral list and DIRECTED staff to bring the list to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.

7. CONSIDER report on Local, Regional, State, and Federal Transportation Related Legislative Issues and take ACTION as appropriate.

The Committee RECEIVED the report.

8. Accept Integrated Pest Management report, and take ACTION as appropriate.

The Committee APPROVED the Integrated Pest Management report and DIRECTED staff to 1) bring the report to the Board of Supervisors (on consent), 2) return to TWIC by May with a report on the status of the recommendations (if the recommendations cannot be fulfilled then an alternative approach to fulfilling the intent of the recommendations will be provided), and 3) when a new coordinator is hired a full report/presentation will be brought to the Board of Supervisors.

9. DIRECT staff to process of the review and vetting of the Power Purchase Agreement for Solar Photovoltaics project through TWIC.

The Committee RECEIVED the update, DIRECTED staff to continue working with County Counsel and SunPower, if there are no major changes bring the final agreement to the Board of Supervisors, and if the agreement changes substantially bring it back to the Committee for an update and reconsideration.

10. REVIEW Status Report and DIRECT staff to forward the report to the Board of Supervisors with revisions as appropriate.

The Committee APPROVED the TWIC Referral Status Report for 2018 and DIRECTED staff to bring the report to the Board of Supervisors.

11. RECEIVE information and DIRECT staff as appropriate.

The Committee RECEIVED the Communication, News, Miscellaneous Items report.

12. The next meeting is currently scheduled for Monday, March 11, 2019.

13. Adjourn

The Transportation, Water & Infrastructure Committee (TWIC) will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities planning to attend TWIC meetings. Contact the staff person listed below at least 72 hours before the meeting.

Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the County to a majority of members of the TWIC less than 96 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at the County Department of Conservation and Development, 30 Muir Road, Martinez during normal business hours.

Public comment may be submitted via electronic mail on agenda items at least one full work day prior to the published meeting time.

John Cunningham, Committee Staff

Glossary of Acronyms, Abbreviations, and other Terms (in alphabetical order): Contra Costa County has a policy of making limited use of acronyms, abbreviations, and industry-specific language in meetings of its Board of Supervisors and Committees. Following is a list of commonly used abbreviations that may appear in presentations and written materials at meetings of the Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee:

AB Assembly Bill	HOT High-Occupancy/Toll
ABAG Association of Bay Area Governments	HOV High-Occupancy-Vehicle
ACA Assembly Constitutional Amendment	HSD Contra Costa County Health Services Department
ADA Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990	HUD United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
ALUC Airport Land Use Commission	IPM Integrated Pest Management
AOB Area of Benefit	ISO Industrial Safety Ordinance
BAAQMD Bay Area Air Quality Management District	JPA/JEPA Joint (Exercise of) Powers Authority or Agreement
BART Bay Area Rapid Transit District	Lamorinda Lafayette-Moraga-Orinda Area
BATA Bay Area Toll Authority	LAFCo Local Agency Formation Commission
BCDC Bay Conservation & Development Commission	LCC League of California Cities
BDPC Bay-Delta Conservation Plan	LTMS Long-Term Management Strategy
BGO Better Government Ordinance (Contra Costa County)	MAC Municipal Advisory Council
BOS Board of Supervisors	MAF Million Acre Feet (of water)
CALTRANS California Department of Transportation	MBE Minority Business Enterprise
CalWIN California Works Information Network	MOA Memorandum of Agreement
CalWORKS California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids	MOE Maintenance of Effort
CAER Community Awareness Emergency Response	MOU Memorandum of Understanding
CAO County Administrative Officer or Office	MTC Metropolitan Transportation Commission
CCTA Contra Costa Transportation Authority	NACo National Association of Counties
CCWD Contra Costa Water District	NEPA National Environmental Protection Act
CDBG Community Development Block Grant	OES-EOC Office of Emergency Services-Emergency Operations Center
CEQA California Environmental Quality Act	PDA Priority Development Area
CFS Cubic Feet per Second (of water)	PWD Contra Costa County Public Works Department
CPI Consumer Price Index	RCRC Regional Council of Rural Counties
CSA County Service Area	RDA Redevelopment Agency or Area
CSAC California State Association of Counties	RFI Request For Information
CTC California Transportation Commission	RFP Request For Proposals
DCC Delta Counties Coalition	RFQ Request For Qualifications
DCD Contra Costa County Dept. of Conservation & Development	SB Senate Bill
DPC Delta Protection Commission	SBE Small Business Enterprise
DSC Delta Stewardship Council	SR2S Safe Routes to Schools
DWR California Department of Water Resources	STIP State Transportation Improvement Program
EBMUD East Bay Municipal Utility District	SWAT Southwest Area Transportation Committee
EIR Environmental Impact Report (a state requirement)	TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership & Cooperation (Central)
EIS Environmental Impact Statement (a federal requirement)	TRANSPLAN Transportation Planning Committee (East County)
EPA Environmental Protection Agency	TWIC Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee
FAA Federal Aviation Administration	USACE United States Army Corps of Engineers
FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency	WBE Women-Owned Business Enterprise
FTE Full Time Equivalent	WCCTAC West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee
FY Fiscal Year	WETA Water Emergency Transportation Authority
GHAD Geologic Hazard Abatement District	WRDA Water Resources Development Act
GIS Geographic Information System	
HBRR Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation	



Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

Subcommittee Report

TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

5.

Meeting Date: 04/08/2019

Subject: CONSIDER Fiscal Year (FY) 2019/2020 Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) Project List for unincorporated Contra Costa County.

Submitted For: Brian M. Balbas, Public Works Director/Chief Engineer

Department: Public Works

Referral No.: 1

Referral Name: Review legislative matters on transportation.

Presenter: Nancy Wein, Public Works
Department

Contact: Nancy Wein
(925)313-2275

Referral History:

On April 28, 2017, the Governor signed Senate Bill 1 (SB1), which is known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017. SB1 invests more than \$5 billion annually statewide to go directly for maintenance, repair, and safety improvements on state highways, local streets and roads, bridges, tunnels and overpasses. Locally, SB1 significantly increases the annual gas tax revenue the County will receive.

SB1 includes performance and reporting requirements in order to be eligible for the RMRA funds. The information and recommendations in this report, once approved by the TWIC and the Board of Supervisors, will fulfill these requirements.

Referral Update:

California cities and counties are seeing a significant influx of new revenue to invest in the local street and road system from SB1.

SB1 increased several taxes and fees to raise over \$5 billion annually in new transportation revenues. SB1 also includes inflationary adjustments in the revenue to local agencies so that the purchasing power of the funds does not decrease as it has in the past. SB1 prioritizes funding towards maintenance and rehabilitation and safety improvements on state highways, local streets and roads, and bridges and to improve the state's trade corridors, transit, and active transportation facilities.

SB1 Funds were available to cities and counties starting in FY 2017/2018 and are comprised of two parts—an increase in the original gas tax revenue that local agencies have been receiving for years and Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) program funds. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC) has provided an estimate of the total revenues the County

can expect from this transportation bill, including the total estimated revenue for RMRA program funds. CSAC estimates the County will receive about \$39.3 million in total transportation funding in FY 2019/2020 from SB1, which is almost double what the County received just a few years ago. Approximately \$14.2 million of that amount is from the RMRA program. This amount will continue to grow in future years with the built-in inflationary index.

SB1 emphasizes the importance of accountability and transparency in the delivery of California's transportation programs. Therefore, in order to be eligible for RMRA funding, state statute requires cities and counties to provide basic RMRA project reporting to the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

Prior to receiving an apportionment of RMRA funds from the State Controller in a fiscal year, a city or county must submit to the CTC a list of projects proposed to be funded with these funds. All projects proposed to receive funding must be reviewed and approved by the applicable city council or county board of supervisors at a regular public meeting.

The list of projects must include a description and location of each proposed project, a proposed schedule for the project's completion, and the estimated useful life of the improvement. (See Attachment A - a project list using the CTC recommended template) The project list does not limit the flexibility of an eligible city or county to fund projects in accordance with local needs and priorities so long as the projects are consistent with RMRA priorities as outlined in the applicable code sections. Some example projects and uses for RMRA funding include, but are not limited to the following:

- Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation
- Safety Projects
- Railroad Grade Separations
- Complete Streets Components (including active transportation purposes, pedestrian and bicycle safety projects, transit facilities, and drainage and stormwater capture projects in conjunction with any other allowable project)
- Traffic Control Devices

Streets and Highways Code Section 2030(b)(2) states that funds made available by the program may also be used to satisfy a match requirement in order to obtain state or federal funds for projects authorized by this subdivision.

The County currently uses the majority of the Gas Tax funds towards public roadway maintenance and repair for approximately 660 miles of the roadway network in the unincorporated areas of Contra Costa County to ensure a safe and convenient public travel in a variety of modes: driving, walking and bicycling. These funds are also used to improve traffic safety throughout the County by using it as the local match to leverage funds from state and federal grant programs.

In FY 2019/2020 it is proposed to designate the majority of the RMRA funds for maintenance activities. The range of proposed projects in future years is expected to broaden as the amount of RMRA funds increases.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):

REVIEW the recommended list of Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA)(SB1) funded road projects, RECEIVE public comment and DIRECT staff to perform any changes or revisions to the recommended project list. RECOMMEND the Board of Supervisors approve project list, and direct staff to proceed with submitting the Fiscal Year 2019/2020 list of projects to the California Transportation Commission prior to the May 1, 2019 submittal deadline for approval.

Fiscal Impact (if any):

If a project list is not reviewed by the TWIC, forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for approval, and submitted to the CTC by the May 1, 2019 deadline, the County will not be eligible to receive its portion of RMRA funds and the projects listed above will not be constructed.

Attachments

04-19 SB1 RMRA Proj.List Apprvl FY 19-20 Appx A

Appendix A

Local Streets and Roads Project List

As required by the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 – Local Streets and Roads Funding, Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA)

General Information

Name: Unincorporated Contra Costa County

Point of Contact:

Nancy Wein
Senior Civil Engineer
Contra Costa County Public Works Department
255 Glacier Drive
Martinez, CA 94553
(925) 313-2275
Nancy.Wein@pw.cccounty.us

Legislative Districts:

- Senate – 3, 7, 9
- Assembly – 11, 14, 15, 16

Jurisdiction's Average Network PCI and date/year of measurement:

- County Average PCI = 71 (as of September 2018)

Fiscal Year (FY): 2019/2020

Rationale for Project List Selection for FY 2019/2020 RMRA allocation

Staff has developed a recommended list of projects for the Transportation Water and Infrastructure Committee (TWIC) and the Board of Supervisors to consider for submitting to the Commission.

The following criteria will be used by staff when developing the current and future project lists for RMRA funds:

- Eligibility criteria for RMRA funds
- Emergency storm damage projects that exceeded existing road fund revenue capacity
- Maintenance and rehabilitation priorities
- Roadway safety
- Expiring grants where local funds are necessary to complete the funding package
- Geographic equity
- Projects where expenditures had already occurred for design of the project and had been shelved due to declining gas tax revenues
- Multi-modal benefits in accordance with the Board of Supervisor's Complete Streets policy
- Positive impact to Road Program performance metrics
- Clearing the queue of delayed projects that were a result of declining gas tax revenues
- Meeting customer expectations

The County will receive about \$39.3 million in total transportation funding in FY 2019/2020 from SB1, with approximately \$14.2 million of that amount from the RMRA program. The County currently uses the majority of the Gas Tax funds towards public roadway maintenance and repair for approximately 660 miles of the roadway network in the unincorporated areas of Contra Costa County to ensure a safe and convenient public travel in a variety of modes: driving, walking and bicycling. These funds are also used to improve traffic safety throughout the County by using it as the local match to leverage funds from state and federal grant programs.

