



CALIFORNIA ECONOMIC SUMMIT 2013

INFRASTRUCTURE ACTION TEAM RESEARCH SUMMARY

THE EXPERTS' PERSPECTIVE ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE CHALLENGE

July 25, 2013

An infrastructure crisis is looming at the national, state, and local levels. California faces a 10-year, \$765 billion infrastructure deficit—some \$500 billion is in transportation alone. State resources cannot fill this gap, and both state and local governments lack adequate tools to address the challenge.

For the last 15 years, experts have wrestled with this problem, offering proposals that range from creating new state agencies to dramatically changing the State's tax structure.

These recommendations have three things in common: California's infrastructure system should be focused on achieving measurable results, the State's solution should be integrated, and new ways to pay for vital infrastructure projects must be found.

California Forward has incorporated these attributes into a draft [Smart Infrastructure Strategy for California](#), which proposes to build on the best thinking across California to guide the state policymakers toward a comprehensive infrastructure plan based on these key elements:

- 1. Focus on results.** California should spend its scarce resources on investments with the highest return on investment supporting long-term job growth, environmental sustainability and community equity.
- 2. Assign responsibility and integrate efforts.** The State's infrastructure investments should not be walled off into their usual silos. Infrastructure investment is a shared responsibility among governments—including state, regional, and local government entities.
- 3. Find new ways to pay for it.** The traditional method of financing public facilities investments—with voters approving bonds and relying on existing tax revenues to pay off the debt—is putting too much pressure on the state budget. Now is the time to look for new ways to pay for the State's infrastructure investments.

There is much work to be done. In the Pew Center on the States' [most recent report](#) on state government performance, California's infrastructure system received a B-, with internal coordination and maintenance, in particular, receiving poor grades.

The following pages capture the experts' recommendations for addressing these issues, including a range of specific policy proposals that may be worth the consideration of the 2013 California Economic Summit Infrastructure Action Team. A summary of these recommendations can be found on pg. 10. Sources consulted are on pg. 11.

1. FOCUS ON RESULTS. California should spend its scarce resources on investments with the highest return on investment supporting long-term job growth, environmental sustainability and community equity.

THE CHALLENGE

The State should be transparent in how it makes decisions about where to invest these resources, and it should identify the return on each investment. To accomplish this, the State will need a robust system for tracking results; including metrics that will allow the public to track progress toward individual program goals, as well as how projects are supporting a triple bottom line.

HOW TO GET THERE: PAST RECOMMENDATIONS

Spend resources on investments that support long-term growth. Be transparent about how choices are made and the return on each investment:

- **National Research Council (1996):** “Measuring infrastructure performance is an essential step toward making decisions aimed at achieving higher performance and improved use of these valuable assets... Local and regional agencies with responsibilities for infrastructure management should explicitly define a comprehensive set of performance measures and set aside funds sufficient to sustain an adequate performance measurement process.”
- **Treasurer Phil Angelides’s “Smart Investments” report (1999):** “Good investment policy dictates that the nature and exact level of public investment should be driven by a set of principles guiding California’s future economic growth, not by a ‘magic’ percentage of the State’s budget or a laundry list of capital projects desired by various agencies...Every dollar invested in support of the [state’s] goals must be viewed as a precious resource...Therefore hard questions must be asked:
 - Is the investment proposal consistent with growth principles that best ensure California’s long-term economic, environmental, and social strength?
 - Is it the most effective means of achieving the desired result?
 - Will it provide an adequate return on investment?
 - Will it protect or enhance already existing assets?”
- **“The California Infrastructure Initiative” – David Dowall, UC-Berkeley (2008):** “An outcomes-oriented approach to infrastructure service provision allows governments to explore various ways of delivering desired outcomes, including alternatives that don’t involve capital investments...It has the potential to deliver significant payoffs, such as faster and most cost-effective delivery of projects, value for money invested, and the possibility of attracting private capital for infrastructure investment.” Some of the Initiative’s proposals include:
 - *Visioning:* “Currently, California does not engage in the preparation of strategic development plans, visioning processes, or multi-sector investment planning...The governor’s office has acknowledged the limits of the current ‘silo approach’ to capital investment planning.”
 - *Examining alternatives:* “California agencies are not currently required to [explore different ways to meeting desired outcomes] as a component of their budgets.”
 - *Ensuring value for money:* “The process should be an ongoing one at all stages of government procurement, management, and operation...California does not currently have legislation requiring value-for-money audits or assessments of alternative procurement methods. The concept can be applied to all approaches to infrastructure delivery—public provision, design-build, outsourcing, and P3s.”

