

CC28
CC 50a

CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 3, 1985

Ag. 399

RESOLUTION 85-46 A proposed Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran)
ADOPTED SUPPORT- Transportation Finance was presented for Council's perusal.
ING SB-290 A lengthy discussion regarding the bill and its impact
(FORAN) TRANS- followed with questions being directed to Staff.
PORTATION
FINANCE

Following discussion, Council, on motion of Mayor Snider, Hinchman second, adopted Resolution No. 85-46 supporting SB290 (Foran) and directed the City Clerk to mail a copy of the resolution to the League of California Cities and to various California Legislators. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Ayes: Council Members - Olson, Reid, Snider, and Hinchman (Mayor)
- Noes: Council Members - Pinkerton
- Absent: Council Members - None

April 10, 1985

Honorable John Garamendi
State Senator
State Capitol, Room 313
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator Garamendi:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable John Foran
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Nancy Jo Plescia

Dear Senator Foran:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable Jim Ellis
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Elizabeth Dahl

Dear Senator Ellis:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable Marian Bergeson
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Kevin Sloat

Dear Senator Bergeson:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable Robert Beverly
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Brian McMahon

Dear Senator Beverly:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable Wadie Deddeh
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Helen Jones

Dear Senator Deddeh:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable Leroy Greene
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Pat Blakeslee

Dear Senator Greene:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable Rebecca Morgan
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Jon Glidden

Dear Senator Morgan:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable Alan Robbins
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Teri Burns

Dear Senator Robbins:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable Art Torres
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Danny Verches

Dear Senator Torres:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

Honorable Rose Ann Vuich
Senator
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Shirley Pearson

Dear Senator Vuich:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

April 10, 1985

League of California Cities
1400 "K" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith please find Resolution No. 85-46 "Resolution in support of SB-290 (Foran) Transportation Finance" which was adopted by the Lodi City Council at its Regular Meeting of April 3, 1985.

As the Resolution indicates, the City of Lodi is in full support of this bill and would urge your "AYE" vote on SB-290.

Very truly yours,

David Hinchman
Mayor

DH:jj

RESOLUTION NO.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SB-290 (FORAN)
TRANSPORTATION FINANCE

WHEREAS, local governments are now experiencing an annual funding shortfall from local streets and roads of between \$400 and \$800 million dollars; and

WHEREAS, local transit systems are also facing a major shortfall in funding; and

WHEREAS, Congress is intending to cut Federal Revenue Sharing to local governments in California and Federal Subsidies to transit; and

WHEREAS, local street and road funding must have an immediate infusion of dollars to prevent taxpayers paying three to four times more to repair that system in the future; and

WHEREAS, Senator John Foran has taken the leadership role in introducing SB-290 a comprehensive transportation finance package for state and local government; and

WHEREAS, SB-290 is the most important transportation finance package to local governments in twenty years; and

WHEREAS, the local transportation system is in need of a stable and predictable source of revenue; and

WHEREAS, without this additional revenue the survivability of Lodi's streets, roads and alleys is questionable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the City of Lodi indicates its full support for Senator Foran's SB-290

Dated:

I hereby certify that Resolution No.
was passed and adopted by the City Council
of the City of Lodi in a regular meeting
held April 3, 1985 by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members -

Noes: Council Members -

Absent: Council Members -

Alice M. Reimche
City Clerk



California Cities Work Together

LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN

League of California Cities

1400 K Street • Sacramento 95814 • (916) 444-5790

MAR 28 1985



CITY OF LODI

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
#11-1985

Sacramento, CA
March 25, 1985

URGENT

URGENT

URGENT

RE: Transportation Finance. SB 290 (Foran). IMMEDIATE ACTION NEEDED

No further hearings will be scheduled on SB 290 until the solid, bipartisan votes necessary to get the bill out of the Senate Transportation Committee can be counted. To translate, SB 290 is dead unless the interest groups supporting the bill can change the minds of certain members of the Committee.

The most immediate political problem with SB 290 is the Governor's opposition to the bill. His strong, unbending opposition to the tax increase in SB 290 results in several key Republican Committee members not wanting to "vote against" the Governor. This also is causing the Governor and Republican members of the Senate Transportation Committee to search for "alternatives" to a gas tax. There have been no specific alternatives offered. There have only been general references to the state "surplus" as an alternative to address the transportation funding gap. What are the realities of a state general fund alternative to SB 290? There are several important policy questions which must be addressed to answer this question.

POLICY QUESTIONS

1. Is there a "surplus" and how much is that surplus?

Comment: The existence and size of any surplus is only speculation at this time.

2. If there is a surplus, what is the likelihood that transportation will have the first call on the surplus?

Comment: There will be many competing demands for any possible surplus. Immediately, transportation interests will begin to compete with a list of demands from the following organizations or programs:

- (a) Abused, neglected and abandoned children
- (b) Unitary tax enactment which seems to be gaining support
- (c) Education (K-12, community colleges, UC system)
- (d) Human resource programs (welfare, aging, mental health, alcohol etc.)
- (e) Prison construction and other criminal justice issues

3. Can the proponents of state general fund surplus secure the votes for transportation funding?

Comment: With the above constituencies competing for any surplus, the priorities of proponents for transportation will have a stiff, if not impossible, battle with proponents of other interests.

4. If transportation funding can be secured from the general fund, what does that mean for future commitments?

Comment: There is, and can be no, commitment of the state beyond one year on state general fund monies. As long as there is a surplus, commitments are easier to keep. When there is no surplus, there will be no commitments to help local government transportation problems. SB 290 is a permanent and stable source of revenue for a problem that needs a constant and stable source of revenue.

5. Do cities want to again face the year-to-year or perhaps the month-to-month revisions and cutbacks connected with state general fund bailouts?

Comment: For the first time in the six years since passage of Proposition 13, cities can plan public services because there is a stable and predictable source of revenues. We should not have to subject our transportation system to that same unpredictable revenue picture which plagued city general services for the past six years.

IMPORTANT ISSUES

The debate on SB 290 has lost its focus. The following issues are the important ones:

1. There is an overwhelming need on the local street and road system in the scale of \$400 to \$800 million annually. A financial solution with stability is needed now!

2. SB 290 is a user tax. What can be a more equitable means of paying for our street and road system than through a tax paid by the users of that system.

3. The state and local transportation system is one system. Financial responsibility is split, but the system is, of necessity, integrated to accommodate statewide travel. It requires a statewide funding source.

4. A state gasoline tax increase is the only way to guarantee a consistent level of transportation services on a statewide basis. Only the Legislature and the Governor can pass a tax which distributes the revenues on an equitable, statewide basis.

5. SB 290 is a stable and predictable revenue source which can be used to properly plan and maintain the transportation system. The bill meets shortfalls in funding which extend 10 to 20 years into the future. General fund alternatives are unpredictable at best and non-existent to date.

6. The economic health of California is directly tied to its transportation system. The investment in that system is too great to play games.

7. SB 290 is introduced at a critical time in terms of the transportation system's maintenance. If adequate revenues are not put into the system now, it will cost 3 to 4 times more to repair that system in the future. Is it a prudent expenditure of taxpayer dollars to ignore this problem?

CONCLUSION

Any alternative solutions to SB 290 mentioned to date have been non-solutions. SB 290 is the most important transportation financing package in 20 years. It is in trouble in the Legislature because of political questions which have little or nothing to do with the undeniable financial crisis in our transportation system.

SB 290 is ours to win our lose. Start by contacting the offices of each of the Senators on the Senate Transportation Committee. A list of their telephone numbers and a contact person in Sacramento is attached.