In FY 2019/2020 it is proposed to designate the majority of the RMRA funds for maintenance activities. The range of proposed projects in future years is expected to broaden as the amount of RMRA funds increases. It should be noted that project list below is a small subset of projects in overall road program and only focuses on how the RMRA funds will be expended as required by the Commission.

PROPOSED PROJECTS (Total RMRA = \$14.2 million)

Proposed Project No. 1: Road Drainage Maintenance (RMRA = \$1.15 million)- Countywide

Description:

- **Ditch Cleaning** – This routine maintenance item is to perform drainage ditch cleaning to remove debris and vegetation which may obstruct the passage of stormwater and cause local flooding. (RMRA = \$300,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2303
- **Clean Catch Basin** – This routine maintenance item is to perform cleaning of sediment and prevent obstructions of catch basins (drainage inlets) and related pipe systems. The county has over twenty thousand catch basins throughout the unincorporated portions of the County. (RMRA = \$550,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2308
- **Inspect Catch Basin** – This routine maintenance item is to perform inspections of catch basins and associated systems. This includes a visual inspection of the drainage inlet and any clean water inserts. Follow-up video inspections may be required for deeper inlets and/or suspected structural issue concerning the inlets. (RMRA = \$300,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2316
- RMRA Priority: Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation

Location:

- Countywide

Proposed Schedule for Completion:

- Anticipated construction year – 2019

Estimated Useful Life:

- 15 - 40 years (ditch – dirt roadway to concrete V-ditch)
- 40 years (concrete structures)

Proposed Project No.2: Traffic Safety Devices Maintenance (RMRA = \$700,000) - Countywide

Description:

- **Traffic Signing** – This routine maintenance item is to perform sign repair, replacement, and installation along the unincorporated County roadways. (RMRA = \$350,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2504
- **Traffic Striping** – This routine maintenance item is to perform new painting, routine painting and replacement of pavement striping along the unincorporated County roadways to enhance public safety. (RMRA = \$350,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2505
- RMRA Priority: Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation

Location:

- Countywide

Proposed Schedule for Completion:

- Anticipated construction year – 2018

Estimated Useful Life:

- 10 years (roadway signage)
- 2 - 4 years (roadway striping - thermoplastic)

Proposed Project No. 3: Pavement Repairs and Preparation (RMRA = \$4.5 million)- Countywide

Description:

- **Pot Hole Patching** – This routine maintenance item is to perform spot pavement repairs of pot holes along the unincorporated County roadways to eliminate surface hazards. (RMRA = \$500,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2101
- **Pavement Fabric Patching** – This routine maintenance item is to perform pavement fabric patching along the unincorporated County roadways to correct minor pavement defects and prevent further cracking. An area of existing damaged asphalt will be removed and excavated to allow a fabric patch to be placed. The roadway base will be compacted and leveled to support the new fabric layer and asphalt layer. (RMRA = \$500,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2102
- **Pavement Failure Repair - Backhoe** – This routine maintenance item is to conduct pavement failure repair along the unincorporated County roadways. This task requires the removal of a larger area of cracked or damaged pavement with a backhoe. The roadway base will be compacted and overlaid with new asphalt. (RMRA = \$600,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2103
- **Pull Box Paving** – This is a roadway paving operation to place asphalt on localized roadway depressions to provide a smooth riding surface for the motorized public along the unincorporated County roadways. (RMRA = \$625,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2104
- **Hand Patching** – This is similar to pot hole patching to conduct spot pavement repairs along unincorporated County roadway, but on a smaller scale. (RMRA = \$600,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2105

- **Crack Sealing** – This pavement preservation task is to seal cracks in the roadway. Cracks are typically filled in to seal the roadway structural section from water penetration. The goal is to prolong the service life of the pavement and/or prepare the roadway surface for an overlay. (RMRA = \$700,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2106
- **Leveling** – This task is associated with leveling of large settlements, depressions, surface irregularities and recent large pavement repairs. This is to provide a smooth riding surface for the motorized public along unincorporated County roadways. (RMRA = \$475,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2107
- **Pavement Failure Repair – Grinder** – This task is to remove badly cracked or broken pavement. The roadway is then replaced with new asphalt and roadway base rock. This task supports pavement preservation operations and also extends the service life of the roadway pavement. (RMRA = \$500,000) County Project No.: 0672-6U2123
- RMRA Priority: Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation

Location:

- Countywide

Proposed Schedule for Completion:

- Anticipated construction year – 2018

Estimated Useful Life:

- 7 years (pavement surface treatment)

Proposed Project No. 4: County-Wide Surface Treatments (RMRA = \$4.50 million)

Countywide:

- **Single Chip Seal Project (2019)** – This project will apply a single chip seal to various roads as a pavement preservation project in the unincorporated Contra Costa County. Work will also include surface preparation and pavement striping and markings. (RMRA = \$700,000) County Project No. 0672-6U2181
- **Double Chip Seal Project (2019)** – This project will apply a double chip seal to various roads as a pavement preservation project in the unincorporated Contra Costa County. Work will also include surface preparation and pavement striping and markings. (RMRA = \$800,000) County Project No. 0672-6U2182
- **Microsurface Project (2019)** – This project will apply a microsurface seal to Pleasant Hill Road and Taylor Boulevard in the unincorporated area of Martinez and Lafayette area. Work will also include surface preparation and pavement striping and markings. (RMRA = \$500,000) County Project No. 0672-6U2183
- **Asphalt Rubber Cape Seal Project (2019)** - The project will apply an asphalt rubber chip seal covered with a type II slurry seal to various roadways in the Bay View (19 streets), Montalvin (18 streets), and unincorporated Lafayette and Martinez (67 streets), Work will also include surface preparation and pavement striping and markings. (RMRA = \$2,500,000) County Project No. 0672-6U2184
- RMRA Priority: Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation

Location:

- Countywide (Bay Point and Central County)

Proposed Schedule for Completion:

- Anticipated construction year – 2018

Estimated Useful Life:

7 years (pavement surface treatment)

Proposed Project No. 5: Kirker Pass Road Northbound Truck Lanes (\$3.35 million)

- The project consists of pavement widening for a truck climbing lane with 8 foot paved shoulders; relocation of HMA dike, concrete ditches, and other drainage features; retaining wall construction; installation of signage and striping; construction of two C.3 bioretention areas; relocation of existing roadside features, and pavement rehabilitation on Kirker Pass Road which consists of 0.1 foot grind and overlay of open grade rubberized hot mix asphalt (HMA). There are significant roadway conforms at Hess Road due to change in grade
- RMRA Priority: Roadway Safety, Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation

Location:

- Kirker Pass Road from Concord Pavilion to about 4,200 feet north of North Hess Road

Proposed Schedule for Completion:

- Construction year – 2019-2020

Estimated Useful Life:

- 40 years (roadway widening)
- 15 years (pavement surface treatment)

NW:sr

G:\transeng\TWIC\2019\04-08-19 - TWIC - SB1_RMRA project list approval FY 19-20 Appendix A.docx



Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

Subcommittee Report

TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

6.

Meeting Date: 04/08/2019
Subject: ACCEPT report on 2018 Bike-to-Work Day and DIRECT staff as appropriate.
Submitted For: TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE,
Department: Conservation & Development
Referral No.: N/A
Referral Name: N/A
Presenter: Robert Sarmiento, DCD **Contact:** Robert Sarmiento
(925)674-7822

Referral History:

This issue has not been heard at TWIC in the past.

Referral Update:

On Bike-to-Work Day, which in 2018, took place on May 10, the public is encouraged to commute by bicycle to the workplace, with the intention of getting people to continue to bike to the workplace on a regular basis.

5,756 riders¹ in Contra Costa County participated in Bike-to-Work Day, including County supervisors and staff from the Department of Conservation and Development and the Public Works Department. 48 bike energizer stations¹, which were staffed by bicycle advocacy groups and volunteers, were set up around Contra Costa County to provide refreshments and promotional materials to riders who participated. Nearly 50 organizations in the East Bay sponsored Bike-to-Work Day², including Contra Costa County, which was a 'Silver'-level sponsor.³

The County's participation in Bike-to-Work Day helped meet County policies in the General Plan and Climate Action Plan and policies in the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, which the County regularly refers to, that promote Bike-to-Work Day and encourage bicycle use.

¹Statistics provided by 511 Contra Costa.

²Bike East Bay, "Find Your Local Energizer Station 2018," <https://bikeeastbay.org/Energizer2018>.

³Silver-level sponsors receive specific recognition and benefits, which are listed here-
https://bikeeastbay.org/sites/default/files/blog_files/BTWD2018-Sponsor-packet_Final_Email_lr.pdf

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):

ACCEPT report on 2018 Bike-to-Work Day and DIRECT staff as appropriate, including 1) recommending measures that will increase the County's participation in future Bike-to-Work Days and 2) bringing this report to the full Board of Supervisors.

Fiscal Impact (if any):

None.

Attachments

2018 Bike to Work Day in Contra Costa County

A close-up photograph of a bicycle seat and handlebars. The seat is black with white stitching. The handlebars are silver. In the background, other bicycles with orange frames are visible, suggesting a bike-sharing station or a bike repair shop. The text "Bike to Work Day in Contra Costa County" is overlaid in green, and "May 10, 2018" is overlaid in white below it.

Bike to Work Day in Contra Costa County

May 10, 2018

Supervisor Mitchoff





**Supervisor Andersen and
Chief of Staff Gayle Israel**

Pleasant Hill BART Energizer Station

*Thanks, REI and Bike
Concord!*



Contra Costa Canal Trail Energizer Station

Thanks, Pleasant Hill Parks and Rec!









Antioch Energizer Station

Lucas Stuart-Chilcote and City of Antioch Resource Coordinator Julie Haas-Wadjowicz.

Lucas is in his 2nd year at Los Medanos College. Julie first met him at her energizer station about 5 years ago. He used to ride every day to high school, including one Bike To Work Day in a 3 piece suit for a presentation.

This year Lucas hosted his first energizer station at Los Medanos College!



511 Contra Costa Energizer Station

Iron Horse Trail/Canal Trail Crossing, Walnut Creek

Meet Steve Biggs.

Has been biking to work most days from Clayton to Concord for 10 years.

10 years ago Steve only cycled recreationally and was encouraged by Bike To Work Day to try bicycling to work. Yesterday was his 10th anniversary of biking to work!

Steve says cycling to work has increased his fitness level for his double century bike rides.



Todos Santos Plaza Energizer Station

Concord





Danville Energizer Station

Thomas Valdriz and Mark Ballock from Street Smarts San Ramon Valley joined Supervisor Andersen And Gayle Israel



Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

Subcommittee Report

TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

7.

Meeting Date: 04/08/2019

Subject: APPROVE & AUTHORIZE to secure Proposition 1 grant funding with the California State Coastal Conservation.