- *Promoting demand aggregation:* “One piece of low-hanging fruit, in terms of ensuring value for money, is demand aggregation. When multiple locations are buying similar products or services, demand aggregation—coordinating and consolidating purchases—offers benefits for both buyers and suppliers...In California, demand aggregation is practiced, but not to the fullest extent possible. PBI California could expand demand aggregation across state agencies and promote it at the local and regional level.”
- *Providing technical assistance:* “The State should consider forming a [California Infrastructure Initiative] office to build management capacity within state agencies and local governments.”
- **An example in practice: [GoCalifornia Action Plan \(2004\)](#) & [California Transportation Commission \(2011\)](#):** *GoCalifornia* was a mobility Action Plan designed in 2004 to decrease congestion, improve travel times, and preserve and enhance the State’s existing transportation networks. The California Transportation Commission Statewide transportation needs assessment (2011) has largely adopted this approach, which includes an extensive set of performance measures that provide a process that will allow the Commission and Caltrans to evaluate and monitor the degree to which the transportation system meets the goals and objectives for improved mobility.

To accomplish this, the State needs a robust system for tracking results, including metrics that track progress toward individual program goals.

- **[National Research Council \(1996\)](#):** “No adequate, single measure of performance has been identified, nor should there be expectation that one will emerge. Infrastructure systems are built and operated to meet basic but varied and complex social needs. Their performance must therefore be measured in the context of social objectives and the multiplicity of stakeholders who use and are affected by infrastructure systems...The specific measures that communities use...may often be grouped into three broad categories: Effectiveness, reliability, and cost.”
- **“[The California Infrastructure Initiative](#)” - David Dowall, UC-Berkeley (2008):** “Decisions about infrastructure planning, delivery, and management should be guided by outcome-oriented measures rather than input or budget amounts. Outcomes such as the quality of services and how they are valued by customers should be measured in economic terms so that comparisons can be made across sectors among alternative projects.”
- **An example in practice: [GoCalifornia Action Plan \(2004\)](#) & [California Transportation Commission \(2011\)](#):**
 - *GoCalifornia* included a range of strategies for achieving measurable progress on these performance measures—including system monitoring and evaluation, maintenance and preservation, smart land-use/demand management/value pricing, and intelligent transportation systems, as well as operational improvements and system completion.
 - The California Transportation Commission’s [2011 Statewide Transportation Needs Assessment](#) sought input from 18 MPOs to identify a set of 12 performance measures across a range of desired outcomes. (See table 1-2 from CTC, next page.)

Table 1-2. Statewide Transportation Needs Assessment - Selected Performance Measures

SMART MOBILITY 2010 GOALS	CATEGORIES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES
Robust Economy	Employment	Increase in jobs
Robust Economy	Economic Output	Value added to Gross State Product
Reliable Mobility	Multimodal Travel Mobility	Change in average per-trip travel time
Reliable Mobility	Asset Condition	Conformance with accepted standards for maintaining system in state of good repair
Environmental Stewardship	Climate and Energy Conservation	Systemwide Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita
Environmental Stewardship	Emissions Reductions	Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per capita
Environmental Stewardship	Air Quality/Public Health	Criteria Pollutant emissions per capita
Social Equity	Equitable Distribution of Access and Mobility	Comparison of outcomes for Low Income and Minority (LIM) and non-LIM communities
Health and Safety	Multimodal Safety	Number of injuries and fatalities per capita from all collisions (including bicycle and pedestrian)
Health and Safety	Pedestrian and Bicycle Mode Share	Percent of total trips per capita taken by biking or walking
Location Efficiency	Support for Sustainable Growth	Percent of total dwelling units in Transit Priority Areas
Location Efficiency	Transit Mode Share	Percent of total trips per capita taken by transit

Another place to start: Regional metrics

- National Research Council (1996):** “Each region with infrastructure decision-making authority should establish a system for continuing data collection to give performance assessment a more quantitative basis and enable longer term performance monitoring. Metropolitan areas with basic databases and modeling tools already in place should seek to integrate information on separate infrastructure modes into a uniform and accessible system, such that existing data sets are documented in consistent ways, within the context of relevant national data collection activities.”

