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Result: Signed into law April 28, 2017

Purpose: California lawmakers on April 6 approved a plan to boost transportation funding by $5.24 billion annually through a combination of motor fuel and vehicle registration increases. The bill, which narrowly passed along mostly party lines, is projected to raise $52.4 billion over the first 10 years, which will be used to fund road and bridge maintenance and improvements, as well as transit and trail infrastructure.
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A case study by the American Road and Transportation Builder’s Transportation Investment Advocacy Center™. TIAC staff researches and prepares detailed case studies of recent successful—and unsuccessful—state and local legislative and ballot initiative campaigns aimed at increasing transportation infrastructure investment. For each case, the studies dig into the politics, issues, media and major players involved in the effort.
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I. History of California Transportation Funding

California has 51,900 miles of state highways and 306,500 miles of locally-owned roads and streets—the second most miles of all states in the country—for a combined total of 332 billion vehicle-miles traveled annually. The state also maintains over 13,000 state bridges. Nearly 20 percent of all imported goods in the United States travel through California’s ports, highways and railways.

Funding Sources

In Fiscal Year 2014/2015, California spent a total of $16.7 billion from a combination of three sources: federal, state and local funding.

Federal funding comprised 21 percent of highway and transit funding.

State spending accounted for 25 percent of highway and transit funding. Revenue is generated from multiple sources, including:

- **Gas Tax**: Prior to the passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB 1), the California state gas tax was comprised of two parts—a flat excise tax of 18 cents-per-gallon, and an additional variable-rate component.
  - The “Fuel Tax Swap” of 2010 resulted in an “adjustable” gas tax that added a 2.25 percent sales tax on motor fuel purchases (reduced from the state’s 6 per-cent general sales tax). To ensure the sales tax percentage on motor fuel does not affect overall cost of taxes paid at the pump when compared to the previous tax structure, the state’s excise tax on fuel is adjusted annually so that any change in the variable-rate percentage is revenue neutral.
  - Prior to SB 1, the combined state gas tax was being charged at 27.8 cents-per-gallon.
- **Sales Tax on Diesel**: A 9.25 percent state sales and use tax is applied to the sale of diesel fuel. Only 6.5 percent applies to transportation funding.
- **Truck Weight Fees**: A fee is assessed on commercial vehicles based on gross weight of the vehicle. The nearly $1 billion generated by this fee is used to pay for transportation bond debt (below).
- **2006 Proposition 1B Bond**: The 2006 Bond Act approved $19.9 billion to be used for “congestion relief, goods movement facilitation, air quality improvement, and safety and security enhancements to the transportation network”.
- **Vehicle License, Registration, and Driver License Fees**: Revenue from these fees is allocated to the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and the Department of Motor Vehicles for traffic law enforcement and regulations.

Local funding provided 54 percent of total highway and transit funding. Cities and counties are given the ability to implement a local sales tax for transportation purposes through a referendum, which must receive two-thirds support from voters to be enacted. The Transportation Development Act of 1971 initiated a statewide 0.25 percent sales tax for local transportation funding. Additional local revenue sources include bonds, property-related charges (including property taxes, benefits assessment districts, and developer fees), and local General Fund revenue.
**Road Usage Charge Pilot Program:** In 2014 the state legislature passed Senate Bill 1077 to begin a pilot program that will test the viability of charging California drivers by the number of miles driven, rather than fuel consumption. Originally scheduled to begin January 2017, the administration requested that it begin July 1, 2016. The pilot involved 5,000 vehicles statewide and lasted for nine months. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) will provide recommendations to the state legislature in the summer of 2017.

**II. Lead-Up to Senate Bill 1 (2017)**

**Transportation Fund Shortfall**

In February 2016 California’s Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) determined that the state highways had an ongoing funding need of $3.6 billion annually, $1.6 billion short of existing funding, with a backlog of needed repairs totaling $12 billion. The total unfunded need was estimated to be around $50 billion.