May 3 is the deadline date to move SB 290 out of the Senate Transportation Committee. If we cannot make a difference before that date, the bill is dead and the alternatives are questionable. **ACT NOW!**

Ask Senate Transportation Committee Members for an "AYE" vote on SB 290. When contacting your Senator, point out the following:

1. The ten streets in the worst condition in your community and the dollars needed to bring those streets up to standard.
2. The direct effect which the ten worst street conditions have on the citizens in your community, i.e., commute, time delay, auto damage, etc.
3. The projected problems or costs if the problem is not addressed now.
4. The effect on economic development, job creation, etc.
5. The business and media support in your community for increased transportation funding.

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

<u>Member</u>	<u>Contact Person</u>	<u>Sacramento Office</u>
Senator John Foran (Chair)	Nancy Jo Plescia	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-0503
Senator Jim Ellis (Vice Chairman)	Elizabeth Dahl	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-3952
Senator Marian Bergeson	Kevin Sloat	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-4961
Senator Robert Beverly	Brian McMahon	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-6447
Senator Wadie Deddeh	Helen Jones	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-6767
Senator Leroy Greene	Pat Blakeslee	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-7807
Senator Rebecca Morgan	Jon Glidden	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-6747
Senator Alan Robbins	Teri Burns	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-3121
Senator John Seymour	Karen Yelverton	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-4264
Senator Art Torres	Danny Verches	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 915/445-3456
Senator Rose Ann Vuich	Shirley Pearson	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-4641

RESOLUTION NO.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SB-290 (FORAN)
TRANSPORTATION FINANCE

WHEREAS, local governments are now experiencing an annual funding shortfall from local streets and roads of between \$400 and \$800 million dollars; and

WHEREAS, local transit systems are also facing a major shortfall in funding; and

WHEREAS, Congress is intending to cut Federal Revenue Sharing to local governments in California and Federal Subsidies to transit; and

WHEREAS, local street and road funding must have an immediate infusion of dollars to prevent taxpayers paying three to four times more to repair that system in the future; and

WHEREAS, Senator John Foran has taken the leadership role in introducing SB-290 a comprehensive transportation finance package for state and local government; and

WHEREAS, SB-290 is the most important transportation finance package to local governments in twenty years; and

WHEREAS, the local transportation system is in need of a stable and predictable source of revenue; and

WHEREAS, without this additional revenue the survivability of Lodi's streets, roads and alleys is questionable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the City of Lodi indicates its full support for Senator Foran's SB-290

Dated:

I hereby certify that Resolution No.
was passed and adopted by the City Council
of the City of Lodi in a regular meeting
held April 3, 1985 by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members -

Noes: Council Members -

Absent: Council Members -

Alice M. Reimche
City Clerk



California Cities Work Together



LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN

RECEIVED

League of California Cities

1400 K Street • Sacramento 95814 • (916) 444-5790

MAR 28 1985



CITY OF LODI

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

#11-1985

Sacramento, CA
March 25, 1985

URGENT

URGENT

URGENT

RE: Transportation Finance. SB 290 (Foran). IMMEDIATE ACTION NEEDED

No further hearings will be scheduled on SB 290 until the solid, bipartisan votes necessary to get the bill out of the Senate Transportation Committee can be counted. To translate, SB 290 is dead unless the interest groups supporting the bill can change the minds of certain members of the Committee.

The most immediate political problem with SB 290 is the Governor's opposition to the bill. His strong, unbending opposition to the tax increase in SB 290 results in several key Republican Committee members not wanting to "vote against" the Governor. This also is causing the Governor and Republican members of the Senate Transportation Committee to search for "alternatives" to a gas tax. There have been no specific alternatives offered. There have only been general references to the state "surplus" as an alternative to address the transportation funding gap. What are the realities of a state general fund alternative to SB 290? There are several important policy questions which must be addressed to answer this question.

POLICY QUESTIONS

1. Is there a "surplus" and how much is that surplus?

Comment: The existence and size of any surplus is only speculation at this time.

2. If there is a surplus, what is the likelihood that transportation will have the first call on the surplus?

Comment: There will be many competing demands for any possible surplus. Immediately, transportation interests will begin to compete with a list of demands from the following organizations or programs:

- (a) Abused, neglected and abandoned children
- (b) Unitary tax enactment which seems to be gaining support
- (c) Education (K-12, community colleges, UC system)
- (d) Human resource programs (welfare, aging, mental health, alcohol etc.)
- (e) Prison construction and other criminal justice issues

3. Can the proponents of state general fund surplus secure the votes for transportation funding?

Comment: With the above constituencies competing for any surplus, the priorities of proponents for transportation will have a stiff, if not impossible, battle with proponents of other interests.

4. If transportation funding can be secured from the general fund, what does that mean for future commitments?

Comment: There is, and can be no, commitment of the state beyond one year on state general fund monies. As long as there is a surplus, commitments are easier to keep. When there is no surplus, there will be no commitments to help local government transportation problems. SB 290 is a permanent and stable source of revenue for a problem that needs a constant and stable source of revenue.

5. Do cities want to again face the year-to-year or perhaps the month-to-month revisions and cutbacks connected with state general fund bailouts?

Comment: For the first time in the six years since passage of Proposition 13, cities can plan public services because there is a stable and predictable source of revenues. We should not have to subject our transportation system to that same unpredictable revenue picture which plagued city general services for the past six years.

IMPORTANT ISSUES

The debate on SB 290 has lost its focus. The following issues are the important ones:

1. There is an overwhelming need on the local street and road system in the scale of \$400 to \$800 million annually. A financial solution with stability is needed now!
2. SB 290 is a user tax. What can be a more equitable means of paying for our street and road system than through a tax paid by the users of that system.
3. The state and local transportation system is one system. Financial responsibility is split, but the system is, of necessity, integrated to accommodate statewide travel. It requires a statewide funding source.
4. A state gasoline tax increase is the only way to guarantee a consistent level of transportation services on a statewide basis. Only the Legislature and the Governor can pass a tax which distributes the revenues on an equitable, statewide basis.

5. SB 290 is a stable and predictable revenue source which can be used to properly plan and maintain the transportation system. The bill meets shortfalls in funding which extend 10 to 20 years into the future. General fund alternatives are unpredictable at best and non-existent to date.

6. The economic health of California is directly tied to its transportation system. The investment in that system is too great to play games.

7. SB 290 is introduced at a critical time in terms of the transportation system's maintenance. If adequate revenues are not put into the system now, it will cost 3 to 4 times more to repair that system in the future. Is it a prudent expenditure of taxpayer dollars to ignore this problem?

CONCLUSION

Any alternative solutions to SB 290 mentioned to date have been non-solutions. SB 290 is the most important transportation financing package in 20 years. It is in trouble in the Legislature because of political questions which have little or nothing to do with the undeniable financial crisis in our transportation system.

SB 290 is ours to win or lose. Start by contacting the offices of each of the Senators on the Senate Transportation Committee. A list of their telephone numbers and a contact person in Sacramento is attached.

May 3 is the deadline date to move SB 290 out of the Senate Transportation Committee. If we cannot make a difference before that date, the bill is dead and the alternatives are questionable. **ACT NOW!**

Ask Senate Transportation Committee Members for an "AYE" vote on SB 290. When contacting your Senator, point out the following:

1. The ten streets in the worst condition in your community and the dollars needed to bring those streets up to standard.
2. The direct effect which the ten worst street conditions have on the citizens in your community, i.e., commute, time delay, auto damage, etc.
3. The projected problems or costs if the problem is not addressed now.
4. The effect on economic development, job creation, etc.
5. The business and media support in your community for increased transportation funding.