2. ASSIGN RESPONSIBILITY AND INTEGRATE EFFORTS. The State's infrastructure investments should not be walled off into their usual silos. Infrastructure investment is a shared responsibility among governments—including state, regional, and local government entities.

THE CHALLENGE

To meet California's infrastructure needs, the State's network of governments must integrate their efforts and provide those with infrastructure responsibility with the financing authority they need to properly manage these projects. The State should also look at how to spend every dollar—whether it is intended for community colleges or public transit projects—with an eye on achieving the State's goals of economic sustainability, environmental protection, and community equity.

HOW TO GET THERE: PAST RECOMMENDATIONS

The State must connect infrastructure responsibilities with financing authority to meet the State's diverse infrastructure needs.

- [California Business Roundtable \(1998\)](#): “Greater authority should be provided to state and local agencies to pursue entrepreneurial partnerships for the development of public capital facilities, particularly in the transportation sector.”
- [Think Long Committee for California \(2011\)](#): “Closing the state's infrastructure deficit must be a coordinated effort so that the interconnections between localities, regions, and the State as a whole are as cost-efficient as possible...Major ideas include rigorous evaluation of alternatives [and] devolution of planning and prioritization to the local and regional level where possible.” Specifically, Think Long proposed the following:
 - *Public Infrastructure Advisory Commission*: “The state should task a fully resourced Public Infrastructure Advisory Commission with establishing a framework for innovating funding mechanisms and developing partnerships. It should do so initially by: restoring the balance among local, regional, and state interests, which allows local and regional areas to control their own future when considering the approval of infrastructure projects; incentivizing the 19 transportation ‘self-help’ regions to leverage resources in ways that promote local/regional infrastructure and economic development priorities.”
- **“3-D Infrastructure” – Mark Pisano, former SCAG director (2013)**: “When viewing all of the transformational changes that the economy will work through over the next 25 years, what emerges will be a more efficient growth pattern and infrastructure investments... We will change from the 3-C world of infrastructure: centralized, capital intensive and controlled by hierarchy, to the 3-D world: diversified, distributed, and decentralized.” To take advantage of this, Pisano proposes the following:
 - *Encourage more Public Benefit Corporations*. To provide regional forums for all of the stakeholders interested in an infrastructure project, Pisano would like the State to encourage the creation of more Public Benefit Corporations (PBCs). These quasi-public entities can be established by state and local governments, use the financial tools of the private sector, and then be operated as nonprofits. (One successful example is the [Presidio Trust](#) in San Francisco.)
 - *Create a new “risk assessment” board*. To ensure the financial risks taken on by Public Benefit Corporations are understood and accounted for, Pisano also proposes creating a new Risk Assessment and Mitigations Board (RAMB) that would assess PBC project proposals.

To integrate its efforts, the State should look at how to spend every dollar with an eye on achieving its goals of economic sustainability, environmental protection, and community equity.

- [Treasurer Phil Angelides's "Smart Investments" report \(1999\)](#): "California's economic attractiveness has been and will always be integrally tied to the State's livability and environmental quality. Our infrastructure investments and growth patterns must recognize this reality." The Treasurer offered these specific recommendations:
 - *Sustainable development*: "Sustainable development means land uses that support transportation options beyond more freeways and roads; a better mix of housing in communities and neighborhoods; locating jobs near housing and balancing job growth with new housing; communities centered around civic spaces with features such as tree-lined streets and 'human scale' design; more effective, well-planning higher-density use of land; and protection of environmental resources."
- ["The California Infrastructure Initiative" - David Dowall, UC-Berkeley \(2008\)](#): "The legislature has adopted several important pieces of legislation to improve cross-sector coordination and to more closely link investments with statewide strategic goals."
 - *Strategic Growth Council*: "[The SGC has also been charged] with coordinating cross-sector infrastructure investment planning and programming...Legislation requires any revision to the State Environmental Goals and Policy Report [to be reviewed by the Strategic Growth Council] to ensure that changes are consistent with state planning priorities."
 - *AB 32 (2008)*: "AB 32 offers strong incentives to develop smart and sustainable infrastructure plans and programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions."
- ["3-D Infrastructure" - Mark Pisano, former SCAG director \(2013\)](#): "The sustainable communities strategies which flexibly link resource utilization to gain efficiencies and also take advantage of information systems to link users to what they are consuming will generate different infrastructure strategies...Investments that are focused on integrated sustainable communities...should be our priority."
 - *Cap & Trade and Sustainable Communities Strategies*: "We have launched an emission trading program and a sustainable communities initiative. These initiatives could lead to more efficient use of our resources and will also encourage us to look at longer run decision-making. If we align our environmental and fiscal decision-making, the solutions to both initiatives become possible."
- ["Working Landscapes" - Glenda Humiston, USDA Rural Development \(2013\)](#): "Working Landscapes is a broad term that refers to promoting the health of ecosystems as well as the livelihoods that are based on natural resources. Working landscapes initiatives support job-creation and economic growth in areas of the economy that depend on food systems, the emerging bio-based economy, tourism, and other industries tied to working landscapes. Initiatives could include:"
 - *Watershed*: Watershed improvements that increase water supply, improve habitat and reduce fire damage.
 - *City-centered growth*: Support for city-centered growth strategies and farmland protection.
 - *Rural economies*: Increased investment in rural and natural resource-based economies.
 - *Goods movement*: Development of state and regional goods movement infrastructure.