The CTC adopted a five-year transportation funding plan in June 2016 that cut or delayed $1.5 billion in highway, bridge and transit projects. The plan cut $754 million in projects from CTC’s current transportation budget. An additional $755 million in planned projects was delayed until 2019-20 or 2020-21. The cuts came after a drop in the price of gasoline, affecting the amount of revenue generated by the state’s “adjustable” gas tax.

**Previous Attempts**

The transportation funding gap was a leading topic of conversation in the state legislature for several years prior to the passage of Senate Bill 1. Gov. Brown had called a two-year special transportation session from 2014 – 2016 meant to stimulate negotiations. Multiple proposals were introduced, but the partisan divide in the legislature prevented real progress for the measures.

Republican lawmakers were adamant that the state utilize existing revenue, rather than raising taxes and fees for new revenues. In the years prior to Senate Bill 1 they proposed redirecting revenue from the state’s cap and trade program, using general fund dollars, streamlining the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and bringing all transportation-related revenue back to the transportation fund that had previously been diverted.

Democratic lawmakers focused their proposals on creating new revenue through increases in taxes and fees, including adjusting the state’s motor fuel taxes, raising vehicle registration fees, and instituting fees on electric and hybrid vehicles.

The disagreement on how to provide the critical transportation investment stalled funding for years. In a Sept. 11, 2015 press conference, Gov. Brown stated, “The roads are going to get fixed. It’s just a question of when.” In November 2016 the Governor, Senate President Pro-Tem, and the Assembly Speaker sent a joint letter to stakeholders stating that transportation would be a priority in 2017.
2016 Local Transportation Ballot Measures

As the 2017 legislative session approached, many advocates pointed to the 2016 general election results as a sign that voters would support increased taxes to address needed transportation improvements. Voters in the state approved 15 of 26 transportation ballot measures worth $135.4 billion, including a 1 cent sales tax in Los Angeles that will provide $120 billion over 40 years for local road, bridge and transit projects. The California measures had to muster at least a two-thirds “super majority” vote to pass—10 of the measures that failed received over 50 percent of the vote, but did not reach that threshold, some by an extremely narrow margin.

In the 2016 general election Democrats achieved supermajority control of both chambers in the state legislature. However, concern arose that moderate Democrats—traditionally from California’s Central Valley and other historically lower-income areas—might be reluctant to increase taxes, and without full party support motor fuel tax legislation may not have enough votes to progress.

Reports

California Research Report from the Road Information Program (TRIP)iii
An August 2016 report by TRIP concluded:

- Deficient roads cost California drivers $53.6 billion in crashes, delays, and additional wear-and-tear on vehicles.
- Traffic accidents claimed the lives of 14,437 people from 2010 to 2014.
- A staggering 37 percent of the state’s roads were in poor or mediocre condition, and 25 percent of bridges showed “significant deterioration or do not meet current design standards” (with 8 percent considered structurally deficient and 17 percent functionally obsolete).
- Vehicle-miles traveled increased by 15 percent from 2000 – 2015.

American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), “2017 Report Card”

The March 2017 annual report by ASCE provided updated numbers during the debate to increase transportation funding. Results of the report included:

- Poor roads cost the average state driver $844 annually in vehicle maintenance costs.
- Fifty percent of the 195,834 miles of public roads are in poor condition.

At the end of the California update, ASCE concluded, “…some specific steps must be taken, beginning with increased, long-term, consistent investment.”
III. Passage of Senate Bill 1

California lawmakers on April 6 approved a plan to boost transportation funding by $5.24 billion annually through a combination of motor fuel and vehicle registration increases. The bill, which narrowly passed along mostly party lines, is projected to raise $52.4 billion over the first 10 years, which will be used to fund road and bridge maintenance and improvements, as well as transit and trail infrastructure. The bill also indexes the tax to inflation starting in 2020.

