



Senate Bill 1 Transportation Funding: Talking Points for Public Workshops

WHAT IS SENATE BILL 1?

[Senate Bill 1](#), The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, was passed and signed into law in April 2017. The bill provides ten years of funding for transportation improvements across the state, creating a long-term sustainable source of transportation funding for the first time in decades. It supplements existing programs like the Active Transportation Program with additional money, and also creates several new programs that can potentially fund healthy transportation projects and programs. The revenue comes from a variety of tax and fee increases on gasoline, trucks and vehicle registrations (see [sidebar](#) for details). This funding becomes available immediately, so the California Transportation Commission, which oversees all transportation funding allocations in the State, is moving quickly to develop an implementation plan for how to spend the money. The CTC staff presented a [draft implementation plan](#) to the Commissioners at its May 17 meeting in San Diego, and expects to adopt it at the next Commissioner meeting on June 28 in Sacramento. The CTC will also be holding workshops across the state to start the stakeholder engagement process of developing guidelines for these programs. The Guidelines process will take several months, and most programs should announce a Call for Projects later this year.

TALKING POINTS FOR WORKSHOPS

The talking points (below) were developed by the Public Health Alliance of Southern California to assist local health departments in their advocacy around SB 1-funded transportation programs. These can be used at workshops, in comment letters and when speaking to agency staff about these programs, to ensure that public health is integrated into the guidelines and that public health-promoting projects and programs remain eligible and competitive.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the [SB 1 transportation funding programs]. These programs offer an exciting opportunity to improve public health, advance health equity and social justice, and achieve state climate goals.

Below you will find several overarching principles that we believe should guide the development of these programs. We will provide specific comments on particular programs once the guidelines are released.

REVENUE SOURCES FOR SB 1

Senate Bill 1 raises money through a variety of taxes and user fees. It will generate approximately \$5-6 billion per year, with inflation adjustments built into most revenue sources.

- 12-cent gas tax increase
- 4% diesel sales tax increase
- 20-cent diesel excise tax increase
- \$25 to \$175 increase in vehicle license fee, based on vehicle value
- \$100 annual vehicle registration fee for zero-emissions vehicles model year 2020 or later
- General fund loan repayments

These funding programs should focus on improving public health, advancing health equity and social justice, and achieving key state climate goals like reducing greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled

In each of these areas, California has important goals that it may not meet unless *all* programs are implemented with these goals in mind. SB1 programs must focus on strategies that will meet the state's climate, clean air, public health, housing, equity, and sustainability goals as detailed below:

- **Public Health:** Many communities face significant and persistent health inequities due to historical marginalization and lack of resources and opportunities to support good health. The social, economic, physical, and services environments in which people live, work, learn and play - known as the social determinants of health - are the key drivers of population and health inequities. To improve health and reduce health inequities, we need to target health-promoting investments to disadvantaged communities.
- **Clean Air:** According to the American Lung Association's 2017 State of the Air report, over 90 percent of Californians live in a county that experiences unhealthy air. Some of the most polluted communities in the country are found in California, and the largest share of harmful air pollution in California comes from transportation sources. It is urgent that we reduce emissions and vehicle miles traveled -- especially in disadvantaged and polluted areas -- to foster healthier communities for all Californians.
- **Reduced Driving and a Shift to Alternative Travel Modes:** The California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans') Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 sets a goal of reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by 15% per capita statewide relative to 2010 levels -- a target that the state is at serious risk of missing. That plan also sets a goal to triple biking and double walking and transit mode shares by 2020 compared to the 2010-12 California Household Travel survey. These funding programs can provide crucial resources to reach these goals.
- **Climate Change:** Regions around the state have set goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through land use and transportation investments, per Senate Bill 375. But they need more resources to meet their goals, and local governments need more incentives. Furthermore, the Air Resources Board's draft Scoping Plan acknowledges that a gap remains between the greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions attainable now from reduced personal-vehicle driving and the reductions that are needed to meet state climate goals. These funding programs can provide crucial resources to reach or at least get closer to these goals.
- **Environmental Mitigation:** We recognize that most of this funding will go to road repair and existing infrastructure meant for driving. However, there should be consideration given to the substantial adverse health impacts of investing in and facilitating greater automobile and truck usage in our regions, and mitigation measures must be taken into account with this funding, especially in disadvantaged communities. These measures should include investments in low-emissions transportation options such as active transportation, public transportation, zero/low-emissions vehicles, carsharing pilots, etc.
- **Affordable Housing and Equal Access to Opportunity:** Across the state, housing production regularly falls far short of the housing needs identified by the Department of Housing and Community Development. As a result, homelessness has surged. Among housed residents, households' budgets are burdened, and regional segregation has worsened as low-income residents are pushed to the fringes. Not only does this tear apart communities, it significantly increases commutes, in one instance more than quadrupling the distance driven. This leads to air and climate pollution and traffic congestion. Solving our transportation challenges and providing access to opportunity requires stabilizing neighborhoods to prevent displacement, and promoting access to affordable homes and transportation choices for Californians of every income.
- **Meet Community Needs:** Far too many Californians live in neighborhoods without access to parks, sidewalks, and other community needs. Many rural disadvantaged communities lack even the most basic civic infrastructure, such as clean water infrastructure. Addressing these needs must be a priority.
- **Conservation and Regional Sustainability:** The State has made cross-agency commitments to improved integration of development and conservation planning and policy (See "Vibrant Communities and Landscapes," Sept. 2016). Yet, similar to VMT reduction, this is an area we are seeing little progress towards our goals.