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Member	Contact Person	Sacramento Office
Senator John Foran (Chair)	Nancy Jo Plescia	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-0503
Senator Jim Ellis (Vice Chairman)	Elizabeth Dahl	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-3952
Senator Marian Bergeson	Kevin Sloat	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-4961
Senator Robert Beverly	Brian McMahon	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-6447
Senator Wadie Deddeh	Helen Jones	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-6767
Senator Leroy Greene	Pat Blakeslee	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-7807
Senator Rebecca Morgan	Jon Glidden	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-6747
Senator Alan Robbins	Teri Burns	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-3121
Senator John Seymour	Karen Yelverton	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-4264
Senator Art Torres	Danny Verches	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 915/445-3456
Senator Rose Ann Vuich	Shirley Pearson	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-4641



California Cities Work Together



LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN

League of California Cities

1400 K Street • Sacramento 95814 • (916) 444-5790

MAR 20 1985
ALICE H. WOODRUFF
CITY CLERK

Sacramento, CA
March 25, 1985

#11-1985

URGENT

URGENT

URGENT

RE: Transportation Finance. SB 290 (Foran). IMMEDIATE ACTION NEEDED

No further hearings will be scheduled on SB 290 until the solid, bipartisan votes necessary to get the bill out of the Senate Transportation Committee can be counted. To translate, SB 290 is dead unless the interest groups supporting the bill can change the minds of certain members of the Committee.

The most immediate political problem with SB 290 is the Governor's opposition to the bill. His strong, unbending opposition to the tax increase in SB 290 results in several key Republican Committee members not wanting to "vote against" the Governor. This also is causing the Governor and Republican members of the Senate Transportation Committee to search for "alternatives" to a gas tax. There have been no specific alternatives offered. There have only been general references to the state "surplus" as an alternative to address the transportation funding gap. What are the realities of a state general fund alternative to SB 290? There are several important policy questions which must be addressed to answer this question.

POLICY QUESTIONS

1. Is there a "surplus" and how much is that surplus?

Comment: The existence and size of any surplus is only speculation at this time.

2. If there is a surplus, what is the likelihood that transportation will have the first call on the surplus?

Comment: There will be many competing demands for any possible surplus. Immediately, transportation interests will begin to compete with a list of demands from the following organizations or programs:

- (a) Abused, neglected and abandoned children
- (b) Unitary tax enactment which seems to be gaining support
- (c) Education (K-12, community colleges, UC system)
- (d) Human resource programs (welfare, aging, mental health, alcohol etc.)
- (e) Prison construction and other criminal justice issues

3. Can the proponents of state general fund surplus secure the votes for transportation funding?

Comment: With the above constituencies competing for any surplus, the priorities of proponents for transportation will have a stiff, if not impossible, battle with proponents of other interests.

4. If transportation funding can be secured from the general fund, what does that mean for future commitments?

Comment: There is, and can be no, commitment of the state beyond one year on state general fund monies. As long as there is a surplus, commitments are easier to keep. When there is no surplus, there will be no commitments to help local government transportation problems. SB 290 is a permanent and stable source of revenue for a problem that needs a constant and stable source of revenue.

5. Do cities want to again face the year-to-year or perhaps the month-to-month revisions and cutbacks connected with state general fund bailouts?

Comment: For the first time in the six years since passage of Proposition 13, cities can plan public services because there is a stable and predictable source of revenues. We should not have to subject our transportation system to that same unpredictable revenue picture which plagued city general services for the past six years.

IMPORTANT ISSUES

The debate on SB 290 has lost its focus. The following issues are the important ones:

1. There is an overwhelming need on the local street and road system in the scale of \$400 to \$800 million annually. A financial solution with stability is needed now!
2. SB 290 is a user tax. What can be a more equitable means of paying for our street and road system than through a tax paid by the users of that system.
3. The state and local transportation system is one system. Financial responsibility is split, but the system is, of necessity, integrated to accommodate statewide travel. It requires a statewide funding source.
4. A state gasoline tax increase is the only way to guarantee a consistent level of transportation services on a statewide basis. Only the Legislature and the Governor can pass a tax which distributes the revenues on an equitable, statewide basis.

5. SB 290 is a stable and predictable revenue source which can be used to properly plan and maintain the transportation system. The bill meets shortfalls in funding which extend 10 to 20 years into the future. General fund alternatives are unpredictable at best and non-existent to date.

6. The economic health of California is directly tied to its transportation system. The investment in that system is too great to play games.

7. SB 290 is introduced at a critical time in terms of the transportation system's maintenance. If adequate revenues are not put into the system now, it will cost 3 to 4 times more to repair that system in the future. Is it a prudent expenditure of taxpayer dollars to ignore this problem?

CONCLUSION

Any alternative solutions to SB 290 mentioned to date have been non-solutions. SB 290 is the most important transportation financing package in 20 years. It is in trouble in the Legislature because of political questions which have little or nothing to do with the undeniable financial crisis in our transportation system.

SB 290 is ours to win or lose. Start by contacting the offices of each of the Senators on the Senate Transportation Committee. A list of their telephone numbers and a contact person in Sacramento is attached.

May 3 is the deadline date to move SB 290 out of the Senate Transportation Committee. If we cannot make a difference before that date, the bill is dead and the alternatives are questionable. **ACT NOW!**

Ask Senate Transportation Committee Members for an "AYE" vote on SB 290. When contacting your Senator, point out the following:

1. The ten streets in the worst condition in your community and the dollars needed to bring those streets up to standard.
2. The direct effect which the ten worst street conditions have on the citizens in your community, i.e., commute, time delay, auto damage, etc.
3. The projected problems or costs if the problem is not addressed now.
4. The effect on economic development, job creation, etc.
5. The business and media support in your community for increased transportation funding.

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

<u>Member</u>	<u>Contact Person</u>	<u>Sacramento Office</u>
Senator John Foran (Chair)	Nancy Jo Plescia	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-0503
Senator Jim Ellis (Vice Chairman)	Elizabeth Dahl	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-3952
Senator Marian Bergeson	Kevin Sloat	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-4961
Senator Robert Beverly	Brian McMahon	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-6447
Senator Wadie Deddeh	Helen Jones	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-6767
Senator Leroy Greene	Pat Blakeslee	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-7807
Senator Rebecca Morgan	Jon Glidden	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-6747
Senator Alan Robbins	Teri Burns	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-3121
Senator John Seymour	Karen Yelverton	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-4264
Senator Art Torres	Danny Verches	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 915/445-3456
Senator Rose Ann Vuich	Shirley Pearson	State Capitol Sacramento 95814 916/445-4641



California Cities Work Together



LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN

League of California Cities

1400 K Street • Sacramento 95814 • (916) 444-5790

MAR 25 1985

ALICE M. DEW#10-1985
CITY CLERK
CITY OF LOS ANGELES

March 22, 1985

***** LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES *****

1. Transportation Finance. SB 290 (Foran). Senate Transportation Committee Vote Postponed to Later Date. Impressive Set of Proponents Endorse the Bill.
2. Unemployment Insurance: State Mandated Cost. AB 216 (McAlister). Bill in Assembly Ways and Means Committee - Employment Development Department and Finance Seek to Resolve Technical Issues.
3. School Site Disposition/Naylor Bill Under Attack.
4. Local Public Agency Employer-Employee Relations: Unfair Labor Practices -- State Public Employment Relations Board. SB 1254 (Dills).
5. Redevelopment. Drastic Revisions are Proposed by Los Angeles County. SB 1039 (Montoya)
6. Mandatory Redevelopment Set-Aside for School Districts. AB 1473 (Stirling).
7. City Reimbursement Mandated for Full Costs of County Property Tax Administration. SB 582 (Vuich) and AB 1954 (N. Waters).
8. Redevelopment. Reimbursement to County for Costs. AB 117 (Frazee).
9. Restrictions on Local Investments. SB 115 (Marks).
10. The Oakland Raider Bill Introduced Again. SB 717 and SCA 18 (Montoya).
11. Brown Act Amended to Include Non-Profit Organizations. SB 1356 (Keene).
12. Limitations on City Annexations and Incorporations. SB 1051 (Lockyer).
13. Sales and Use Taxation. Place of Sale. AB 724 (Campbell).
14. Sales Tax. Direct Payment Permits. SB 413 (Beverly) Passes Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee.
15. Increases in Budget for the State ABC. SB 927 (Seymour).
16. Property Taxation: Property Transfer Exemption. ACA 62 (Hannigan) and AB 67 (Hannigan). Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee Passes Bills Exempting Property Transferred Between Parents and Children from Change of Ownership Reassessment.
17. Spaying of Dogs by Pound. AB 1663 (Campbell).
18. Changed Status of Bills Previously Reported.