Submitted For: Brian M. Balbas, Public Works Director/Chief Engineer

Department: Public Works

Referral No.: 2

Referral Name: Review application for transportation, water and infrastructure grants to be prepared by Public Works & Conservation and Development Departments.

Presenter: Carl J. Roner, Public Works
Department

Contact: Carl J. Roner
(925)313-2213

Referral History:

N/A

Referral Update:

The purpose of the proposed Coastal Conservancy Proposition 1 Grant* will be to fund the design phase of a green infrastructure project which will provide drainage to the Montarabay parking lot. The facility's parking lot, which is 1.82 acres in size, is completely paved and does not have any drainage facilities. During much of the winter it is flooded by rainfall, restricting parking and access to the community center. The adjacent ballfields do not dry out until late summer. These flooding events limit public access to the facility during the winter months and interfere with food distribution events that are held in the Montarabay parking lot on a monthly basis.

The overall site is set between higher ground to the west and elevated railroad embankments to the north and south. The only way to provide for surface runoff drainage is to construct a pipeline to Garrity Creek, to the east. Due to the large surface area of the parking lot, the former industrial use of the site as a sewage treatment plant, and the sensitivity of adjacent Garrity Creek, which discharges to San Pablo Bay, any drainage improvements to the parking lot should incorporate bioswales and other green infrastructure techniques to treat surface drainage prior to discharge. Bioswales are landscape elements designed to concentrate or remove debris and pollution out of surface runoff water.

Placing bioswales in the parking lot to break up and slow down traffic (precluding illegal street racing) would be a benefit to the users of the community center, particularly the less mobile elderly. Bioswales would also make the site more attractive and parklike, adding an element of urban greening to the site requested by the grant application.

The grant will pay for the engineering and landscape design for the bioswales and drainage pipeline. Public Works will need to obtain additional funding from outside sources at a later date to permit and construct the bioswale and drainage pipeline.

* Coastal Conservancy Proposition 1 grants fund multi-benefit ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration projects.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):

REVIEW the Proposition 1 grant application, and DIRECT staff as appropriate including sending the application to the full Board of Supervisors with a recommendation to approve and authorize the Public Works Director, or designee, to execute grant application documents to secure grant funding with the California State Coastal Conservancy, not to exceed \$200,000, for the Montarabay Green Infrastructure and Drainage Project.

Fiscal Impact (if any):

None. The grant will pay for the engineering and landscape design for the bioswales and the drainage pipeline. Public Works will need to obtain additional funding from outside sources at a later date to permit and construct the bioswales and drainage pipeline.

Attachments

No file(s) attached.



Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

Subcommittee Report

TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

8.

Meeting Date: 04/08/2019

Subject: CONSIDER report: Local, Regional, State, and Federal Transportation Issues: Legislation, Studies, Miscellaneous Updates, take ACTION as Appropriate

Submitted For: TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE,

Department: Conservation & Development

Referral No.: 1

Referral Name: REVIEW legislative matters on transportation, water, and infrastructure.

Presenter: John Cunningham, DCD

Contact: John Cunningham
(925)674-7883

Referral History:

This is a standing item on the Transportation, Water, and Infrastructure Committee referral list and meeting agenda.

Referral Update:

In developing transportation related issues and proposals to bring forward for consideration by TWIC, staff receives input from the Board of Supervisors (BOS), references the County's adopted Legislative Platforms, coordinates with our legislative advocates, partner agencies and organizations, and consults with the Committee itself.

This report includes four sections, 1: LOCAL, 2: REGIONAL, 3: STATE, and 4: FEDERAL.

1. LOCAL

Accessible Transportation Strategic (ATS) Plan

Background: With assistance from Contra Costa County staff, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) submitted a successful grant to Caltrans under the Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant program in February 2017 to conduct the ATS Plan. The ATS Plan is a comprehensive study of how accessible transit/paratransit is provided in the County.

Update: CCTA and County conducted a Request for Proposals solicitation which ended in late March and are in the process of awarding a contract.

2. REGIONAL

No report in April.

3. STATE

3.1 April State Legislative Report. A report from Mark Watts will be provided at the meeting. Mr. Watts has a conflict and will not be able to attend in April

3.2 Iron Horse Corridor - Removal of Encumbrances

Background: The County's State Legislative Platform includes:

"239: SUPPORT regional coordination that provides for local input in addressing transportation needs....Consistent with that position, relief from the requirements imposed on the County by the state relative to the Iron Horse corridor would foster coordination along this multi-jurisdictional corridor. Such relief could be provided through administrative action or County sponsored legislation."

3.3 Legislation For Discussion/Action

A list of all legislation being tracked by staff is attached. For the specific bills below, a copy of the bill text is attached and the County's prior position and/or communication when available.

- AB 907 (Salas) California Department of Aging: grants: transportation. *See attached letter.*
- AB 1568 (McCarty) Housing Law Compliance: Withholding of Transportation Funds
- SB 137 (Dodd) Federal Transportation Funds: State Exchange Programs
- SB 228 (Jackson) Master Plan on Aging

4. FEDERAL

No written report in April.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):

CONSIDER report on Local, Regional, State, and Federal Transportation Related Legislative Issues and take ACTION as appropriate.

Fiscal Impact (if any):

There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments

SB 137 - Dodd Fed-State Exchange

FINAL BOS to AM Salas: GGRF/SPD Grants

AB 1568 McCarty

AB 970 - Salas

SB228 - Jackson

April 2019 TWIC Bill Tracking



SB 137 – DODD

Federal transportation funds: state exchange programs

Summary

SB 137 reduces duplicative federal transportation permitting and environmental review by expanding the State's existing program to exchange federal surface transportation revenues for state transportation revenues. Referred to as the Match-Exchange Program, this streamlining mechanism is currently only available to regional transportation planning agencies with populations below 200,000.

Background

The California Department of Transportation (CalTrans), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs), and cities and counties all receive federal surface transportation funding for a variety of transportation projects ranging from capital improvements, safety projects on existing roads and bridges, and bicycle and pedestrian related infrastructure projects.

All transportation projects in the state fully or partially funded with federal, state, regional or local revenues, and regardless of what level of government is acting as the lead agency, are required to go through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review and apply for other necessary permits. When a project includes any amount of federal funding, the State, regional agencies, and cities and counties also have to go through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.

CEQA is in many ways more robust than NEPA, as are many of our natural resource and wildlife laws. As such, undergoing federal review in addition to state review is duplicative and adds time and cost to transportation projects without

any added benefit to the public process or the environment. Counties estimate that going through federal environmental and permit review in addition to California's robust processes adds anywhere from fifteen- to forty percent to the cost of a project.

Existing Law

Section 182.6(g) of the S&HC permits a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) not designated as, nor represented by, a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) with an urbanized area of greater than 200,000 population, to exchange its annual apportionment of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for non-Federal funds (State cash). If an eligible RTPA elects not to exchange, Section 182.6(h)(1) permits an eligible county represented by that RTPA to exchange its entire annual sub-apportionment, pursuant to Section 182.6(d)(2) (110 percent 1990/91 Federal-aid Secondary minimum), for State cash.

In addition, Section 182.6(h)(2) of the S&HC permits an eligible county, located within an MPO boundary, to exchange its entire apportionment of Section 182.6(d)(2) funds, if it receives less than one percent of the total statewide apportionment under Section 182.6(d)(2) or that portion, if any, received in excess of 3.5 percent of the total statewide apportionment

This Bill

SB 137 will allow the state, regions, and cities and counties to reduce the cost of transportation projects and provide for more projects to be completed with the same amount of revenue by expanding the Match Exchange Program to regions over 200,000 in population and to other



federal surface transportation programs including the Transportation Alternatives Program, Highway Safety Improvement Program, and local bridge projects. This bill does not require, but authorizes the state to expand the Match Exchange Program to the extent state funds are available and would not compromise other state funded projects or activities.

Support

California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
(Sponsor)

Contact

Marisol.prietovalle@sen.ca.gov

Sponsor Contact: Chris Lee (CSAC)

clee@counties.org (916)650-8180

The Board of Supervisors

County Administration Building
651 Pine Street, Room 106
Martinez, California 94553-1293

John Gioia, 1st District
Candace Andersen, 2nd District
Diane Burgis, 3rd District
Karen Mitchoff, 4th District
Federal D. Glover, 5th District

Contra Costa County



David Twa
Clerk of the Board
and
County Administrator
(925) 335-1900

March 29, 2018

Honorable Rudy Salas
State Capitol
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0032

Re: Assembly Bill 970 – California Department of Aging: Grants: Transportation: Support with Amendments

Dear Congressman Salas,

On behalf of the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors, I am writing to thank you for bringing forward the visionary legislation, *AB 970 - California Department of Aging: Grants: Transportation*. The bill would provide grant funding for transportation programs to/from nonemergency medical services for older individuals and persons with a disability who reside in rural, desert, or mountain areas. The bill is timely, improvements to this type of transportation are critical if we are to improve emergency response to this vulnerable population.

Transportation services for this population have long been in need of improvement, your bill is an excellent response to those needs. Contra Costa County has been developing a similar proposal that would benefit the entire state, directly fund locally identified needs including in Assembly District 32, and is consistent with the intent of AB 970.

We have attached two documents which describe the proposal in detail. The first is an unbacked bill (*Transportation funding: services for seniors and persons with disabilities*) proposing a new program, and the second is a report (*Seniors/Persons with Disabilities State Transportation Funding Program Proposal*) establishing the rationale and describing the strategy for a statewide program.

In summary, the proposal leverages existing federal requirements for the development of *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plans*. These plans are developed nationwide and are required to be, "...developed and approved through a process that includes participation by seniors, individuals with disabilities, representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human services providers and other members of the public..."

As suggested by the requirements, these *Coordinated Plans* establish specific local needs and define a strategic approach to transportation investments. The attached approach would leverage these plans resulting in 1) expedited implementation, and 2) a program that is inherently tailored to each locality complete with documented effectiveness and support.

The County respectfully requests that AB 970 be amended to incorporate the approach described in the attached documents and summarized below:

- There is a need for both capital and operations funding programs. The capital program would fund vehicle purchase as currently envisioned in AB 970.
- Funding should be provided statewide with eligible expenditures guided by the existing *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plans*. These locally produced plans include recommendations reasonably forecasted¹ to simultaneously increase cost effectiveness, expand service, and increase service quality. Implementation of the *Coordinated Plans* is hampered by a lack of dedicated funding.
- The creation and operation of Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSAs) and other systemic or organizational improvements² should be an eligible expenditure of funding. The CTSA structure was authorized under the Social Service Transportation Act (AB 120 – 1979) and encourages coordination among transportation providers improving access, quality of service and cost-effectiveness. Implementation of the CTSA mechanism is hampered by a lack of dedicated funding.

If you have any questions or concerns on this request please don't hesitate to reach out to the County. Our staff and legislative advocate are available to provide assistance, John Cunningham, Principal Transportation Planner (john.cunningham@dcd.cccounty.us, (925) 674-7833) and Mark Watts (mwatts@swmconsult.com, (916) 446-5508).

Again, thank you for bringing this important bill forward.