The approval of Senate Bill 1 will:

- Increase the state gas tax by 12 cents-per-gallon and the diesel tax by 20 cents-per-gallon, with an additional 4 percent increase in the diesel sales tax, beginning Nov. 1, 2017.
- Eliminate the current Board of Equalization “Gas Tax Swap” formula for a variable-rate motor fuel tax based on annual changes to the Consumer Price Index beginning July 1, 2019.
- Create a Transportation Improvement Fee based on the market value of the vehicle beginning Jan. 1, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Vehicle</th>
<th>Annual Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $4,999</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $59,999</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 and higher</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on depreciated value of vehicle. Values not adjusted for inflation in the future.

- Implement a Zero-Emission Vehicle Fee of $100 for electric vehicles beginning in 2020 for model year 2020 or later.
- Also include transportation improvement fee breakdown based on value of the vehicle starting in 2018
- Require the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to generate up to $100 million in department efficiencies, overseen by the newly-created Transportation Inspector General.

Legislation to change taxes must be approved by a two-thirds majority in California. State Democrats recently secured two-thirds majority in both chambers of the legislature, but several voiced hesitation on giving their support. The hours leading up to passage involved vigorous negotiations, including allocating some of the new revenue for specific transportation projects, such as increasing HOV lanes, bringing commuter rail to California’s Central Valley, and creating a direct route from a state highway to a state university campus. Senate Bill 1 passed the California Senate shortly after 7pm PT with a vote of 27-11, with only one Republican voting in favor of the bill and one Democrat opposed to the plan. The California Assembly subsequently approved the bill 54-26 at 10:40 pm PT, with one Democrat voting against the bill and no Republicans supporting the bill.
In addition to Senate Bill 1, California lawmakers also approved **Assembly Constitutional Amendment 5**, a bill that will prohibit the legislature from borrowing revenue generated by all taxes and fees on motor vehicles for non-transportation purposes. A transportation fund “lockbox” was already in place to prevent revenue derived from gasoline and diesel excise taxes and vehicle registration fees from being utilized for non-transportation purposes. The bill will go before state voters in the June 2018 Primary Election for final approval.

Gov. Jerry Brown (D) strongly championed for this legislation since the plan was introduced on March 29. The governor appeared before both chambers during legislative committee hearings as well as in the districts of state lawmakers who voiced hesitation about signing on to the bill. Gov. Brown signed the bill into law on April 28.

---

**Figure 1:** Transportation Revenue Increases, from June 8 LAO report.

**Figure 2**

**Transportation Revenue Increases**

*Total: $5.2 Billion*

- Transportation Improvement Fee
- Gasoline Excise Tax
- Diesel Excise Tax
- Diesel Sales Tax
- ZEV Registration Fee

*a Reflects average annual increase over the next ten years. ZEV = zero-emission vehicle.*
Figure 4
Formulas for Distributing New Transportation Revenues

Figure 2 - Formulas for Distributing New Transportation Revenue, from June 8 LAO report.iv

Figure 5
Transportation Spending Increases
(In Billions)

Figure 3 - Transportation Spending Increases, from June 8 LAO report.iv
**Legislative Makeup**

At the time of the package’s passage, California’s governor (Jerry Brown) was Democrat, and the legislature was majority Democrat. Of the 120 members, 67.5 percent—the minimum needed to pass tax increase legislation—voted to pass the bill, while 31 percent voted against it (two legislators did not vote).

- There were 82 Democrats in the California State Legislature, with 80 voting in favor of SB 1 and 2 opposed.
- There were 38 Republicans in California State Legislature, with one voting in favor of SB 1 and 35 opposed. (Two Republicans were absent, or did not vote.)

See Appendix B for legislator votes.
IV. Key Players

Supporters

Arguments

- Delaying road maintenance leads to larger problems that are costlier to deal with down the road.
- Congestion is negatively impacting most Californians’ quality of life.
- Recent bad weather illustrated the poor state of California’s roads and bridges, such as bridge failure and road closures in the popular Big Sur area due to large amounts of rain.
- Revenue needs to be reliable, long-term funding in order to aid with future project planning and avoid the need to revisit transportation funding in the future.
- The fairest way to raise the revenue is through those that use the roads.
- The cost of the gas tax increase to residents will be offset by money saved from less wear-and-tear on vehicles.