FEDERAL AFFAIRS

19. Mandatory Retirement Age for Public Safety Officers.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

1. SUPPORT

Transportation Finance. SB 290 (Foran). Senate Transportation Committee Vote Postponed to Later Date. Impressive Set of Proponents Endorse the Bill. The Senate Transportation Committee on Tuesday, March 19, conducted an approximately four-hour hearing on SB 290. Council Member Jim Beall from San Jose, Vice Chair

of the League Committee on Transportation and Public Works, testified on behalf of cities in support of SB 290. Proponents of the legislation represented not only direct beneficiaries of SB 290 such as local governments and transit districts, but also prominent members of California's business community who view this package as being important to the economic health of California. While the vote was postponed because two members of the Committee were absent, it appears from the discussion at the hearing that several members of the Committee who were present are not prepared to vote for the bill at this time. Senator Foran will reset the bill for hearing in the near future.

There are two noticeable problems which surfaced during the hearing. First, several members of the Committee are very reluctant to vote for this legislation because the Governor is opposed at this time. Local government efforts to pass the bill should focus on business leaders who recognize the need for SB 290 and the undeniable transportation funding shortfall. If the Administration can be convinced to consider the problem on its merits, there is some hope of progress. The second problem is the less-than-unified position of certain agencies which will directly benefit from the legislation including COG's and certain counties. Divisive testimony of several witnesses focused on highly technical and non-substantive issues which can be easily accommodated. Attention should be redirected to the most important fact that SB 290 provides about \$670 million in new revenues for transportation in California. At this point, the author of SB 290 needs to rally all the support that he can get for passage of the bill. It is more productive to solve political problems surrounding the bill than to get lost in details which can always be handled later.

Attached to the Bulletin is a list of dollar amounts which individual cities can expect from the increase in the gasoline tax under SB 290. The figures were developed by the Legislative Analyst's office.

Several Senators on the Committee indicated that they have not yet heard from city officials in their district on the specific local need for SB 290. If you have not contacted your Senator, please do so immediately. Phone calls from city officials in support of SB 290 will make a difference. The need for the revenues in SB 290 is easily documented in virtually all communities in California. When members can clearly identify the need in their own local jurisdictions, they will become more willing to vote for the bill in spite of the Governor's position.

Please contact the members of the Senate Transportation Committee and urge a "yes" vote on SB 290. The members of the Committee are: Foran, Chair; Ellis, Vice Chair; Bergeson, Beverly, Deddeh, L. Greene, Morgan, Robbins, Seymour, Torres, and Vuich.

2. SUPPORT

Unemployment Insurance: State Mandated Cost. AB 216 (McAlister). Bill in Assembly Ways and Means Committee - Employment Development Department and Finance Seek to Resolve Technical Issues. AB 216 has been temporarily stalled in the Assembly Ways and Means

Committee for about three weeks. This bill implements the provisions of the Sacramento decision which found the state financially responsible for the state-mandated local costs of the unemployment insurance program. (See Legislative Bulletins #2-1985, #3-1985, #4-1985.) Given legislative inaction to resolve this mandated cost issue, the author of AB 216 had asked Employment Development Department to waive the payment required of cities for 60 days. The waiver was requested under the assumption that AB 216 could be moved quickly through the Legislature eliminating entirely the need to make these payments. It now appears that AB 216 will not move as quickly as first suggested. We believe that the concerns expressed by the Employment Development Department and the Department of Finance can be eliminated. However, AB 216 will not be passed before the next payment by cities is required.

The League has received a number of phone calls from city officials asking for our recommendation as to whether cities should continue to pay for unemployment insurance benefits. Given the delay which is taking place with AB 216, we recommend that you continue to follow the course of action you chose in your jurisdiction for the last unemployment insurance payments. Most jurisdictions have continued to pay. We believe AB 216 will eventually pass, however, local governments will be faced with at least one if not two more billing periods before AB 216 finally reaches the Governor's desk. EDD indicates that very few city jurisdictions have chosen not to pay the EDD billing. Continuing to make payments will permit the Legislature to act in good faith on this issue. Remember that AB 216 contains an appropriation to pay local government costs from May of 1984 to the effective date of the bill. It is far preferable to have a legislative solution to this problem than to seek another remedy in court.

3. ACTION
NEEDED

School Site Disposition/Naylor Bill Under Attack. Several years ago, the Legislature enacted what is popularly known as the "Naylor Bill," which requires school districts to sell to cities or park districts at reduced costs the playground and open space areas of some surplus school sites. Recently, school districts have learned how to avoid these requirements by securing waivers from the provisions of the "Naylor Bill." This effectively means that cities have not been able to obtain these school sites at a reduced price. Three bills have now been introduced relating to this subject.

The first is SB 887 (Seymour) which would provide that if the city or a local park district does not purchase the property pursuant to the Naylor provisions, then the city may not subsequently zone the property to open space, but must instead zone it to any zoning classification the school district requests, if that zoning classification is the same as or compatible with the uses of property adjacent to the school site. It therefore removes virtually all zoning discretion from the city and places zoning control in the school district. Clearly, this is an inappropriate and perhaps unconstitutional abridgment of municipal police powers.

The second bill is AB 2198 (Felando). AB 2198 would simply repeal the Naylor provisions and require cities to pay full fair market value for any school district property they purchased.

The third bill is AB 1978 (Naylor). AB 1978 would prevent school districts from obtaining from the state a waiver of the school site disposition provisions of the Naylor Bill.

It is expected that AB 2198 and AB 1978 will be assigned to the Assembly Education Committee, and that SB 887 will be assigned to the Senate Education Committee. Interested city officials should contact the members of those Committees in support of AB 1978, and in opposition to AB 2198 and SB 887. The Assembly Education Committee members are: Hughes, Chair; Bader, Vice Chair; Allen, Bradley, Campbell, Clute, Farr, Hayden, Johnston, Leonard, McClintock, O'Connell, and Vasconcellos. Members of the Senate Education Committee are: Hart, Chair; Bergeson, Vice Chair; Carpenter, Davis, Deddeh, Dills, Morgan, Seymour, Stiern, Torres and Watson.

4. OPPOSE

Local Public Agency Employer-Employee Relations: Unfair Labor Practices -- State Public Employment Relations Board. SB 1254 (Dills). This legislation is virtually identical to legislation introduced last session (SB 1440 - Torres) and would define

unfair labor practices for the purposes of the Meyers-Milius-Brown Act. The bill also provides that the party alleging a violation of unfair labor practices can elect to have that unfair labor practice charge resolved in either Superior Court or by the State Public Employment Relations Board.