Sincerely,



John Gioia, Chair
Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

cc: Hon. Adrin Nazarian, Chair - Assembly Aging and Long-Term Care Committee
L. Vance Taylor, Chief - Office of Access and Functional Needs – Gov. Office of Emergency Services
MTC Legislation Committee c/o Rebecca Long
Erik Turner, Assembly District 32 Staff

Attachments

- *Seniors/Persons with Disabilities State Transportation Funding Program Proposal*
- *Transportation funding: services for seniors and persons with disabilities*

¹ Transportation Research Board/National Academy of Sciences: Report 91: Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation & Transit Services: “*Significant economic benefits — including increased funding, decreased costs, and increased productivity — can be obtained by coordinating human service transportation and transit services.*”

² Systemic operational or organizational improvements include the creation of new service models and organizations such as CTSAs, mobility management centers, one-call/one-click operations, nonprofit agencies, joint powers, technology investments that increase cost-effectiveness of operations, facilitate client payment accounting systems (supporting client/fund comingling and cost allocation), improve client ease-of-access (one call/one click, interactive voice response), and enhance/enable access to TNCs.

79731

02/12/19 09:16 AM
RN 19 05897 PAGE 1

Transportation funding: services for seniors and persons with disabilities

An act to add Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 99100) to Part 11 of Division 10 of the Public Utilities Code, relating to transportation.



19058979731BILL0A14

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) The “aging tsunami,” brought about by the aging of the baby boomers has long been forecasted to increase the demand for public transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities. This is a well-documented issue. The California State Plan on Aging indicates that by 2030 senior age groups will increase anywhere from 70 percent up to 274 percent. These age groups have cognitive and physical characteristics that either require public transportation services or results in the loss of ability to drive themselves, or both.

(b) In order for transportation programs and systems to adequately serve seniors and persons with disabilities (SPD) in the current regulatory environment, both of the following are required:

(1) An increase in funding for capital programs that enable efficiencies and reduce greenhouse gases (GHG).

(2) An increase in transportation operations funding to respond to the forecasted increase in demand for services.

(c) Increases in regional or local supplemental funding for these services have not been provided even as major new transportation sources have been enacted or approved, including Regional Measure 2 and Regional Measure 3 in the Bay Area, and Senate Bill 1 (Chapter 5 of the Statutes of 2017).

(d) Victims of wildfires are often disproportionately seniors and persons with disabilities. These outcomes can be related to limited access to quality transportation. However, with a significant level of new investment, coupled with better coordinated services the state can see significant, systemic improvements to transportation services for this population and this will indirectly but significantly improve emergency responses for this population. Any specific effort intended to directly improve emergency responses for this population will require a modern SPD transportation framework.

(e) There is a strong nexus between SPD transportation services and GHG production. This nexus supports the use of revenue from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund for transportation services for the SPD population. This nexus is demonstrated by both of the following:

(1) Federal Highway Administration and American Public Transit Association data establish that paratransit shuttle operations are a significant source of GHGs.

(2) Operational improvements made possible by technology investments and administrative changes can demonstrably decrease GHGs production by increasing the number of shared trips in a demand-response or paratransit operation.

(f) It is appropriate to efficiently and effectively respond to the demographically driven expansion of the population being served and to increase the efficiency of this segment of the transportation system by providing additional funding for these services.

SEC. 2. Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 99100) is added to Part 11 of Division 10 of the Public Utilities Code, to read:



CHAPTER 2. TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

99100. It is the intent of the Legislature that 5 percent of the annual proceeds of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund be appropriated in the annual Budget Act for the purpose of the program established pursuant to this chapter to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the state in accordance with the requirements of Section 39712 of the Health and Safety Code.

99101. The Controller shall establish a program for the purpose of providing funding for transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities.

99102. The Controller shall annually allocate funds made available for the program established pursuant to this chapter on a formula basis as follows:

(a) Fifty percent of the funds to be allocated to local or regional transportation agencies that have sought and received voter approval of taxes or that have imposed fees, including uniform developer fees as defined by subdivision (b) of Section 8879.67 of the Government Code, which taxes or fees are dedicated solely to transportation improvements, and that provide transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities.

(b) Fifty percent of the funds to be allocated to counties.

99103. (a) An entity that receives an allocation pursuant to Section 99102 shall provide grants from that allocation to a qualified service provider to provide transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities.

(b) If an entity receives an allocation pursuant to Section 99102 whose source is the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, the entity shall ensure that a grant provided to a qualified service provider is consistent with the guidelines adopted by the State Air Resources Board pursuant to Section 39715 of the Health and Safety Code.



LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

Bill No. _____
as introduced, _____.
General Subject: Transportation funding: services for seniors and persons with disabilities.

Existing law provides various sources of funding for transportation purposes, including funding for paratransit and other transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities.

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The act authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. Existing law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the state board as part of a market-based compliance mechanism to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and to be available upon appropriation. Existing law continuously appropriates 35% of the annual proceeds of the fund for transit, affordable housing, and sustainable communities programs and 25% of the annual proceeds of the fund for certain components of a specified high-speed rail project.

This bill would state the intent of the Legislature that 5% of the annual proceeds of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund be appropriated in the annual budget act to fund transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities. The bill would require the Controller to establish a program for the purpose of funding transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities. The bill would require the Controller to annually allocate funds made available to the program on a formula basis with 50% to be allocated to local or regional transportation agencies that meet certain requirements and 50% to be allocated to counties. The bill would require the entities that receive these allocations to provide grants to qualified service providers to provide transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities.

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



Seniors/Persons with Disabilities State Transportation Funding Program Proposal

Concept Approved by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors: September 25, 2018 (revised December 2018)¹

Issue Summary: In order for transportation programs and systems to adequately serve seniors and persons with disabilities (SPD) in the current regulatory environment, the following is required: **1)** an increase in funding for capital programs that enable efficiencies, and reduce greenhouse gasses (GHGs), and **2)** an increase in transportation operations funding to respond to the forecasted increase in demand for services. Both programs include incentives to implement more cost effective, user-friendly systems that reduce GHG production.

Both of these changes are necessary in order to efficiently and effectively respond to the demographically driven expansion of the population being served and to increase the efficiency of this segment of the transportation system. As described further in this proposal, there has been substantial *analysis* of these issues. However, no state or federal funding program makes use of that analysis and responds to the scale or complexity of the issue adequately.

The issue is best summarized in the *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan* for the Bay Area although the stark assessment is applicable statewide as described in the **Statewide Need** section of this proposal:

Current senior-oriented mobility services do not have the capacity to handle the increase in people over 65 years of age...the massive growth among the aging ...points to a lack of fiscal and organizational readiness...the closure and consolidation of medical facilities while rates of diabetes and obesity are on the rise will place heavy demands on an already deficient system.

The “*already deficient system*” serving the SPD population requires a robust policy and funding response that is comparable to improvements seen in other transportation system sectors. California’s response to automotive congestion is justifiably robust and systematic, freeway widening, transit expansion, express lanes, etc. These activities all saw increased funding under the Road Repair and Accountability Act (SB 1 2017). Bicyclists are benefiting from substantially increased infrastructure investment with green lanes and separated bikeways as a result of the Complete Streets Act (AB 1358[2008]) and the creation of the Active Transportation Program (SB 99 [2013], Chapter 359 and AB 101[2013], Chapter 354). This proposal establishes some parity in transportation system investment and progress between the SPD population and the general public (which also reduces GHGs).

Impacted Population: Due to the overlapping disadvantaged factors (age, disability poverty, chronic conditions, etc.) defining a population figure is challenging. However, the growth in the senior population, and the associated characteristics of that population, are compelling as a standalone data point even without the addition of the population with disabilities (but not elderly).

During the 2010 to 2060 time period, California’s over 60 population will have a 166% increase. During the same period, the over age 85 population will increase by 489%. For comparison’s sake, the working age population (25-64) will increase just 21% during that time.² Actual population figures from the Department of Finance are as follows: Age 65+: 5,460,081 (2016), 10,371,162 (2036), 13,488,801 (2060).

The simple numerical increase in the senior population is compounded by demographic complexities, there will be more single and/or childless seniors (reduced ability to rely on close family members for transportation assistance), and the population as a whole will experience a *decreasing* number of working aging people supporting (financially, direct services) a *growing* number of elderly people.³

The impact of this broad systemic degradation of the State’s ability to support this population is described by the Public Policy Institute for California⁴ as follows, “...a greater share of the state’s human and economic resources being used to provide health care and other types of support for this group.” This proposal is a strategic approach to allocating those resources.

¹ The proposal has been revised but is still consistent with the original intent as approved by the Board of Supervisors.

² Population figures from the California Department of Aging: https://www.aging.ca.gov/data_and_statistics/facts_about_elderly/

³ The “aged dependency ratio” (the ratio of the number of seniors to the number of people of working ages supporting [directly and financially]) is set to increase from 19 to 32, there will be fewer adults of prime working age relative to the senior population.

⁴ Planning for California’s Growing Senior Population, August 2015, <https://www.ppic.org/publication/planning-for-californias-growing-senior-population/>

Timeline: The intent is to have this Seniors/Persons with Disabilities (SPD) Transportation Funding Program proceed in the 2019 legislative session. While there is no set timeline driving this effort, the aforementioned spike in demand for service, and the lack of progress in this field have been *observed* and *analyzed* for decades⁵. This proposal leverages *existing* tools to quickly operationalize strategies and actions that have long been identified but underdeveloped due to a lack of funding.

Background: The impending increase in the senior population and the transportation systems serving the same have been the subject of considerable analysis with limited action for some time⁵. This situation is summarized in the National Academy of Sciences sponsored report, “*Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation and Transit Services*”:⁶

*Ideas about coordinating human service transportation and public transit services should shift from the research arena to **operational** practice. Local transportation services for the disadvantaged are often delivered by a variety of nonprofit organizations, operated independently by multiple entities in a community, and result in duplicative, overlapping, and uncoordinated services. The analysis concludes that although coordination sounds like an easy and magical policy solution to be effective, state-level policies must, at a minimum, **target and fund the coordination process.***

This proposal **targets and funds the coordination process**. Nearly immediate **operational** implementation is possible by leveraging existing analysis and tools:

- The statewide inventory of locally developed *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plans*⁷ (hereafter “Coordinated Plans”) all include implementable recommendations. The Coordinated Plans are planning documents consistently produced throughout the state in response to federal requirements⁷. These documents include recommendations reasonably forecasted⁶ to simultaneously increase cost effectiveness, expand service, and improve service quality.
- Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies: (CTSAs) were created under the Social Service Transportation Act (AB 120 – 1979). The Act required agencies throughout California to conduct regional inventory reports and prepare/implement action plans. The intent was to encourage coordination among social service transportation providers so existing transportation resources are used more effectively.

Issue Details:

- 1) **Fragmented/Inefficient Services:** This transportation sector is funded by numerous local, state, and federal programs across multiple governmental sectors (transportation, social services, public health, etc.). These programs, in many areas, have resulted in the unintended consequence of fragmented and duplicative programs.⁸ In addition to the administrative and fiscal problems resulting from this fragmentation, these silos result in arbitrary transit service boundaries requiring unnecessary passenger transfers⁹. These transfers simultaneously increase costs, decrease safety, extend trip times, and significantly compromise service quality and ease of access for this categorically disadvantaged population¹⁰.