Players

- Gov. Jerry Brown (D)
- “Fix Our Roads” coalition (see Appendix C for coalition members)
- California Senate President Pro-Tem Kevin DeLeon (D)
- California Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon (D)
- California Sen. Jim Beal (D)
- California Assemblyman Jim Frazier (D)
- Newspaper Editorial Boards throughout the state

Campaign

The “Fix Our Roads” coalition ran a targeted campaign to increase public support and convince reluctant lawmakers to vote in favor of SB 1. The group did extensive polling, traditional and social media outreach (in both English and Spanish), held rallies, and more to generate interest in the bill.

The Fix Our Roads coalition spent over $1 million in advertising in the weeks leading up to the April 6 vote with heavy targeting of Moderate Democrats or Democrats who had

Figure 4- Statewide radio and television ads were used to generate public interest in support of SB 1. In eight districts with uncertain lawmakers, ads were run asking their constituents to appeal directly to them.
voiced a reluctance to support the legislation. Members of the Fix Our Roads Coalition also had eight press conferences (two at the State Capitol) in the month leading up to the vote. These press conferences were held throughout the state and to show legislators that they had support from local labor, elected officials, and local business.

In addition to covering state issues, the campaign also raised awareness of the local impact of a state gas tax. The website encouraged visitors to click on their state legislative district to see what road projects have been canceled or delayed due to lack of funding, how that will affect the district’s jobs and economy, and the lost revenue for cities in that district due to the current gas tax formula.

For details on polling by the California Alliance for Jobs, see APPENDIX A: California Alliance for Jobs-State Transportation Funding (page 13).

\[\text{Figure 5: Seven principles of SB 1, from the "Fix Our Roads" website.}\]

\textbf{Opponents}

\textbf{Arguments}

- Californians already pay one of the highest gas taxes in the nation, and the increase would negatively impact low-income residents. New revenue could be found without a tax increase.
- Caltrans has adequate funding but is inefficient with managing the revenue, and construction processes need to be streamlined to help projects be completed more quickly.
- The bill was pushed through the legislature too quickly in order to meet an artificial deadline.
Proposed projects do not include lane-expansion to address congestion.

Players

- State Republican party
- Howard Johnson Taxpayers Association

V. Why the Bill Succeeded

Governor as a champion

Gov. Jerry Brown made the state’s critical transportation infrastructure needs a rallying call for his governorship. Throughout the years he worked closely with lawmakers, researchers and advocates to study the condition of California’s roads and bridges and make recommendations on the best methods to improve them.

At the time of SB 1, Gov. Brown increased his campaign and threw his support behind the bill, including holding multiple public rallies, speaking before legislative committees, meeting with reluctant lawmakers, and traveling to the districts of legislators who were on the fence about supporting the bill.

Legislative champions

Prior to the 2016 General Election, partisan divide prevented the legislature from moving forward on a bill to provide needed transportation revenue. Once the Democratic Party gained supermajority control of the legislature they moved forward with their priority of improving the state’s roads and bridges.

Several lawmakers championed an increase in transportation funding. Having advocates on the floors of both chambers enabled gave the bill an additional advantage, as legislators were campaigning until the moment the bill was called to get enough votes for passage.

Proven need

Numerous reports by both non-partisan legislative organizations and advocacy groups reinforced the dire state of California’s transportation fund. This message became amplified after an unusual amount of rainfall lead to severe damage among several of the state’s most heavily-traveled roads and bridges. The amount of revenue going into emergency repairs increased, and the situation brought to light the delayed maintenance and repairs that are needed to ensure the state’s transportation infrastructure could handle such extreme weather.