Increasing urban densities and investment in existing communities rather than new expansive growth is essential to preserving California's beauty and biodiversity, our agricultural economies and food supply, and myriad ecosystem services our landscapes provide, including groundwater recharge, flood abatement, and carbon sequestration.

- **Performance Measures:** SB 1 promotes accountability and all programs should develop performance measures to track intended and actual benefits and impacts of all projects, including goals related to public health and social equity.

The funds should prioritize efforts to bring tangible benefit to disadvantaged communities

Far too often, transportation investments have further burdened low-income communities and communities of color, for instance by dividing neighborhoods with freeways or worsening air quality in already-impacted neighborhoods. These communities have also often not shared in the benefits of investments, as transportation dollars flow elsewhere while infrastructure serving their neighborhoods is lacking. The scoring criteria for the entire pot of funding should reward efforts that will benefit disadvantaged communities. Set-asides in each program should ensure that a certain percentage of the funds go to efforts that make serving disadvantaged communities central to the work. In addition, project applicants should have to demonstrate how they will mitigate environmental, health and other burdens imposed upon disadvantaged communities by building projects funded by SB 1. If a project is within the top 25% of CalEnviroScreen scores, it should have to identify how it will minimize these burdens.

Application questions should ask about public health, environmental justice, social equity and other impacts of building transportation projects.

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) is one of the few transportation programs that asked questions about how a project will improve public health, benefit disadvantaged communities and reduce injuries and fatalities. We encourage the CTC to require similar questions in applications for other funding programs, even those that do not directly fund walking and bicycling projects. This will help ensure that public health and social equity considerations are taken into account in project selection.

The funds should seek to catalyze policy, systems and environmental change

Due to the magnitude of the challenge, these funds should not be used for the next step in business-as-usual planning. Instead, they should fund innovation and effective strategies that will have a real impact on the results, including greater integration of public health, health equity and social justice.

The funds should be consistent with other state plans and policies

There are numerous state plans and policies that encompass transportation funding, including the California Transportation Plan 2040, Caltrans Sustainability Master Plan, State Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (Toward an Active California), the Toward Zero Deaths Initiative, ARB Scoping Plan, and Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines. These funding programs should promote consistency with those programs and advance the goals contained therein, especially those related to improving public health and social justice.

The program design should build knowledge through inclusive dialogue

The program design should promote dialogue and learning between experts, state agency staff, and different regions to advance the spread of leading practices. In particular, the programs should seek to meaningfully engage residents who know their community best, and they should encourage MPOs and local jurisdictions to do the same.

The program design should reward and incentivize successful implementation

The program should seek to fund high-performing regions and localities and reward success. Programs should consider the results of recent planning and fund regions and localities whose planning is leading in the right direction.

The funds should promote integrated strategies

It's not enough to do one thing well. For regions to succeed at meeting the state's goals above, they will need to address climate, driving, advance equity, conserve landscapes, and improve public health.



Grant Program Components

We recommend the grant program make the following activities eligible:

- Active transportation infrastructure (in programs besides ATP)
- Non-infrastructure education and encouragement programs
- Planning activities that incorporate public health
- Health impact assessments
- Climate adaptation and resilience
- Affordable housing production
- Scenario planning modeling of public health impacts
- Spending regional transportation funds on alternatives to driving
- Other strategies identified in Appendix K of the Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines (public health strategies)
- Community engagement in disadvantaged communities
- Technical assistance for disadvantaged communities seeking to apply for these programs

SPECIFIC PROGRAM TALKING POINTS

State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)

- Complete Streets - SB 1 called out that all projects to the extent feasible should incorporate complete streets, we ask that this be called out clearly and include recommendations for high standards of facilities
- Climate resiliency, advanced materials and technologies on all projects where feasible was also called out in SB 1
- These projects should improve public health and reduce health inequities in communities

Local Streets and Roads Program

- Complete Streets - SB 1 called out that all projects to the extent feasible should incorporate complete streets, we ask that this be called out clearly and include recommendations for high standards of facilities
- Climate resiliency, advanced materials and technologies on all projects where feasible was also called out in SB 1
- These projects should improve public health and reduce health inequities in communities

Trade Corridor Enhancement Account

- Limit project eligibility to non-general-purpose lane highway capacity, including dedicated freight lanes, managed lanes, operational efficiencies that verifiably mitigate air and climate pollution, and advanced technologies that facilitate zero-emissions freight transportation
- Reduce air quality and health burdens on adjacent communities to trade corridors and hubs
- All competitive programs should have a transparent set of scoring criteria to rank projects
- These projects should improve public health and reduce health inequities in communities

2017 Active Transportation Program Augmentation

- We support funding projects that have already applied and allowing them to use their existing applications. This will save staff resources in putting together another application.



- In future rounds we recommend refinements to the public health and disadvantaged communities questions and greater funding parity for non-infrastructure and planning.

Solutions for Congested Corridors Program

- All competitive programs should have a transparent set of scoring criteria to rank projects
- These projects should improve public health and reduce health inequities in communities

Local Partnership Program

- All competitive programs should have a transparent set of scoring criteria to rank projects
- These projects should improve public health and reduce health inequities in communities