⁵ Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports 109878, 591707, 650079, 658766, 660247, 667361, et al: “...duplication of effort and inefficiency in providing transportation when agencies do not coordinate...”, “...state and local agencies are unaware that they are...providing transportation services identical and parallel to those of another agency” “...transit agency officials that we spoke with said that they would like to implement coordination efforts, but have been unable to get various parties to come together...”, “continuing challenges such as insufficient leadership at the federal level and limited financial resources and growing unmet needs at the state and local level.”, “...state and local officials expressed concern about their ability to adequately address expected growth in elderly, disabled, low-income, and rural populations.”, “...agencies providing similar transportation services to similar client groups may lead to duplication and overlap when coordination does not occur.”

⁶ Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences: Transit Cooperative Research Program, *Report 91: Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation and Transit Services*: “Significant economic benefits — including increased funding, decreased costs, and increased productivity — can be obtained by coordinating human service transportation and transit services.”

⁷ A 2004 Executive Order resulted in federal transit law requiring that eligibility for certain funding streams be established through “...a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan,” and that the plan be “developed and approved through a process that included participation by seniors, individuals with disabilities, representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human services providers and other members of the public”. As a result, throughout the country there are consistently developed and adopted coordinated plans. These plans identify the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes and provide strategies for meeting these needs, and prioritize transportation services for funding and implementation.

⁸ GAO: Transportation Coordination: Benefits and Barriers Exist, Planning Efforts Progress Slowly: “As HHS and FTA have recognized, the lack of coordination among human services transportation providers and public transit operators contributes to the duplication or overlapping of transportation services...particular clients may be left unserved or underserved...”

⁹ Martin Wachs, Professor Emeritus of Urban Planning, testified at a December 5, 2018 CPUC hearing (TNC Access for All Act) that problems with making cross county trips for this population have been discussed since the 1960s.

¹⁰ GAO: Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Safe Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue., “...GAO and others have reported

In summary, current arrangements are a lose-lose-lose scenario with all parties suffering sub-optimal outcomes, the client population experiencing inadequate service, the agency providing the service is logistically and fiscally overwhelmed, and the tax paying public receives a poor return on their investment.

- 2) Demographically Driven Increase in Demand:** The “aging tsunami”¹¹, brought about by the aging of the baby boomers has long been forecasted to increase the demand for the subject transportation services. This is a well-documented issue, the California State Plan on Aging indicates that by 2030 senior age groups will increase anywhere from 70% up to 274%. These age groups have cognitive and physical characteristics that either require this type of service and/or results in the loss of ability to drive themselves. These increases will magnify the negative fiscal impact of the fragmented systems mentioned above.

Proposal/Solution Details: The two identified issues, administrative/operations fragmentation and demographically driven increases in demand are addressed by two components of this proposal: **1) a Capital** program focused on efficiency-improving, GHG reducing investments, and **2) an Operations** program with allocations based on population served by the program and subsequently indexed to the growth (or contraction) in the same population.

This proposal exclusively serves disadvantaged individuals that is not only consistent with, but above and beyond the definition of disadvantaged communities in Senate Bill 535 (2012 – DeLeón).

1) Capital

Capital funding will be disbursed through competitive grants to projects which are included in the applicable Coordinated Plan or meet other program requirements. Projects will implement systemic operational or organizational improvements proven to result in more efficient use of resources, improve service quality, increase shared trips, and reduce GHGs.

Eligible activities include but are not necessarily limited to **planning** including study and/or creation of new service models and organizations such as CTAs, mobility management centers, one-call/one-click operations, nonprofit agencies, joint powers, other service area consolidation activities, **technology investments**¹² including software/hardware solutions that increase cost-effectiveness of operations, facilitate client payment accounting systems (supporting client/fund comingling and cost allocation), improve client ease-of-access (one call/one click, interactive voice response), enable access to shared and autonomous mobility services, and support coordination or consolidation of separate operations or jurisdictions.

2) Operations

- Operations funding will be appropriated annually, on a continuing basis, with funding levels reflecting:
 - The population served and responding to the growth or contraction of that population over time (See **Proposal Notes**), and
 - An incentive program with substantial increases in funding for operations that serve countywide (or larger¹³) service areas (no-transfer), and/or co-mingling of different populations, ADA Paratransit, senior, Medicaid, general public, etc.¹⁴ (See **Proposal Notes** for geographic and

that the variety of federal programs providing transportation services to the transportation disadvantaged has resulted in fragmented services that can be difficult for clients to navigate and narrowly focused programs that may result in service gaps”

¹¹ California State Plan on Aging 2017-2021: “The impact of an aging population, described by some as an “age wave” and others as an “aging tsunami,” will be felt in every aspect of society. The economic, housing, **transportation**, health, and social support implications of this phenomenon must also be viewed in the context of the State’s tremendous population growth, which continues to challenge the State’s overall infrastructure planning.”

¹²Technology investments are sizable immediate and ongoing costs. These investments are **only** cost and operationally effective in larger geographic areas with diverse and comingled passenger categories. With every service silo and geographic contraction, these investments have a substantially reduced return on investment.

¹³Larger service areas are more efficient in a demand response system for several reasons. The ability to build shared trips (critical for cost and GHG savings) requires a critical mass of riders not possible in a small service area or with exclusive clientele (Medicaid for example) . Second, technology to build shared rides is expensive to purchase/maintain and is not cost effective on smaller scales.

¹⁴ Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences: TCRP, Report 91: Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation and Transit Services: “There are numerous viable strategies for coordinating the operations of human service transportation and public transit operations ...strategies generate significant economic benefits: When transit agencies coordinate with human service agencies to provide trips to human service agency clients, the transit agencies can realize significant additional funds... human service agencies typically receive substantial trip cost savings....Coordinated cost reduction strategies generated impressive savings...Transit authorities can receive substantial cost savings through contracts with other agencies that may have more freedom to combine trips or to use volunteers and may provide service at lower cost....arrangements often lead to significantly increased revenues for the other transportation providers...when human service agencies coordinate or consolidate their separate transportation services to create

operational restrictions)

- Agencies should be granted provisional eligibility for operations funding under the following scenarios:
 - The programs and projects seeking funding are found to be consistent with the applicable Consolidated Plan. The legislative body that originally approved the Consolidated Plan will pass a resolution in a noticed hearing making that determination.
 - Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies (CTSAs) that are active and otherwise in good standing (as confirmed by the original, approving authority) are categorically eligible for operations funding.
- Provisional eligibility will be subsequently confirmed by the State (see **Proposal Notes** below)

Emergency Services: Repatriation Fund

The Program would close an existing gap in emergency response funding and programs. *Evacuation* activities for seniors/persons with disabilities (referred to as “access & functional needs” [AFN] population in the emergency services profession) are categorically eligible for disaster relief funding. However, there is no funding or authority to *return (repatriate)* the AFN population to their origin during the post-disaster period. The transportation needs of this population can vary greatly from the general population often requiring special vehicles and staff to accommodate mobility/medical devices or support individuals with cognitive or physical limitations. A Repatriation Fund within the SPD Program will fund these activities and make any statutory changes necessary to authorize reimbursement.

The Repatriation Fund is not integral to the intent of the SPD Transportation Funding Program but is being included as this initiative may be an expeditious mechanism to close this gap in services.

Revenue Options

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF)

There is a strong nexus between SPD transportation services and GHG production. This nexus supports the use of GGRF revenue for transportation services for the SPD population when expenditures are made consistent with the **Proposal/Solution Details** section above.

High Paratransit GHG Production Levels:

The United States Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy uses Federal Highway Administration and American Public Transit Association data to establish that paratransit shuttle operations are a significant source¹⁵ of greenhouse gasses (GHGs).

Capacity for SPD Program to Reduce GHG Production:

Operational improvements made possible by technology investments and administrative changes have a demonstrable¹⁶ ability to decrease GHGs production by way of increasing the number of shared trips in a demand-response or paratransit operation.

Significant Co-Benefits

Disadvantaged Communities: In addition to being explicitly consistent with the core principle of the Cap-and-Trade Program (GHG reduction) the SPD program *specifically* serves a categorically and acutely disadvantaged population statewide without geographic restrictions.

Currently, there are **no** GGRF revenues **specifically** dedicated to this population other than the broad preference for projects in disadvantaged communities in limited areas. The Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) is **silent** on service to seniors/persons with disabilities, this proposal addresses that gap.

larger transportation services, the typical benefits to human service agencies include reduced unit costs; improved quality of service; and increased efficiency, effectiveness, and cost effectiveness...creates much lower per trip costs, thus generating real savings for public transit operators...can provide substantial economic benefits...provide very substantial economic benefits."

¹⁵ U.S. Department of Energy: [Maps and Data - Average Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled of Major Vehicle Categories: Average Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled of Major Vehicle Categories](#); Ranking of highest VMT categories (highest to lowest): *Class 8 Truck, Transit Bus, Refuse Truck, Paratransit Shuttle, Delivery Truck, School Bus, Police, Light Truck, Light-Duty Vehicle, Car, Motorcycle.*

¹⁶ University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Transportation Studies, "Evaluating the Impact of ITS on Personalized (demand response/paratransit) Public Transit" **"Benefits of ITS: They describe the following benefits of ITS implementation. • Increase in the percent shared rides (the percentage of time that there are two or more requests in vehicle) from 38% to 55% • 13% savings in the unit transportation cost per passenger mile • Total personnel salaries decreased by 28%"**

Public Health: Given the fragile nature of the target population, and the fact that the lack of transportation is a common barrier to routine medical appointments¹⁷, mobility improvements from this program are reasonably assumed to increase public health and quality of life.

Operational Cost Savings: An increase in shared trips, in addition to reducing GHGs, also reduces operational costs as established by the Institute of Transportation Studies – *Benefits of Intelligent Transportation Systems* citation¹⁶. Considering the oft-cited high costs of operating demand responsive paratransit service, this is only a “co-benefit” in the GGRF context but would be considered a substantial primary benefit in any other context.

Emergency Response Capacity: Victims of wildfires are often disproportionately seniors and persons with disabilities. These outcomes can be related to limited access to quality transportation. This proposal does not *directly* address this situation (with the exception of the **Repatriation Fund** which addresses after-incident activities). However, this proposal will make significant, systemic improvements to transportation services for this population and will indirectly but significantly improve emergency response to this population. Any specific effort intended directly improve emergency response to this population will require a modern SPD transportation framework, as described in this proposal, if it is to be effective.

Proposal Notes: In order to administer the programs in this proposal the State would have obligations to administer this proposal:

1. Technology investments can be sizable in both immediate and ongoing costs. These investments are **only** cost and operationally effective in larger geographic areas with diverse and comingled passenger categories. With every service silo and geographic contraction, these investments have a substantially reduced return on investment. There should be substantial incentive for service areas which are county level (or larger) and systems which co-mingle different passenger types and funding programs. Smaller geographic operational areas and service to a siloed passenger population should not be eligible for funding.
2. The State Auditor, with assistance from the Department of Transportation, should conduct a meta-analysis of the numerous state and federal studies (see note below) on this topic for the purpose of identifying best practices and establishing metrics by which systemic improvements and operations are evaluated. **No new/original study is warranted.**
3. As mentioned in this document, there is a wealth of research on optimizing and improving this transportation service sector in addition to the CTSA and Coordinated Plan mechanisms. In particular, recommendations from *Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation and Transit Services*, (TCRP Report 91, 2003), *Sharing the Costs of Human Services. Volume 1: The Transportation Services Cost Sharing Toolkit* (TCRP Report 144, Transit Cooperative Research Program, 2011), and other resources available here: <https://nationalcenterformobilitymanagement.org/by-topic/coordination/>
4. A maintenance of effort requirement shall be imposed, SPD funds will not supplant existing revenue streams.
5. Included in the meta-analysis recommendation above should be the identification of statutory, administrative or other barriers to coordination (specifically the co-mingling of different client types and revenue streams) and identification of solutions.
6. Entities receiving funding under this program should be subject to a) a review of CTSA and Coordinated Plan eligibility and effectiveness, and b) performance audits (with an obligation to implement corrective actions). Program implementation should be a dynamic and iterative process.
7. The Department of Finance should establish a mechanism to index operations funding to the target population.