Active Coalition with Effective Messaging
The “Fix Our Roads” coalition played a proactive, engaged role in advocating for increased transportation funding and generating support for SB 1. Messaging focused on the economic benefits of increased funding and the delayed action by state lawmakers. The coalition had broad support from transportation industry professionals, business, public officials, labor, and local government, ensuring the message received a wide audience and guaranteed lawmakers of their support.
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APPENDIX B: Legislative Votes

Senate

“Yes” Votes
Sen. Ben Allen (D - District 26)
Sen. Toni Atkins (D - District 39)
Sen. James Beall Jr. (D - District 15)
Sen. Steven Bradford (D - District 35)
Sen. Anthony Cannella (R - District 12)
Sen. Kevin de Leon (D - District 24)
Sen. Bill Dodd (D - District 3)
Sen. Cathleen Galgiani (D - District 5)
Sen. Edward Hernandez (D - District 22)
Sen. Robert Herzberg (D - District 18)
Sen. Gerald Hill (D - District 13)
Sen. Ben Hueso (D - District 40)
Sen. Hannah-Beth Jackson (D - District 19)
Sen. Ricardo Lara (D - District 33)
Sen. Connie M. Leyva (D - District 20)
Sen. Mike McGuire (D - District 2)
Sen. Tony Mendoza (D - District 32)
Sen. Holly Mitchell (D - District 30)
Sen. Bill Monning (D - District 17)
Sen. Josh Newman (D - District 29)
Sen. Richard Pan (D - District 6)
Sen. Anthony Portantino, Jr. (D - District 25)
Sen. Richard Roth (D - District 31)
Sen. Nancy Skinner (D - District 9)
Sen. Henry Stern (D - District 27)
Sen. Bob Wieckowski (D - District 10)
Sen. Scott Wiener (D - District 11)

Didn’t Vote
Sen. Joel Anderson (R - District 38)
Sen. Tom Berryhill (R - District 8)

“No” Votes
Sen. Patricia C. Bates (R - District 36)
Sen. Jean Fuller (R - District 16)
Sen. Ted Gaines (R - District 1)
Sen. Steve Glazer (D - District 7)
Sen. John Moorlach (R - District 37)
Sen. Mike Morrell (R - District 23)
Sen. Janet Nguyen (R - District 34)
Sen. Jim Nielsen (R - District 4)
Sen. Jeff Stone (R - District 28)
Sen. Andy Vidak (R - District 28)
Sen. Scott Wilk (R - District 21)

Assembly

“Yes” Votes
Assemblyman Cecilia Aguilar-Curry (D - District 4)
Assemblyman Joaquin Arambula (D - District 31)
Assemblyman Marc Berman (D - District 24)
Assemblyman Richard Bloom (D - District 50)
Assemblyman Raul Bocanegra (D - District 39)
Assemblyman Rob Bonta (D - District 18)
Assemblyman Autumn Burke (D - District 62)
Assemblyman Anna Caballero (D - District 30)
Assemblyman Ian Charles Calderon (D - District 57)
Assemblyman Sabrina Cervantes (D - District 60)
Assemblyman Edwin Chau (D - District 49)
Assemblyman David Chiu (D - District 17)
Assemblyman Kansen Chu (D - District 25)
Assemblyman Ken Cooley (D - District 8)
Assemblyman Jim Cooper (D - District 9)
Assemblyman Matt Dababneh (D - District 45)
Assemblyman Tom Daly (D - District 69)
Assemblyman Susan Talamantes Eggman (D - District 13)
Assemblyman Jim Frazier (D - District 11)
Assemblyman Laura Friedman (D - District 43)
Assemblyman Cristina Garcia (D - District 58)
Assemblyman Eduardo Garcia (D - District 56)
Assemblyman Mike Gipson (D - District 64)
Assemblyman Todd Gloria (D - District 78)
Assemblyman Jimmy Gomez (D - District 51)
Assemblyman Lorena Gonzalez (D - District 80)
Assemblyman Adam Gray (D - District 21)
Assemblyman Tim Grayson (D - District 14)
Assemblyman Chris Holden (D - District 41)
Assemblyman Jacqui Irwin (D - District 44)
Assemblyman Reginald Jones-Sawyer (D - District 59)
Assemblyman Ash Kalra (D - District 27)
Assemblyman Marc Levine (D - District 10)
Assemblyman S. Monique Limón (D - District 37)
Assemblyman Evan Low (D - District 28)
Assemblyman Kevin McCarty (D - District 7)
Assemblyman Jose Medina (D - District 61)
Assemblyman Kevin Mullin (D - District 22)
Assemblyman Al Muratsuchi (D - District 66)
Assemblyman Adrin Nazarian (D - District 46)
Assemblyman Patrick O'Donnell (D - District 70)
Assemblyman Bill Quirk (D - District 20)
Assemblyman Sharon Quirk-Silva (D - District 65)
Assemblyman Eloise Reyes (D - District 47)
Assemblyman Sebastian Ridley-Thomas (D - District 54)
Assemblyman Freddie Rodriguez (D - District 52)
Assemblyman Blanca Rubio (D - District 48)
Assemblyman Miguel Santiago (D - District 53)
Assemblyman Mark Stone (D - District 29)
Assemblyman Tony Thurmond (D - District 15)
Assemblyman Phil Ting (D - District 19)
Assemblyman Shirley Weber (D - District 79)
Assemblyman Jim Wood (D - District 2)

