



support because it is small and disadvantaged, Corning, will not benefit from this bill because Tehama County is excepted by the bill.

In addition, many of the 37 counties this bill affects have only one or two communities with populations larger than 25,000, such as El Dorado County, Humboldt County, Kings

SB 990 (VIDAK)

Page 3

---

County, Madera County, and Shasta County. Given that the large population centers in these counties are far from dominating (for example, Humboldt County's one larger community is Eureka), it is likely that more than five percent of their county shares are spent in the counties' other small communities. One of the cities in support of this bill, Shasta Lake, falls into this category. This bill, therefore, does not appear to resolve any problem in these counties.

Finally, in the few counties where this bill could have any real effect, the solution may create more problems than it solves. For example, the two disadvantaged small communities in Orange County, Midway City and Laguna Woods, have a combined population of 24,677 (8,485 and 16,192 respectively). These two small communities comprise less than one percent of the county's population, and yet this bill commits to them five percent of the county's STIP funding. In Marin County, two of its 33 small communities qualify as disadvantaged small communities and represent only 1.1 percent of the county's population. In both cases, these lucky communities will receive a significantly disproportionate share of transportation funding at the cost of funding to other parts of the county. This distortion could lead to inefficient and unreasonable overall transportation infrastructure spending in the state.

Based only on the math in the examples above, it is suspect whether this bill resolves the identified problem and who it ultimately benefits. If the committee decides to revisit transportation funding formulas, it should give significant consideration to the potential outcomes of any changes and to factors that achieve the desired results.

3. Everyone benefits from good transportation networks . An issue raised by this bill, and other attempts to create set-asides of transportation funding for particular localities or infrastructure types, is how these types of diversions from the overall funding pot can undermine a region's overall transportation network. When transportation decisions are considered regionwide and based on the most efficient and effective mobility solutions, everyone in that region benefits. Alternatively, when money is set aside for a particular need over the region's highest priorities, it can have significantly harmful effects. For example, imagine deciding that transportation funds should be exclusively spent on the maintenance of local streets, to the detriment of the

SB 990 (VIDAK)

Page 4

---

highway systems and other mobility solutions throughout a particular region. Soon, the highways would deteriorate so badly that traffic would choose instead to use the local roads, increasing congestion across the region. Because traffic on the local roads would increase so significantly, more funding would have to be diverted to maintaining the roads. Freight would no longer flow through the region, having compounding effects on the region's economy. The reduced funding for public transit, combined with worse traffic on local roads affecting the efficiency of the transit systems, would lead to lower ridership and even worse congestion. It isn't hard to imagine how overall livability of the region would erode. This extreme example only illustrates the importance of thinking about a region's transportation network holistically, and remembering that it is often the case that without improvements in one part of the region, everyone suffers. This bill undermines this regional planning approach by dedicating a portion of transportation funds to particular communities, whether or not that is in the best interest of the region.

4. Rural counties' opposition . Of note is a letter of opposition from Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC), given that this bill is presumably intended to benefit the members of RCRC. According to their letter, California's rural county supervisors are concerned about earmarking limited regional transportation funds. RTPAs should have the ability to address disadvantaged populations' transportation needs within their jurisdictions through the existing planning process and based on local community needs. RCRC believes that current state and federal laws and regulations provide adequate protections for disadvantaged small communities to participate

in the public planning and decision-making process. As an example, Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act requires RTPAs to utilize an inclusive planning process that incorporates various public involvement strategies to address issues of equality. RCRC opposes this bill because it decreases the amount of funding RTPAs have available to address regional transportation priorities.

POSITIONS: (Communicated to the committee before noon on  
Wednesday,  
April 23, 2014.)

SUPPORT: City of California City  
City of Calimesa

SB 990 (VIDAK)

Page 5

---

City of Corning  
City of McFarland  
City of Orange Cove  
City of Shafter  
City of Shasta Lake  
City of Tehachapi

OPPOSED: Orange County Transportation Authority  
Rural County Representatives of California