¹⁷ Health Outreach Partners, “Overcoming Obstacles to Health Care: Transportation Models That Work”.

Statewide Need: The following excerpts from Coordinated Plans throughout the state demonstrate the need:

- **Kings County:** *“Increasing revenue resources: Identified as the core issue...an efficient coordination process must be established...there are many benefits to consolidating on a large scale...there has been no movement towards consolidating transportation entities...The greatest barrier to coordination is lack of funding...There is simply not enough money available to meet all transportation needs for the target population...human service agencies piece meal together trips for the most critical needs.”*
- **Kern County:** *“Priorities for the 2007 Coordinated Plan were identified as... Identify and pursue new funding sources...Barriers Identified: insufficient agency funding for Transportation...Very limited transportation funding was reported...difficulty in securing operating dollars to expand or develop new services in both rural communities and Metropolitan Bakersfield...transit systems are operating at their limits of their present funding base is among the most significant of constraints...”*
- **Los Angeles County:** *“Roadblocks to further coordination. Several were identified, including the following: Funding restrictions; capacity constraints...”*
- **Butte County:** *“Top-ranked barriers to accessing needed transportation: Funding challenges for directly operating or contracting for transportation...”*
- **Inyo-Mono Counties:** *“The greatest barrier to coordination for all rural counties is lack of funding. There is simply not enough money available to meet all transportation needs for the target population... particularly in light of the dispersed communities and long travel distance...as such, the various human service agencies piece meal together trips for the most critical needs. Lack of funding/resources contributes to the limited staff time available for all agencies to pursue further coordination efforts”*
- **Lake County:** *“PRIORITY 1 – Critical: Pursue and secure funding to support, maintain, improve safety and enhance the Lake County public transportation network...”*, *“...Continued priority must be placed on securing new funding sources...”*
- **Madera County:** *“The greatest barrier to coordination for many smaller counties is lack of funding. There is simply not enough money available to meet all transportation needs for the target population, particularly in light of the dispersed development pattern and long travel distance in Madera County”*
- **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco Bay Area):** *“Current senior-oriented mobility services do not have the capacity to handle the increase in people over 65 years of age...the massive growth among the aging ...points to a lack of fiscal and organizational readiness...the closure and consolidation of medical facilities while rates of diabetes and obesity are on the rise will place heavy demands on an already deficient system.”*
- **Sacramento Area Council of Governments:** *“...gaps in service remain due to geography, limitations in fixed-route and demand responsive services, program/funding constraints, eligibility limitations, knowledge and training.”*
- **San Bernardino:** *“...Coordinated Plan strategies can be supported with 5310 funds ...however, this competitive funding source is modest...”*, *“...agencies and their transit programs need for assistance continues as they face funding uncertainties “*, *“...First Priority Strategies: Secure funding...to maintain, enhance and expand transit and specialized transportation services...”*
- **San Diego:** *“...gaps in service remain due to geography, limitations in transit service, funding constraints, eligibility, knowledge, and training...”*
- **Shasta County:** *“...limited resources in the form of staff availability, interest, leadership, service and/or capital capacity, funding, and time...”*,
- **Stanislaus Council of Governments:** *“While public transportation services do receive Local Transportation Funds...and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds, it is generally not sufficient to address many of the service challenges, such as limited frequencies and longer service hours, which were common themes...”*
- **Ventura County:** *“...limited funds suggest that it will be critically important to seek other funding sources to address many of the proposed strategies. Such additional funding sources could include but are not limited to...State cap and trade funding...”*

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 1, 2019

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2019–20 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 1568

Introduced by Assembly Member McCarty
(Coauthor: Senator Wiener)

February 22, 2019

An act to ~~add~~ *amend* Section ~~65400.5~~ to 65585 of the Government Code, and to amend Section 2034 of, and to add Section 2036.5 to, the Streets and Highways Code, relating to state government finance.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1568, as amended, McCarty. ~~General plans: housing element: production report:—~~*Housing law compliance:* withholding of transportation funds.

The Planning and Zoning Law requires a city or county to adopt a general plan for land use development within its boundaries that includes, among other things, a housing element. ~~The Planning and Zoning Law requires a planning agency, after a legislative body has adopted all or part of a general plan, to provide an annual report to the legislative body, the Office of Planning and Research, and the Department of Housing and Community Development on the status of the general plan and progress in meeting the community's share of regional housing needs. Existing law requires a planning agency to include in its annual report specified information, known as a production report, regarding units of net new housing, including rental housing and for-sale housing that have been issued a completed entitlement, building permit, or certificate of occupancy. Existing law, the Housing Element Law, prescribes requirements for the preparation of the housing element, including a requirement that a planning agency submit a draft of the~~

element or draft amendment to the element to the Department of Housing and Community Development prior to the adoption of the element or amendment to the element. Existing law requires the department to review the draft and report its written findings, as specified. Existing law also requires the department, in its written findings, to determine whether the draft substantially complies with the Housing Element Law.

Existing law also requires the department to review any action or failure to act by the city or county that it determines is inconsistent with an adopted housing element or a specified provision of the Housing Element Law and to issue written findings, as specified, whether the action or failure to act substantially complies with the Housing Element Law. If the department finds that the action or failure to act by the city or county does not substantially comply with the Housing Element Law, and if it has issued findings as described above that an amendment to the housing element substantially complies with the Housing Element Law, existing law authorizes the department, after allowing no more than 30 days for a local agency response, to revoke its findings until it determines that the city or county has come into compliance with the Housing Element Law. Existing law also requires the department to notify the city or county and authorizes the department to notify the Office of the Attorney General that the city or county is in violation of state law if the department makes certain findings of noncompliance or a violation of specified provisions related to housing.

This bill would require the ~~department, on or before June 30, 2022, and on or before June 30 every year thereafter and until June 30, 2051,~~ to review each production report submitted by a city or county in accordance with the provisions described above to determine if that city or county has met the applicable minimum housing production goal for that reporting period. The bill would provide that, if the department determines that a city or county has met its applicable minimum housing production goal for that reporting period, the department shall, no later than June 30 of that year, submit a certification of that result to the ~~Controller.~~ department to also notify the Controller that the city or county is in violation of state law if the department makes certain findings of noncompliance or a violation, as described above. The bill would authorize the city or county to submit evidence that the city or county is no longer in violation of state law to the department and to request the department to issue a finding that the city or county is no longer in violation of state law. If the department finds that the city or

county is no longer in violation of state law, the bill would require the department to notify the city or county and the Controller.

Existing law creates the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program and, after certain allocations for the program are made, requires the remaining funds available for the program to be allocated 50% for maintenance of the state highway system or to the state highway operation and protection program and 50% for apportionment to cities and counties by the Controller pursuant to a specified formula. Before receiving an apportionment of funds under the program from the Controller in a fiscal year, existing law requires an eligible city or county to submit to the California Transportation Commission a list of projects proposed to be funded with these funds. Existing law requires the commission to report to the Controller the cities and counties that have submitted a list of projects and requires the Controller, upon receipt of the report, to apportion funds to eligible cities and counties included in the report, as specified. Existing law requires cities and counties to maintain their existing commitment of local funds for street, road, and highway purposes in order to remain eligible for an allocation or apportionment of these funds.

This bill would, commencing with the 2022–23 fiscal year and through and including the 2051–52 fiscal year, also ~~require~~ *prohibit* cities and counties ~~to be certified in the prior fiscal year~~ *from being found* by the Department of Housing and Community ~~Development~~, *Development to be not in violation of state law*, as described above, in order to remain eligible for an apportionment of these funds. For each city and county that is ~~not in compliance with this requirement~~, *found by the department to be in violation of state law*, the bill would require the Controller to withhold the apportionment of funds that would otherwise be apportioned and distributed to the city or county for the fiscal year and deposit those funds in a separate escrow account for each city or county that is ~~not in compliance~~. *found by the department to be in violation of state law*. The bill would require the Controller to distribute the funds in the escrow account to the applicable city or county after the city or county is ~~certified to~~ *found by the department to no longer be in compliance violation of state law* and meets other specified requirements. The bill would make other technical and conforming changes.

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

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

1 ~~SECTION 1. Section 65400.5 is added to the Government~~
2 ~~Code, to read:~~
3 ~~65400.5. (a) For purposes of this section:~~
4 ~~(1) “Department” means the Department of Housing and~~
5 ~~Community Development.~~
6 ~~(2) “Production report” means the information reported by a~~
7 ~~city or county pursuant to subparagraph (H) of paragraph (2) of~~
8 ~~subdivision (a) of Section 65400 as a part of the annual report~~
9 ~~described in Section 65400.~~
10 ~~(b) The department shall, on or before June 30, 2022, and on~~
11 ~~or before June 30 every year thereafter and through and including~~
12 ~~June 30, 2051, review each production report submitted by a city~~
13 ~~or county to determine if the city or county has met the applicable~~
14 ~~minimum housing production goal for that reporting period. The~~
15 ~~minimum housing production goal shall be calculated using the~~
16 ~~following schedule:~~
17 ~~(1) For a production report that covers a reporting period for~~
18 ~~each calendar year commencing January 1, 2022, to January 1,~~
19 ~~2027, inclusive, the minimum housing production goal means that~~
20 ~~the production report reflects that the number of units of housing~~
21 ~~available in that city or county is at least 20 percent of the city or~~
22 ~~county’s share of regional housing needs for each income category.~~
23 ~~(2) For a production report that covers a reporting period for~~
24 ~~each calendar year commencing January 1, 2028, to January 1,~~
25 ~~2032, inclusive, the minimum housing production goal means that~~
26 ~~the production report reflects that the number of units of housing~~
27 ~~available in that city or county is at least 40 percent of the city or~~
28 ~~county’s share of regional housing needs for each income category.~~
29 ~~(3) For a production report that covers a reporting period for~~
30 ~~each calendar year commencing January 1, 2033, to January 1,~~
31 ~~2038, inclusive, the minimum housing production goal means that~~
32 ~~the production report reflects that the number of units of housing~~
33 ~~available in that city or county is at least 60 percent of the city or~~
34 ~~county’s share of regional housing needs for each income category.~~
35 ~~(4) For a production report that covers a reporting period for~~
36 ~~each calendar year commencing January 1, 2039, to January 1,~~
37 ~~2044, inclusive, the minimum housing production goal means that~~
38 ~~the production report reflects that the number of units of housing~~

1 available in that city or county is at least 80 percent of the city or
2 county's share of regional housing needs for each income category.