Assemblyman Anthony Rendon (D - District 63)

No Votes
Assemblyman Dante Acosta (R - District 38)
Assemblyman Travis Allen (R - District 72)
Assemblyman Catharine Baker (R - District 16)
Assemblyman Frank Bigelow (R - District 5)
Assemblyman William Brough (R - District 73)
Assemblyman Rocky Chávez (R - District 76)
Assemblyman Phillip Chen (R - District 55)
Assemblyman Steven S. Choi (R - District 68)
Assemblyman Jordan Cunningham (R - District 35)
Assemblyman Brian Dahle (R - District 1)
Assemblyman Heath Flora (R - District 12)
Assemblyman Vince Fong (R - District 34)
Assemblyman James Gallagher (R - District 3)
Assemblyman Matthew Harper (R - District 74)
Assemblyman Kevin Kiley (R - District 6)
Assemblyman Tom Lackey (R - District 36)
Assemblyman Brian Maienschein (R - District 77)
Assemblyman Devon Mathis (R - District 26)
Assemblyman Chad Mayes (R - District 42)
Assemblyman Melissa Melendez (R - District 67)
Assemblyman Jay Obernolte (R - District 33)
Assemblyman Jim Patterson (R - District 23)
Assemblyman Rudy Salas (D - District 32)
Assemblyman Marc Steinorth (R - District 40)
Assemblyman Randy Voepel (R - District 71)
Assemblyman Marie Waldron (R - District 75)
APPENDIX C: “Fix Our Roads” Coalition Members

**BUSINESS**
California Chamber of Commerce
American Council of Engineering Companies – California
Associated General Contractors of California
United Contractors
California Construction and Industrial Materials Association
California Asphalt Pavement Association
Engineering Contractors Association
Bay Area Council
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County Business Federation (LA BizFed)
Golden State Gateway Coalition
East Bay Leadership Council
Associated General Contractors, San Diego Chapter
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Silicon Valley Organization
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
Orange County Business Council
Santa Cruz County Business Council
South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
Redwood City/San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce
Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce
Western States Trucking Association
Flasher Barricade Association
Granite Construction Co.
Caterpillar
Solar Tubines
California Nevada Cement Association

California Chapters of the National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA)
Southern California Contractors Association
Southern California Partnership For Jobs
United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW)
Western States Council