SB 1254 is another attempt by local public employee organizations to extend State Public Employment Relations Board jurisdiction over cities, counties and special districts. It is sponsored again by the Peace Officers Research Association of California. This bill has been defeated twice in the last two years following a very difficult fight on the floor of the Senate. The primary argument we have used successfully is that PERB jurisdiction means public employees strikes will be authorized. The State Public Employment Relations Board has already ruled for school districts that a strike by employees in response to an unfair labor practice as defined is legal. California decisional law provides unequivocally that in the absence of specific authorization, public employees do not have the right to strike.

The bill has not been assigned to a Committee as of yet, however, we fully expect the bill to be heard in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee.

5. OPPOSE

Redevelopment. Drastic Revisions Are Proposed By Los Angeles County. SB 1039 (Montoya). Sponsored by Los Angeles County, SB 1039 is a determined and misguided effort to destroy the community redevelopment law as it has been utilized so successfully in California. It represents the incredible

view that California would be better off without the economic development, job creation and the removal of blighted structures from depressed neighborhoods which result from the use of the community redevelopment law. SB 1039 must be opposed immediately and vigorously by each and every redevelopment agency in the state.

SB 1039 provides the following:

(1) The definition of blight is narrowed to conform to the definition utilized by UDAG federal regulations. This alone would eliminate most redevelopment proposals in the future.

(2) The total area included within the project areas in a city may not exceed 25% of the entire area of the city unless approved by the Board of Supervisors.

This, of course, is a completely arbitrary approach which ignores the extent of real and actual blight in a community, particularly a smaller city.

(3) The county auditor is prohibited, unless directed by the Board of Supervisors, from allocating or paying any portion of any additional tax increment revenues which would otherwise be allocated when the total assessed valuation of the taxable property in all of the project areas in all of the cities in the county and the agency in the county exceed, in the aggregate, 7% of the total assessed valuation of all of the taxable property in the county, subject to any indebtedness incurred prior to January 1, 1986.

(4) The state controller would be required to audit every redevelopment agency whose expenses for staff, salaries, wages and benefits and other administrative expenses exceed 10% of the tax increment revenue in any given year.

(5) The term of existence of a redevelopment plan could not exceed 25 years, unless that limitation would impair the rights of holders of bonds.

(6) When a redevelopment plan is adopted, the city would also be required to adopt an ordinance which contains a finding that the agency and the city council have considered and rejected the levy of benefit assessments within the project area and the rationale for rejecting the utilization of benefit assessments.

SB 1039 (Montoya) is unjustified and unnecessary following the adoption of "reform" redevelopment legislation in each of the last two years. We strongly urge you to direct your opposition letters to the Senate Local Government Committee. The members are: Marks, Chair; Vuich, Vice Chair; Ayala, Campbell, Craven, Garamendi and Russell.

6. OPPOSE

Mandatory Redevelopment Set-Aside for School Districts. AB 1473 (Stirling). The only mandatory expenditure of redevelopment tax-increment funds in current law is the obligatory 20% set-aside for low and moderate income housing, unless certain fundings related to an absence of need can be made. This bill, AB 1473, would require, upon the request of a school district, that every redevelopment plan adopted after January 1, 1986, mandatorily expend on school buildings and improvements the "amount of property tax revenues which would have been received by the school district" without any diversion of tax-increment revenues to the redevelopment agency. While appealing to educators, AB 1473 represents the "impossible dream." It amounts to spending the same money twice. Unfortunately, it isn't possible to both redevelop a blighted area, repay tax-allocation bonds, increase the area's assessed valuation through rehabilitation and new construction and provide schools with their full share of the growth of tax-increment revenues. AB 1473 is based on the myth that growth in redevelopment project areas would take place without redevelopment activities and that such growth is not dependent upon the expenditure of tax-increment revenues.

Letters of opposition should be sent to the author and to the members of the Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee. The members are: Hannigan, Chair; Dennis Brown, Vice Chair; Cortese, Davis, Floyd, Hayden, Johnston, Klehs, Lewis, McClintock, Molina, Seastrand, and Sher.

7. OPPOSE

City Reimbursement Mandated for Full Cost of County Property Tax Administration. SB 532 (Vurch) and AB 1954 (N. Waters). SB 532 would reduce the allocation of property tax revenues to cities, school districts, community colleges and special districts by the county's total property tax administration costs. AB 1954 provides that only counties with less than 200,000 population may withhold their costs of property tax administration from cities, schools, community colleges and special districts. The League opposes these two measures vigorously because property tax administration is clearly a countywide function which has historically been most equitably supported by a countywide tax. If the cost of this service is to be borne by the taxpayers of the individual local agencies and school districts within the county, then those taxpayers ought to receive a credit against their county taxes, inasmuch as unincorporated area taxpayers aren't being asked to pay for this service twice. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the current percentage allocation of property tax revenues to counties following Proposition 13 is based upon the counties' average share of the property tax actually levied and received in the last three years before Prop. 13. This allocation includes the countywide cost of property tax administration. If such a cost is to be shifted to cities and special districts, then the counties' share of the property tax ought to be reduced correspondingly. SB 532 and AB 1954 will be assigned to their respective Revenue and Taxation Committees in the Senate and Assembly. Letters of opposition to the authors as well as Committee members are encouraged.

8. OPPOSE

Redevelopment. Reimbursement to County for Costs. AB 117 (Frazee). Current law now requires a redevelopment agency to reimburse the county for the so-called "section 33328" report, which provides the basic fiscal data upon which the agency's future financial costs can be estimated. AB 117, which is sponsored by San Diego County, would extend the concept of reimbursement to the county's cost for property tax administration.

The League opposes AB 117 because counties may now recover their costs (and more) through the negotiation of a tax-sharing agreement.

Many of the agency's demands on a county are in fact the result of state law and are beyond the agency's control. County administration of taxes is an historic function which has long been included in the county's share of the property tax. Redevelopment agencies should not be singled out to pay for these costs.

Letters of opposition to AB 117 should be directed to the author and the Assembly Local Government Committee. The members are: Cortese, Chair; Lancaster, Vice Chair; Bradley, Bronzan, Calderon, Eaves, Frazee, Hauser, Mountjoy, and Robinson.

9. OPPOSE

Restrictions on Local Investments. SB 115 (Marks). Late last week the League's Revenue and Taxation Committee voted to oppose SB 115 both as introduced (10% limit on long-term security investment categories) and as it may be amended (5 year average maturity limitation, based on the agency's dollar-weighted average maturity). The League is asking the author to drop SB 115 in either of these two forms because there is no statewide evidence that a need exists to adopt still additional restrictions on local government investment practices. AB 1073 (Cortese) of 1984 has just taken

effect and its full disclosure requirements should be allowed to operate.

10. OPPOSE The Oakland Raider Bill Introduced Again. SB 717 and SCA 13 (Montoya). These bills which resemble AB 1585 of last year prohibit a city from condemning the following properties if the purpose is to prevent relocation: theaters, hospitals, taxi companies, marinas, sports franchise, cable television companies and amusement parks.

This prohibition would apply regardless of whether there is a bona fide public purpose in exercising eminent domain to take one of these properties. The bills should be opposed on three grounds. First, they limit cities' eminent domain powers in areas where there is no evidence of abuse, and without regard to any bona fide public purpose. Second, they increase litigation potential by introducing motive for a condemnation into the lawsuit. Third, the application of the bill to cable television probably violates Article XI, Section 9 of the State Constitution.

SB 717 has been assigned to the Senate Local Government Committee. City officials should contact members of the Committee and urge a "NO" vote on the bill. Members of the Committee are: Marks, Chair; Vuich, Vice Chair; Ayala, Campbell, Craven, Garamendi, and Russell.