3 ~~(5) For a production report that covers a reporting period for~~
4 ~~each calendar year commencing January 1, 2045, and January 1,~~
5 ~~2050, the minimum housing production goal means that the~~
6 ~~production report reflects that the number of units of housing~~
7 ~~available in that city or county is 100 percent of the city or county's~~
8 ~~share of regional housing needs for each income category.~~

9 ~~(e) Any calculation made by the department pursuant to~~
10 ~~subdivision (b) that results in a fractional unit shall be rounded~~
11 ~~down.~~

12 ~~(d) If the department determines that a city or county has met~~
13 ~~its applicable minimum housing production goal for that reporting~~
14 ~~period as described in subdivision (b), the department shall no~~
15 ~~later than June 30 of that year submit a certification of that result~~
16 ~~to the Controller. A certification is valid for the next fiscal year.~~

17 *SECTION 1. Section 65585 of the Government Code is*
18 *amended to read:*

19 65585. (a) In the preparation of its housing element, each city
20 and county shall consider the guidelines adopted by the department
21 pursuant to Section 50459 of the Health and Safety Code. Those
22 guidelines shall be advisory to each city or county in the
23 preparation of its housing element.

24 (b) (1) At least 90 days ~~prior to~~ *before* adoption of its housing
25 element, or at least 60 days ~~prior to~~ *before* the adoption of an
26 amendment to this element, the planning agency shall submit a
27 draft element or draft amendment to the department.

28 (2) The planning agency staff shall collect and compile the
29 public comments regarding the housing element received by the
30 city, county, or city and county, and provide these comments to
31 each member of the legislative body before it adopts the housing
32 element.

33 (3) The department shall review the draft and report its written
34 findings to the planning agency within 90 days of its receipt of the
35 draft in the case of an adoption or within 60 days of its receipt in
36 the case of a draft amendment.

37 (c) In the preparation of its findings, the department may consult
38 with any public agency, group, or person. The department shall
39 receive and consider any written comments from any public

1 agency, group, or person regarding the draft or adopted element
2 or amendment under review.

3 (d) In its written findings, the department shall determine
4 whether the draft element or draft amendment substantially
5 complies with this article.

6 (e) Prior to the adoption of its draft element or draft amendment,
7 the legislative body shall consider the findings made by the
8 department. If the department’s findings are not available within
9 the time limits set by this section, the legislative body may act
10 without them.

11 (f) If the department finds that the draft element or draft
12 amendment does not substantially comply with this article, the
13 legislative body shall take one of the following actions:

14 (1) Change the draft element or draft amendment to substantially
15 comply with this article.

16 (2) Adopt the draft element or draft amendment without changes.
17 The legislative body shall include in its resolution of adoption
18 written findings which explain the reasons the legislative body
19 believes that the draft element or draft amendment substantially
20 complies with this article despite the findings of the department.

21 (g) Promptly following the adoption of its element or
22 amendment, the planning agency shall submit a copy to the
23 department.

24 (h) The department shall, within 90 days, review adopted
25 housing elements or amendments and report its findings to the
26 planning agency.

27 (i) (1) (A) The department shall review any action or failure
28 to act by the city, county, or city and county that it determines is
29 inconsistent with an adopted housing element or Section 65583,
30 including any failure to implement any program actions included
31 in the housing element pursuant to Section 65583. The department
32 shall issue written findings to the city, county, or city and county
33 as to whether the action or failure to act substantially complies
34 with this article, and provide a reasonable time no longer than 30
35 days for the city, county, or city and county to respond to the
36 findings before taking any other action authorized by this section,
37 including the action authorized by subparagraph (B).

38 (B) If the department finds that the action or failure to act by
39 the city, county, or city and county does not substantially comply
40 with this article, and if it has issued findings pursuant to this section

1 that an amendment to the housing element substantially complies
2 with this article, the department may revoke its findings until it
3 determines that the city, county, or city and county has come into
4 compliance with this article.

5 (2) The department may consult with any local government,
6 public agency, group, or person, and shall receive and consider
7 any written comments from any public agency, group, or person,
8 regarding the action or failure to act by the city, county, or city
9 and county described in paragraph (1), in determining whether the
10 housing element substantially complies with this article.

11 (j) The department shall notify the city, county, or city and
12 county *and the Controller* and may notify the Office of the
13 Attorney General that the city, county, or city and county is in
14 violation of state law if the department finds that the housing
15 element or an amendment to this element, or any action or failure
16 to act described in subdivision (i), does not substantially comply
17 with this article or that any local government has taken an action
18 in violation of the following:

19 (1) Housing Accountability Act (Section 65589.5 of the
20 Government Code).

21 (2) Section 65863 of the Government Code.

22 (3) Chapter 4.3 (commencing with Section 65915) of Division
23 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code.

24 (4) Section 65008 of the Government Code.

25 (k) (1) *A city or county that the department has found to be in*
26 *violation of state law pursuant to subdivision (j) may, in a form*
27 *and manner prescribed by the department, submit evidence that*
28 *the city or county is no longer in violation of state law to the*
29 *department and may request the department to issue a written*
30 *finding that the city or county is no longer in violation of state law.*

31 (2) *If the department finds that the city or county is no longer*
32 *in violation of state law, the department shall notify the city or*
33 *county and the Controller.*

34 SEC. 2. Section 2034 of the Streets and Highways Code is
35 amended to read:

36 2034. (a) (1) Before receiving an apportionment of funds
37 under the program pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (h) of
38 Section 2032 from the Controller in a fiscal year, a city or county
39 shall submit to the commission a list of projects proposed to be
40 funded with these funds. All projects proposed to receive funding

1 shall be adopted by resolution by the applicable city council or
2 county board of supervisors at a regular public meeting. The list
3 of projects proposed to be funded with these funds shall include
4 a description and the location of each proposed project, a proposed
5 schedule for the project's completion, and the estimated useful life
6 of the improvement. The project list shall not limit the flexibility
7 of a city or county to fund projects in accordance with local needs
8 and priorities so long as the projects are consistent with subdivision
9 (b) of Section 2030.

10 (2) The commission shall submit an initial report to the
11 Controller that indicates the cities and counties that have submitted
12 a list of projects that meet the requirements of paragraph (1) and
13 that are therefore eligible to receive an apportionment of funds
14 under the program for the applicable fiscal year pursuant to
15 paragraph (3). If the commission receives a list of projects from a
16 city or county after it submits its initial report to the Controller,
17 the commission shall submit a subsequent report to the Controller
18 that indicates the cities and counties that submitted a list of projects
19 that meet the requirements of paragraph (1) after the commission
20 submitted its initial report.

21 (3) The Controller, upon receipt of the initial report, shall
22 apportion funds to eligible cities and counties included in the initial
23 report.

24 (4) (A) For any city or county that is not included in the initial
25 report submitted to the Controller pursuant to paragraph (2), the
26 Controller shall retain the monthly share of funds that would
27 otherwise be apportioned and distributed to the city or county
28 pursuant to paragraph (3).

29 (B) If the Controller receives a subsequent report from the
30 commission within 90 days of receiving the initial report from the
31 commission that a city or county has become eligible to receive
32 an apportionment, the Controller shall apportion the applicable
33 portion of funds retained pursuant to subparagraph (A) to the city
34 or county included in the subsequent report.

35 (C) The Controller shall reapportion to all eligible cities and
36 counties included in the initial report or a subsequent report from
37 the commission pursuant to the formula in clauses (i) and (ii) of
38 subparagraph (C) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section
39 2103 any funds that were retained pursuant to subparagraph (A)

1 but that were not apportioned and distributed pursuant to
2 subparagraph (B).

3 (b) For each fiscal year, each city or county receiving an
4 apportionment of funds shall, upon expending program funds,
5 submit documentation to the commission that details the
6 expenditures of all funds under the program, including a description
7 and location of each completed project, the amount of funds
8 expended on the project, the completion date, if applicable, and
9 the estimated useful life of the improvement.

10 (c) Before receiving an apportionment of funds under the
11 program pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (h) of Section
12 2032, an eligible city or county may expend other funds on eligible
13 projects and may reimburse the source of those other funds when
14 it receives its apportionment from the Controller over one or more
15 years.

16 SEC. 3. Section 2036.5 is added to the Streets and Highways
17 Code, to read:

18 2036.5. (a) Commencing with the 2022–23 fiscal year, and
19 until the 2051–52 fiscal year, in addition to the requirement
20 specified in Section 2036, in order to remain eligible in any fiscal
21 year for an apportionment of funds pursuant to paragraph (2) of
22 subdivision (h) of Section 2032 a city or county ~~shall, in the prior~~
23 ~~fiscal year, be certified~~ *shall not be found* by the Department of
24 Housing and Community Development *to be in violation of state*
25 *law pursuant to Section 65400.5 65585 of the Government Code.*
26 *Code during the prior fiscal year.*

27 (b) For each city or county that is ~~not in compliance with~~ *found*
28 *by the Department of Housing and Community Development to be*
29 *in violation of state law as described in* subdivision (a), the
30 Controller shall withhold the apportionment of funds that would
31 otherwise be apportioned and distributed to that city or county for
32 the fiscal year and shall deposit those funds in a separate escrow
33 account for each city or county that is ~~not in compliance with~~ *found*
34 *by the Department of Housing and Community Development to be*
35 *in violation of state law as described in* subdivision (a).

36 (c) The Controller shall distribute the funds held in an escrow
37 account created pursuant to subdivision (b) to the applicable city
38 or county after both of the following occur:

39 (1) The city or county is ~~certified~~ *found* by the Department of
40 Housing and Community Development ~~pursuant to Section 65400.5~~

1 ~~of the Government Code in the prior fiscal year.~~ *to no longer be*
2 *in violation of state law as described in subdivision (k) of Section*
3 *65585 of the Government Code.*

4 (2) The city or county submits a list of projects proposed to be
5 funded with the funds in the escrow account that meet the
6 requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 2034 to the commission
7 and the commission submits a report to the Controller indicating
8 that the list of projects meets those requirements.

9 (d) If a city or county whose funds have been withheld complies
10 with paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) but does not comply with
11 paragraph (2) of subdivision (c), the Controller shall reapportion
12 the funds that have been withheld to eligible cities and counties
13 pursuant to the formula in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (C)
14 of paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 2103.

15 (e) A city or county that receives an apportionment of funds
16 pursuant to this section shall comply with subdivision (b) of Section
17 2034 with respect to the expenditure of those funds.

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 20, 2019

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2019–20 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 970

Introduced by Assembly Member Salas

February 21, 2019

An act to add Chapter 8.5 (commencing with Section 9580) to Division 8.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, relating to aging.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 970, as amended, Salas. California Department of Aging: grants: transportation.

Existing law, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The act authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. Existing law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the state board as part of a market-based compliance mechanism to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and to be available for appropriation.

Existing law establishes the Air Quality Improvement Program, which is administered by the state board for the purpose of funding projects related to, among other things, the reduction of criteria air pollutants and improvement of air quality. Existing law requires that moneys in the Air Quality Improvement Fund, upon appropriation by the Legislature, be expended by the state board in accordance with the program.