**TRANSPORTATION**
Transportation California
California Transit Association
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Self-Help Counties Coalition
California Rural Counties Task Force
Napa Valley Transportation Authority
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
Solano Transportation Authority
Lake County/City Area Planning Council
Transportation Agency for Monterey County
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments
Merced County Association of Governments
Mendocino Council of Governments
Humboldt County Association of Governments
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Council of San Benito County Governments
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Trinity County Department of Transportation

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT**
League of California Cities
California State Association of Counties
California Association of Councils of Governments
Southern California Association of Governments
Urban Counties Caucus
North State Super Region
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Gateway Cities Council of Governments
Cities Association of Santa Clara County
Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority
California Chapters of the American Public Works Association
MuniServices
Alameda County
Alpine County
Amador County
Calaveras County
Del Norte County
Glenn County
Humboldt County
Imperial County
Inyo County
Kings County
Lake County
Los Angeles County
Marin County
Mariposa County
Mendocino County
Mono County
Monterey County
Napa County
Nevada County
Riverside County
Sacramento County
San Joaquin County
San Mateo County
Santa Barbara County
Santa Clara County
Santa Cruz County
Shasta County
Sierra County
Solano County
Sonoma County
Tuolumne County
Ventura County
Yolo County
Yuba County
City of Alameda
City of Albany
City of American Canyon
City of Arcata
City of Arroyo Grande
City of Azusa
City of Bellflower
City of Belvedere
City of Brentwood
City of Brisbane
City of Buelton
City of Buena Park
City of Capitola
City of Carpinteria
City of Cathedral City
City of Ceres
City of Cerritos
City of Chino
City of Chino Hills
City of Cloverdale
City of Coachella
City of Colton
City of Concord
City of Corona
City of Costa Mesa
City of Crescent City
City of Cudahy
City of Cupertino
City of Daly City
City of Danville
City of Davis
City of Delano
City of Diamond Bar
City of Dinuba
City of Downey
City of Dublin
City of El Centro
City of Encinitas
City of Fillmore
City of Fort Bragg
City of Fremont
City of Garden Grove
City of Gardena
City of Glendale
City of Goleta
City of Gonzales
City of Grass Valley
City of Grover Beach
City of Gustine
City of Hayward
City of Hercules
City of Hillsborough
City of Hollister
City of Indian Wells
City of Indio
City of King City
City of La Mirada
City of Lafayette
City of Laguna Beach
City of Lakeport
City of Lakewood
City of Livermore
City of Lodi
City of Lompoc
City of Long Beach
City of Los Angeles
City of Lynwood
City of Madera
City of Marina
City of Martinez
City of Menifee
City of Menlo Park
City of Mill Valley
City of Modesto
City of Monterey
City of Moorpark
City of Moraga
City of Moreno Valley
City of Morgan Hill
City of Morro Bay
City of Mountain View
City of Oakley
City of Ontario
City of Orland
City of Pacific Grove
City of Pacifica
City of Palos Verdes Estates
City of Petaluma
City of Pico Rivera
City of Pittsburg
City of Placentia
City of Pomona
City of Rancho Cucamonga
City of Rio Dell
City of Riverbank
City of Rohnert Park
City of Sacramento
City of Salinas
City of San Buenaventura
City of San Carlos
City of San Gabriel
City of San Jose
City of San Leandro
City of San Luis Obispo
City of San Rafael
City of Santa Barbara
City of Santa Cruz
City of Santa Maria
City of Santa Monica
City of Santa Paula
City of Santa Rosa
City of Sausalito
City of Scotts Valley
City of Signal Hill
City of Solana Beach
City of Solvang
City of South Gate
City of Stockton
City of Suisun City
City of Thousand Oaks
City of Torrance
City of Tracy
City of Tulare
City of Turlock
City of Ukiah
City of Union City
City of Vallejo
City of Ventura
City of Vernon
City of Walnut Creek
City of Waterford
City of Windsor
City of Yountville
City of Yreka

ELECTED OFFICIALS
Mayor Aja Brown, City of Compton
Supervisor Robert Rivas, County of San Benito
Council Member Gregorio Gomez, City of Farmersville
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