11. OPPOSE Brown Act Amended to Include Non-Profit Organizations. SB 1356 (Keene). Under current law, private non-profit organizations that receive monies under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are subject to the Brown Act. SB 1356 would extend the Brown Act's coverage to all private non-profit organizations that receive public money to be expended for public purposes pursuant to any federal law. The bill could potentially make all local civic organizations subject to the Brown Act, together with all of its notice requirements and open meeting requirements. It would in particular restrict economic development organizations, since they could no longer negotiate privately with companies which are considering relocating. SB 1356 has been assigned to the Senate Local Government Committee for hearing. Interested city officials should contact the members of that Committee in opposition to the bill. The members are: Marks, Chair; Vuich, Vice Chair; Ayala, Campbell, Craven, Garamendi, and Russell.
-

12. OPPOSE Limitations on City Annexations and Incorporations. SB 1051 (Lockyer). SB 1051 would prohibit the incorporation or annexation of property if the area involved in the incorporation or annexation is more than 50% government-owned. The prohibition is absolute without regard to the appropriateness of the incorporation or annexation. The bill arbitrarily removes all discretion from LAFCOs, without regard to the merits of a proposal. SB 1051 has been assigned for hearing to the Senate Local Government Committee, and interested city officials should write the members of that Committee in opposition to the bill. The members are: Marks, Chair; Vuich, Vice Chair, Ayala, Campbell, Craven, Garamendi, and Russell.
-

13. REVIEW AND COMMENT Sales and Use Taxation. Place of Sale. AB 724 (Campbell). Under the current state and local sales and use tax law, the incidence of the retail sale is generally considered to be the place of business of the retailer. This bill instead provides that the incidence of the retail sale will be where the tangible, personal property which is sold is physically located at the time of sale. This bill has the potential for changing sales tax allocations between cities. It is very difficult to assess the possible sales tax shift which the bill may cause.

We ask for your review and comment on AB 724. Please direct your comments to Dwight Stenbakken of the League staff.

14. REVIEW AND COMMENT Sales Tax. Direct Payment Permits. SB 418 (Beverly) Passes Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee. Under existing law, the sales and use tax is imposed on retailers for the privilege of selling tangible, personal property. Generally, consumers pay the sales and use tax to the retailer but it is the retailer, not the consumer, who is liable for the tax. This bill authorizes the Board of Equalization to establish a procedure for the issuance of a direct payment permit so that consumers who are issued permits will pay the retailer's sales tax liability directly to the Board of Equalization. The Board is permitted to issue a direct sales permit if the following conditions are met:

- (1) The consumer agrees to pay the tax liability of the retailer directly to the Board;
- (2) The Board determines that a direct payment permit would ease the collection of tax;
- (3) The Board determines that a direct payment permit would increase the convenience of the Board, the consumer and the retailer.

We ask finance officers to review this bill and give us any thoughts you may have as to any possible sales tax shift between cities. Please direct your comments to Dwight Stenbakken on the League staff.

15. INFORMATION REQUESTED Increases in Budget for the State ABC. SB 927 (Seymour). SB 927, would increase funding of enforcement officers for the state's Alcoholic Beverage Control Board. The ABC today has fewer enforcement officers than when it was first formed in the 1950's. SB 927 would place a 15% surcharge on all alcoholic beverage control licenses, and would create a special fund with the monies obtained from that surcharge, which would be used to employ attorneys, investigators, and support staff. The staff would all be used for enforcement of the alcoholic beverage control laws. We request that city officials supply Senator Seymour and the League with information describing problems which they are having with alcoholic beverage licensees which could be prevented or curtailed if the ABC had a better staffed enforcement division.
-

16. REVIEW AND COMMENT Property Taxation: Property Transfer Exemption. ACA 62 (Hannigan) and AB 67 (Hannigan). Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee Passes Bills Exempting Property Transferred Between Parents and Children from Change of Ownership Reassessment. This proposed Constitutional Amendment and accompanying implementation legislation exempts transfers of real property between parents and children from change of ownership reappraisal for tax purposes thereby preventing higher property taxes when property is transferred within "the family." This bill is in large part a response to arguments made by the proponents of Proposition 36. They argued that the current law was unfair because parents could not transfer property to children without having the property reassessed at a higher market value. ACA 62 takes away that argument from the Jarvis supporters. The Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee staff estimates a revenue loss of between \$5 and \$20 million per year.

The bill will be heard next in the Assembly Ways and Means Committee.

17. REVIEW AND COMMENT Spaying of Dogs by Pounds. AB 1663 (Campbell). Current law generally requires pounds to have cats spayed or neutered before they are given away. AB 1663 would require that dogs over six months of age also be spayed or neutered before they are given away and provide that puppies under six months of age could not be given away unless a fee covering the cost of spaying or neutering was deposited with the pound. We would appreciate receiving comments from interested city officials regarding the merits of this bill.
-

18. Changed Status of Bills Previously Reported.

(a) SB 198 (Montoya). Transient Occupancy Tax on Time-Share Estates. SB 198 was heard by the Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee this week and was defeated. (See Legislative Bulletins of February 22 (#6-1985) and March 15 (#9-1985) for additional details.)

(b) AB 512 (Floyd). Union Veto of PERS Contract Amendments. Opposed by the League and described in Legislative Bulletins of February 22 (#6-1985) and March 15 (#9-1985), this bill was originally set for hearing on March 20 in the Assembly Public Employees and Retirement Committee. Because of the author's absence from Sacramento last Wednesday, the bill was held over.

(c) AB 190 (Floyd) and AB 525 (W. Brown). Mandatory Peace Officers Time Bank. Originally set for hearing in the Assembly Public Employees and Retirement Committee on March 20, these bills were also held over this week due to the absence of their authors.

FEDERAL AFFAIRS

19.

Mandatory Retirement Age for Public Safety Officers. The National League of Cities will be filing an amicus curiae brief on a case pending before the U.S. Supreme Court, Baltimore v. Firefighters.

The case affects the question of mandatory retirement ages for public safety officers. Previously, the Supreme Court ruled that mandatory retirement ages for state game wardens were discriminatory and in direct violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. The ruling did not affect federal mandatory retirement ages because the Age Discrimination in Employment Act specifically exempts federal public safety officers from the Act. In the Baltimore case, the appellate court said in effect that if Congress provided an exemption for its own public safety officers, this amounted to a bona fide occupational qualification which also applied to state and local governments. This ruling was favorable to local governments in that it finally recognized the definite double standard which Congress has maintained for federal public safety officers and local public safety officers.

Since the Supreme Court ruled that mandatory retirement provisions in state and local governments are subject to the ADEA, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has investigated many California Cities seeking large amounts of information, charging violation of federal law, and holding conciliation meetings on the issue of potential mandatory retirements which may occur for public safety officers. The EEOC has persisted in forcing local governments to stop mandatory retirements even when most, if not all, cities contacted are members of the State Public Employees Retirement System where mandatory retirement ages are set by the State Legislature.

The National League of Cities is seeking information for the amicus curiae brief. The information needed includes the following:

1. The time and money expended by local governments to respond to EEOC letters of violation and demands for information; and the time and money to support local government claims in any conciliation hearings on this issue.
2. Any cities where direct legal action has been taken by EEOC against the city.
3. A projection of the cost to local government if mandatory age retirements are finally eliminated. This means a detailing of the cost to review each employee on a case-by-case basis to determine if that employee is qualified to continue in a safety job.

During the last three or four years, scores of cities have received letters of violation from EEOC commencing an investigation, urging a conciliation conference and threatening litigation. We hope every city so contacted will bring this information to Don Jones's attention.

The information which you compile should be sent directly to the National League of Cities office in care of Don Jones. Don will be coordinating the efforts on this amicus brief for the National League of Cities. The address for the National League of Cities is 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004.