Existing law requires the California Department of Aging to designate various private nonprofit or public agencies as area agencies on aging to work for the interests of older Californians within a planning and

service area and provide a broad array of social and nutritional services. Existing law states that the mission of the department is to provide leadership to the area agencies on aging in developing systems of home- and community-based services that maintain individuals in their own homes or the least restrictive homelike environments. *Existing law establishes certain wellness, injury prevention, and other programs within the department to serve both older individuals and persons with a disability, as defined.*

This bill would require the department to administer a grant program to receive applications from area agencies on aging to fund transportation to and from nonemergency medical services for older individuals ~~with disabilities~~ *and persons with a disability* who reside in rural, desert, or mountain areas within a planning and service area, for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The bill would require that transportation be made available using the purchase, lease, or maintenance of zero-emission or near-zero-emission vehicles with a capacity for 7, 12, or 15 passengers.

The bill would authorize the allocation of moneys from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and the Air Quality Improvement Fund, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to fund the grant program.

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

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

1 SECTION 1. Chapter 8.5 (commencing with Section 9580) is
2 added to Division 8.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:

3

4 CHAPTER 8.5. TRANSPORTATION FOR MEDICAL SERVICES

5

6 9580. (a) The department shall administer a grant program to
7 fund transportation to and from nonemergency medical services
8 for older ~~individuals with disabilities~~ *individuals, as defined in*
9 *Section 9018, and persons with a disability, as defined in Section*
10 *9653, pursuant to this section for the purpose of reducing*
11 *greenhouse gas emissions.*

12 (b) Area agencies on aging may apply for grants from the
13 department pursuant to this section. An area agency on aging that
14 has been awarded a grant shall use the funds to provide
15 transportation as described in subdivision (c).

1 (c) (1) Eligible transportation includes transportation to and
2 from nonemergency medical services for older individuals ~~with~~
3 ~~disabilities~~ *and persons with a disability, as described in*
4 *subdivision (a)*, who reside in rural, desert, or mountain areas
5 within a planning and service area.

6 (2) Eligible transportation shall be made available using the
7 purchase, lease, or maintenance of zero-emission or
8 near-zero-emission vehicles with a capacity for 7, 12, or 15
9 passengers.

10 (d) (1) The department may use moneys allocated to the grant
11 program pursuant to Section 9581 to cover reasonable
12 administrative costs incurred by the department under this section.

13 (2) An area agency on aging that has been awarded a grant may
14 use grant moneys to cover reasonable administrative costs incurred
15 by the area agency on aging under this section.

16 9581. Moneys from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund,
17 created pursuant to Section 16428.8 of the Government Code, and
18 the Air Quality Improvement Fund, created pursuant to Section
19 44274.5 of the Health and Safety Code, may be allocated, upon
20 appropriation by the Legislature, to fund the grant program
21 described in Section 9580.

Introduced by Senator JacksonFebruary 7, 2019

An act to add Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 9800) to Division 8.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, relating to aging.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 228, as introduced, Jackson. Master Plan on Aging.

Existing law requests the University of California to compile specified information, including a survey of existing resources throughout California's governmental and administrative structure that are available to address the needs of an aging society. Existing law requires the Secretary of the California Health and Human Services Agency, based upon the information compiled by the University of California and with the consultation or advice of specified entities, to develop a statewide strategic plan on aging for long-term planning purposes and submit the plan to the Legislature.

This bill would require the Governor to appoint an Aging Czar and a 15-member Aging Task Force to work with representatives from impacted state departments and with stakeholders to identify the policies and priorities that need to be implemented in California to prepare for the aging of its population and to develop a master plan for aging. The bill would require the master plan to address how the state should accomplish specified goals, including expanding access to coordinated, integrated systems of care. The bill would also require the Aging Task Force to solicit input from stakeholders and gather information on the impact of California's aging population.

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

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

1 SECTION 1. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the
2 following:

3 (1) The Public Policy Institute of California estimates that
4 California's older population will nearly double by 2030, bringing
5 an increase of 4 million people over the age of 65.

6 (2) The implications of the population aging impact not only
7 older adults and people with disabilities, but also their families,
8 local communities, and the state.

9 (3) Twenty percent of California's older adults live in poverty,
10 and this number is expected to increase with the rise of aging
11 adults in the state.

12 (4) Ninety percent of older adults would like to age in their
13 homes, but often lack access to the necessary services and supports
14 to do so.

15 (5) The cost of long-term services and supports (LTSS) is
16 unaffordable for most Californians:

17 (A) The annual cost of 30 hours per week of home care is almost
18 \$36,000, three-quarters of the state's median household income.

19 (B) The median annual cost of nursing home care is \$112,055,
20 more than twice the state's median household income.

21 (C) Only 5 percent of Californians aged 40 and older have
22 purchased private long-term care insurance.

23 (6) Across the state, older adults, people with disabilities, and
24 families rely on services provided through multiple state entities,
25 including, but not limited to, the State Department of Health Care
26 Services, the State Department of Social Services, the California
27 Department of Aging, the Department of Rehabilitation, the
28 Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and
29 Community Development, the Department of Insurance, the
30 Department of Veterans Affairs, and the State Department of
31 Education.

32 (7) Despite the programs and services administered by a range
33 of state departments, families struggle to weave together services
34 and finance care in the hopes of helping loved ones remain at
35 home. Individuals and their families do not know where to turn
36 for help or how to pay for services. When help is finally found,
37 many people are bounced between programs with little assurance
38 that their needs will be met.

1 (8) California is woefully unprepared to care for this growing
2 and increasingly diverse demographic. California cannot meet the
3 workforce needs of older adults and people with disabilities, with
4 a growing shortage of paraprofessionals and professionals needed
5 to provide culturally competent care to an increasingly diverse
6 population.

7 (9) The AARP Public Policy Institute reports that in 2015,
8 California’s 4.5 million unpaid family caregivers provided
9 approximately \$57 billion worth of unpaid care, yet often without
10 the necessary training and support.

11 (10) As the population ages, the demand for healthcare,
12 long-term services and supports, affordable housing, accessible
13 transportation, oral healthcare, mental healthcare, and other services
14 will continue to outpace supply unless there is intentional
15 leadership and action.

16 (11) Recent polling data shows that more than two-thirds of
17 likely voters feel the state is not prepared to address the healthcare
18 and social support needs of its fast-growing older adult population.
19 Nearly 9 out of 10 voters say it is important for the state to have
20 a master plan to invest in services that allow older adults to age in
21 the place that they prefer.

22 (12) Numerous entities have issued reports calling for system
23 change, including the Little Hoover Commission in both 1996 and
24 2011, the Strategic Planning Framework for an Aging Population,
25 a report prepared in response to Chapter 948 of the Statutes of
26 1999, the Assembly Committee on Aging and Long-Term Care in
27 2006, and the Senate Select Committee on Aging and Long-Term
28 Care in 2015. Despite hopeful intentions, none of these efforts led
29 to meaningful change.

30 (13) The 2015 report by the Senate Select Committee on Aging
31 and Long-Term Care, “A Shattered System: Reforming Long-Term
32 Care in California” identified a number of system challenges
33 including system fragmentation, lack of access to services,
34 workforce challenges and cultural competency, and a crumbling
35 infrastructure.

36 (14) According to the 2017 Long-Term Services & Supports
37 State Scorecard, the highest-performing states all have one thing
38 in common: a commitment to a clear and strategic plan that guides
39 thoughtful investments as part of an integrated and responsive
40 approach to serving older adults and people with disabilities. As

1 examples, Connecticut, Washington, and Minnesota have outlined
2 clear strategies with a broad framework for systems improvement.
3 Policymakers and elected officials in these states have collaborated
4 in developing a vision with specific benchmarks and goals that
5 serve as the foundation for achieving broad transformation.

6 (b) It is the intent of the Legislature in enacting this act that a
7 Master Plan for an Aging California is developed that empowers
8 all Californians to age with dignity, choice, and independence.

9 SEC. 2. Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 9800) is added
10 to Division 8.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:

11
12 CHAPTER 13. MASTER PLAN FOR AGING IN CALIFORNIA
13

14 9800. The Governor shall appoint both of the following:

- 15 (a) An Aging Czar to lead the master planning process.
- 16 (b) A 15-member Aging Task Force that includes consumers,
17 healthcare providers, long-term services and supports providers,
18 labor providers, transportation providers, housing providers, local
19 government, and marginalized communities.

20 9805. (a) The Aging Czar shall, with the assistance of the
21 Aging Task Force, work with representatives from impacted state
22 departments and with stakeholders, as described in Section 9810,
23 to identify the policies and priorities that need to be implemented
24 in California to prepare for the aging of its population and to
25 develop a master plan for aging.

26 (b) The master plan shall propose how, at a minimum, the state
27 should accomplish all of the following:

- 28 (1) Expand access to coordinated, integrated systems of care.
- 29 (2) Strengthen access to long-term services and supports (LTSS).
- 30 (3) Prepare families to plan and pay for LTSS.
- 31 (4) Support California’s family caregivers.
- 32 (5) Increase access to oral healthcare.
- 33 (6) Develop affordable housing options.
- 34 (7) Enhance access to transportation.
- 35 (8) Develop a culturally competent paraprofessional and
36 professional workforce.
- 37 (9) Prevent exploitation and abuse, including financial abuse
38 and physical abuse, of older adults.
- 39 (10) Streamline state administrative structures to improve service
40 delivery.

1 9810. Under the leadership of the Aging Czar, the Task Force
2 shall develop and implement a process to solicit input from a wide
3 variety of stakeholders, and shall convene community-specific
4 public forums to gather information on the impact on the
5 community of California’s aging population.

O



California

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

[Home](#)
[Bill Information](#)
[California Law](#)
[Publications](#)
[Other Resources](#)
[My Subscriptions](#)
[My Favorites](#)
ADD A NEW BILL TO TRACK:

[Keyword Tracking](#)

BILLS TRACKED:14 [+ Expand All](#)

NOTE: All subscriptions will be deleted at the end of their respective two-year session.

	Select All <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bill	Subject	Status	Delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	AB-311	Regional centers: billing: daily rates.	Assembly-In Committee Process-Appropriations	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	AB-641	Developmental services: integrated competitive employment.	Assembly-In Committee Process-Human Services	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	AB-812	Developmental services: Inspector General.	Assembly-In Committee Process-Human Services	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	AB-823	Developmental services.	Assembly-In Committee Process-Human Services	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	AB-970	California Department of Aging: grants: transportation.	Assembly-In Committee Process-Aging and Long Term Care	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	AB-1025	Transportation: California Transportation Commission: San Ramon Branch Corridor: reimbursement.	Assembly-In Committee Process-Transportation	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	AB-1475	Construction Manager/General Contractor method: local transportation authorities: bridge over Bollinger Canyon.	Assembly-In Committee Process-Transportation	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	AB-1568	General plans: housing element: production report: withholding of transportation funds.	Assembly-In Committee Process-Housing and Community Development	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	SB-50	Planning and zoning: housing development: incentives.	Senate-In Committee Process-Housing	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	SB-127	Transportation funding: active transportation:	Senate-In Committee Process-Transportation	delete

	Select	Bill	Subject	Status	Delete
	All <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		streets.		
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	SB-137	Federal transportation funds: state exchange programs.	Senate-In Committee Process-Appropriations	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	SB-228	Master Plan on Aging.	Senate-In Committee Process-Human Services	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	SB-235	Planning and zoning: housing production report: regional housing need allocation.	Senate-In Committee Process-Housing	delete
+	<input type="checkbox"/>	SB-330	Housing Crisis Act of 2019.	Senate-In Committee Process-Governance and Finance	delete