GAS TAX ALLOCATIONS

Legislative Analyst

	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Allocations</u>	<u>SB290</u> <u>Allocations</u>
ALAMEDA		
Alameda	\$ 971382	\$ 1671179
Albany	202409	341657
Berkeley	1378811	2375605
Dublin	249081	422041
Emeryville	56016	88550
Fremont	1853099	3195628
Hayward	1278521	2202209
Livermore	675278	1159227
Newark	464245	794360
Oakland	4543064	7846459
Piedmont	140700	234966
Pleasanton	499547	855396
San Leandro	861555	1481292
Union City	597989	1025598
ALPINE		
AMADOR		
Amador City	6250	3168
Ione	32848	54518
Jackson	35248	59181
Plymouth	12917	15778
Sutter Creek	24777	38830
BUTTE		
Biggs	23859	32000
Chico	399657	662962
Gridley	60464	93459
Oroville	136570	221241
Paradise	322781	533889
CALAVERAS		
Angels	30586	51372
COLUSA		
Colusa	48606	96741
Williams	22746	39633
CONTRA COSTA		
Antioch	576166	1039256
Brentwood	67887	114750
Clayton	59716	99886
Concord	1292674	2342510
Danville	633315	1143204
El Cerrito	290299	519293
Hercules	94266	162729
Lafayette	321805	576600
Martinez	315255	564685
Moraga	189399	335767
Pinole	183007	324141
Pittsburg	478321	861286
Pleasant Hill	340135	609940
Richmond	948002	1715587
San Pablo	265000	473277
San Ramon	410560	738035
Walnut Creek	737000	1331797

	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Allocations</u>	<u>SB290</u> <u>Allocations</u>
DEL NORTE		
Crescent City	51900	73800
EL DORADO		
Placerville	109869	159672
South Lake Tahoe	322501	482805
FRESNO		
Clovis	447887	836137
Coalinga	92902	166254
Firebaugh	52670	90334
Fowler	37475	61660
Fresno	3179764	5991377
Huron	46415	78530
Kerman	52611	90223
Kingsburg	73330	129322
Mendota	76653	135592
Orange Cove	56290	97164
Parlier	76251	134832
Reedley	157045	287297
Sanger	165654	303542
San Joaquin	29764	47109
Selma	157553	288255
GLENN		
Orland	53963	100111
Willows	60385	113188
HUMBOLDT		
Arcata	188040	327242
Blue Lake	20695	28387
Eureka	312310	549173
Ferndale	23694	33743
Fortuna	104955	178863
Rio Dell	39502	61973
Trinidad	9911	9128
IMPERIAL		
Brawley	197578	387673
Calxico	187246	366896
Calipatria	34829	60387
El Centro	301801	597266
Holtville	56468	103904
Imperial	46214	83284
Westmorland	24508	39633
INYO		
Bishop	51527	77549
KERN		
Arvin	82832	166120
Bakersfield	1364252	2894072
California City	36133	66703
Delano	199400	414274

	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>SB290</u>
	<u>Allocations</u>	<u>Allocations</u>
Maricopa	17295	26600
McFarland	68608	135837
Ridgecrest	237117	494568
Shafter	82676	165786
Taft	67329	133115
Tehachapi	50243	96741
Wasco	118117	241236
KINGS		
Avenal	55187	97611
Corcoran	84909	155186
Hanford	274696	522841
Lemoore	127865	238401
LAKE		
Clearlake	152447	296244
Lakeport	48377	87434
LASSEN		
Susanville	88481	148490
LOS ANGELES		
Agoura Hills	259599	450829
Alhambra	877451	1544021
Arcadia	604527	1061125
Artesia	186812	322042
Avalon	33808	51326
Azusa	426488	746113
Baldwin Park	715632	1257708
Bell	345542	602890
Bellflower	713652	1254204
Bell Gardens	462144	809201
Beverly Hills	426325	745823
Bradbury	15546	19013
Burbank	1108324	1952515
Carson	1071319	1887041
Cerritos	701266	1232290
Claremont	436755	764279
Commerce	154687	265203
Compton	1102660	1942496
Covina	539610	946264
Cudahy	249534	433019
Culver City	496337	869699
Downey	1058353	1864100
Duarte	251224	436009
El Monte	1126322	1984360
El Segundo	186005	320614
Gardena	604843	1061683
Glendale	1859491	3281591
Glendora	510816	895318
Hawaiian Gardens	149101	255237
Hawthorne	751376	1320951
Hermosa Beach	238637	413739

	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Allocations</u>	<u>SB290</u> <u>Allocations</u>
Hidden Hills	0	0
Huntington Park	621555	1091253
Industry	13717	15778
Inglewood	1247289	2198395
Irwindale	18068	23476
La Canada Flintridge	259146	450026
La Habra Heights	68090	111982
Lakewood	949532	1671558
La Mirada	522521	916028
Lancaster	683293	1200489
La Puente	406586	710898
La Verne	331137	577403
Lawndale	319648	557075
Lomita	249812	433512
Long Beach	4740402	8378920
Los Angeles	39209309	69366353
Lynwood	658383	1156415
Manhattan Beach	434939	761064
Maywood	299644	521682
Monrovia	408238	713821
Montebello	714092	1254984
Monterey Park	743670	1307317
Norwalk	1090527	1921027
Palmdale	222052	384394
Palos Verdes Estates	188779	325523
Paramount	503513	882396
Pasadena	1582166	2790907
Pico Rivera	715581	1257618
Pomona	1327657	2340592
Rancho Palos Verdes	623459	1094623
Redondo Beach	782441	1377031
Rolling Hills	0	0
Rolling Hills Estates	102485	172839
Rosemead	575014	1008906
San Dimas	341303	595391
San Fernando	242787	421081
San Gabriel	403610	705632
San Marino	176519	303831
Santa Fe Springs	192500	332107
Santa Monica	1179458	2078377
Sierra Madre	141482	241838
Signal Hill	97440	163912
South El Monte	234021	405571
South Gate	940072	1654820
South Pasadena	301523	525005
Temple City	390870	683091
Torrance	1703094	3004871
Vernon	5935	2009
Walnut	196335	338891
West Covina	1128466	1988154

	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Allocations</u>	<u>SB290</u> <u>Allocations</u>
West Hollywood	868294	1527820
Westlake Village	148432	254135
Whittier	892346	1570376
MADERA		
Chowchilla	65477	127380
Madera	270246	557253
MARIN		
Belvedere	36887	53580
Corte Madera	118916	190556
Fairfax	103574	164937
Larkspur	158995	257481
Mill Valley	178093	289370
Novato	601309	996074
Ross	42233	62507
San Anselmo	166065	269288
San Rafael	602178	997526
Sausalito	106167	169267
Tiburon	122993	197363
MARIPOSA		
MENDOCINO		
Fort Bragg	78012	125371
Point Arena	10664	10043
Ukiah	171229	284998
Willits	60172	94820
MERCED		
Atwater	224632	423557
Dos Palos	45686	78776
Gustine	44493	76477
Livingston	71908	129298
Los Banos	138645	257884
Merced	508746	970969
MODOC		
Alturas	40315	74401
MONO		
Mammoth Lakes	101342	155653
MONTEREY		
Carmel-By-The-Sea	60655	106962
Del Rey Oaks	23119	35081
Gonzales	43011	73175
Greenfield	59641	105020
King City	80739	148111
Marina	318333	611123
Monterey	343992	649552
Pacific Grove	192394	359242
Salinas	1022108	1948141
Sand City	7020	4331
Seaside	400156	831672
Soledad	75910	138693

	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Allocations</u>	<u>SB290</u> <u>Allocations</u>
NAPA		90357
Calistoga	55116	
Napa	674092	1201917
St. Helena	68562	114504
Yountville	42913	68444
NEVADA		181027
Grass Valley	105181	
Nevada City	36206	56638
ORANGE		5200051
Anaheim	3043137	
Brea	418358	707796
Buena Park	851710	1449470
Costa Mesa	1128045	1922411
Cypress	556950	944994
Fountain Valley	722989	1229166
Fullerton	1398853	2385893
Garden Grove	1685255	2876063
Huntington Beach	2351705	4016679
Irvine	995896	1696240
Laguna Beach	245617	412154
La Habra	623579	1059028
La Palma	212146	354868
Los Alamitos	157161	260764
Newport Beach	865466	1473013
Orange	1272152	2169047
Placentia	491403	832811
San Clemente	388877	657341
San Juan Capistrano	283574	477117
Santa Ana	2911847	4975352
Seal Beach	348821	588786
Stanton	346291	584455
Tustin	529881	898665
Villa Park	98042	159581
Westminster	949658	1617105
Yorba Linda	444201	752026
PLACER		180580
Auburn	108459	
Colfax	17815	22673
Lincoln	67326	108924
Loomis	110483	184108
Rocklin	113776	189843
Roseville	357973	615252
PLUMAS		43850
Portola	25494	
RIVERSIDE		351074
Banning	210613	
Beaumont	103795	168865
Blythe	103834	168932
Cathedral City	202293	336882

	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>SB290</u>
	<u>Allocations</u>	<u>Allocations</u>
Coachella	161528	267346
Corona	549854	929750
Desert Hot Springs	103899	169043
Hemet	350294	589344
Indian Wells	29435	42022
Indio	352793	593604
Lake Elsinore	115634	189061
La Quinta	95500	154716
Moreno Valley	872440	1480019
Norco	295911	496577
Palm Desert	195819	324766
Palm Springs	498269	841758
Perris	113227	184955
Rancho Mirage	99975	162349
Riverside	2355833	4010386
San Jacinto	121312	198747
SACRAMENTO		
Folsom	200256	324051
Galt	87715	137466
Isleton	17223	20596
Sacramento	4088286	6770093
SAN BENITO		
Hollister	166751	314610
San Juan Bautista	20090	29702
SAN BERNARDINO		
Adelanto	45387	72013
Barstow	246398	428667
Big Bear Lake	118223	201247
Chino	585471	1030285
Colton	298242	520654
Fontana	577069	1015377
Grand Terrace	126184	215372
Loma Linda	150886	259201
Montclair	315398	551094
Needles	61373	100377
Ontario	1315033	2324747
Rancho Cucamonga	779866	1375200
Redlands	620261	1092012
Rialto	559474	984157
San Bernardino	1652811	2924066
Upland	658671	1160164
Victorville	243128	422865
SAN DIEGO		
Carlsbad	512329	903486
Chula Vista	1125332	1994380
Coronado	256215	447480
Del Mar	69521	115194
El Cajon	1007363	1784410

	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Allocations</u>	<u>SB290</u> <u>Allocations</u>
Escondido	938440	1661738
Imperial Beach	304236	532951
La Mesa	661936	1169602
Lemon Grove	278182	486578
National City	690235	1219970
Oceanside	1097399	1944660
Poway	647217	1143405
San Diego	11965173	21287654
San Marcos	254810	444980
Santee	754410	1334206
Vista	530712	936044
SAN FRANCISCO		
San Francisco	8453881	15775803
SAN JOAQUIN		
Escalon	48129	76521
Lodi	503610	880924
Manteca	372219	648881
Ripon	60311	98035
Stockton	2142159	3774684
Tracy	278674	483676
SAN LUIS OBISPO		
Arroyo Grande	160735	283725
Atascadero	227947	405018
El Paso De Robles	147490	259625
Grover City	123327	215661
Morro Bay	122531	214212
Pismo Beach	75728	129053
San Luis Obispo	451487	812749
SAN MATEO		
Atherton	109467	175917
Belmont	331360	548861
Brisbane	45084	67708
Burlingame	360013	597021
Colma	14506	16312
Daly City	1092135	1827524
East Palo Alto	361141	598916
Foster City	330338	547144
Half Moon Bay	104783	168196
Hillsborough	148622	241727
Menlo Park	382784	635293
Millbrae	275860	455580
Pacifica	495178	824196
Portola Valley	59862	92545
Redwood City	759307	1268128
San Bruno	475049	790365
San Carlos	347094	575306
San Mateo	1079481	1806256
So. San Francisco	687675	1147733
Woodside	76592	120663

	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>SB290</u>
	<u>Allocations</u>	<u>Allocations</u>
SANTA BARBARA		
Carpinteria	148405	251501
Guadalupe	60165	96963
Lompoc	370745	640894
Santa Barbara	988870	1723442
Santa Maria	599608	1041711
SANTA CLARA		
Campbell	453571	751089
Cupertino	512573	849838
Gilroy	345382	570018
Los Altos	386544	638908
Los Altos Hills	107603	172056
Los Gatos	376663	622371
Milpitas	556174	922812
Monte Sereno	51015	77348
Morgan Hill	259020	425476
Mountain View	828808	1379107
Palo Alto	756380	1257886
San Jose	9122381	15259701
Santa Clara	1205524	2009600
Saratoga	405157	670061
Sunnyvale	1496958	2497361
SANTA CRUZ		
Capitola	130437	211847
Santa Cruz	583366	975566
Scotts Valley	101836	163620
Watsonville	337453	560912
SHASTA		
Anderson	106452	164715
Redding	660997	1063289
SIERRA		
Loyalton	15820	25038
SISKIYOU		
Dorris	15696	19481
Dunsmuir	32920	50277
Etna	14399	17162
Fort Jones	11590	12139
Montague	22324	31331
Mt. Shasta	40933	64604
Tulelake	15309	18789
Weed	41670	65921
Yreka	88988	150522
SOLANO		
Benecia	238484	426547
Dixon	116189	203320
Fairfield	792425	1437664
Rio Vista	45268	73867
Suisun	169995	301533

	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Allocations</u>	<u>SB290</u> <u>Allocations</u>
Vacaville	595014	1077326
Vallejo	1079280	1961264
SONOMA		
Cloverdale	58036	95021
Cotati	54922	89464
Healdsburg	101119	171922
Petaluma	460330	813085
Rohnert Park	342831	603358
Santa Rosa	1153970	2051175
Sebastopol	79602	133515
Sonoma	90567	153087
STANISLAUS		
Ceres	212360	364063
Hughson	44164	69046
Modesto	1567860	2741631
Newman	47930	75651
Oakdale	121430	204570
Patterson	63783	103457
Riverbank	84140	139163
Turlock	408812	708643
Waterford	42205	65609
SUTTER		
Live Oak	48650	82660
Yuba City	247264	457055
TEHAMA		
Corning	67556	114972
Red Bluff	136086	240521
Tehama	9453	8524
TRINITY		
TULARE		
Dinuba	135072	236260
Exeter	79601	135659
Farmersville	78777	134164
Lindsay	97136	167460
Porterville	291148	519317
Tulare	317135	566446
Visalia	706093	1271857
Woodlake	71161	120351
TUOLUMNE		
Sonora	60809	92232
VENTURA		
Camarillo	533662	946755
Fillmore	133148	229766
Moorpark	171293	298052
Ojai	97371	165719
Oxnard	1513987	2701709
Port Hueneme	252371	443195
San Buenaventura	1050421	1871844

	<u>1984-85</u> <u>Allocations</u>	<u>SB290</u> <u>Allocations</u>
Santa Paula	282363	496887
Simi Valley	1057763	1884988
Thousand Oaks	1173970	2093019
YOLO		
Davis	474172	864387
Winters	42063	68622
Woodland	400472	727925
YUBA		
Marysville	149205	233159
Wheatland	27176	36129