3. FIND NEW WAYS TO PAY FOR INFRASTRUCTURE. The traditional method of financing public facilities investments—with voters approving bonds and relying on existing tax revenues to pay off the debt—is putting too much pressure on the state budget. There simply isn't enough money to do the job right.

THE CHALLENGE

The following options should be considered for financing public infrastructure:

- Public funding including dedicating state, regional and local revenues to infrastructure investments
- Private financing including strengthening the Infrastructure Bank and facilitating the use of private capital invested in public infrastructure

HOW TO GET THERE: PAST RECOMMENDATIONS

Public funding alone can't close the State's infrastructure shortfall. But some additional public resources should be dedicated to infrastructure investments in the form of state, regional, and local revenues.

- Lower local vote thresholds: Local governments could be given the ability to enact, extend, or increase special taxes to fund local transportation projects with 55 percent voter approval.
 - [Treasurer Phil Angelides's "Smart Investments" report \(1999\)](#): "Communities need a majority vote for local capital investments."
 - [Think Long Committee for California \(2011\)](#): "Improve local agency ability to plan for and finance infrastructure by adopting the same rules for local infrastructure and transit districts that we have for schools, where new funding can be approved by local voters with a 55% majority."
 - [California Economic Summit \(2012\)](#): "Give local governments the ability to enact, extend, or increase special taxes to fund local transportation projects with 55% voter approval (including sales taxes, parcel taxes and bond measures)."
- **Expand existing funding sources:** Some existing funding sources supporting infrastructure could be expanded, including:
 - **VLF:** Partially restore the Vehicle License Fee and dedicate to highway and road improvement.
 - [California Economic Summit \(2013\)](#): "Partially restore annual Vehicle License Tax and dedicate funds to transportation."
 - **Gas tax:** Strengthen the state fuel-tax system as a source of transportation funding.
 - [California Economic Summit \(2012\)](#): "Implement the recommendations of the LAO to strengthen the state fuel-tax system as a source of transportation funding by transitioning the current per-gallon gas tax to a mileage and vehicle weight-based tax/fee."
 - **General Obligation bonds:** Require a new dedicated funding source for future state General Obligations bonds.
 - [California Business Roundtable \(1998\)](#): "Require a new dedicated funding source for future state General Obligations bonds...Benefits include improved transparency and governance since voters will know that state bonds aren't 'free' and reduce debt-service costs, which will free up funds for other purposes in the state budget."
 - [Think Long Committee for California \(2011\)](#): "Consistent with the Committee's belief that costs must be transparent and not hidden, [a proposal to lower the local vote threshold] would also require that new dedicated funding sources for future state General Obligation bonds be approved only if voters also approved a new funding source."

- **User fees:** Adopt demand management techniques or user fees for state infrastructure to encourage efficient resource use, conservation, and cost savings.
 - [Think Long Committee for California \(2011\)](#): “Adopt user fees, where appropriate, for infrastructure funding. This can include tolls for peak-hour freeway use and the use of public-private partnerships where the private sector finances and develops public infrastructure in return for user fees.”
 - [California Economic Summit \(2012\)](#): “Follow the recommendations of the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) and others to correct deficiencies in the current state fuel-tax system to provide funding that keeps pace with needs and inflation in an era when fuel efficiency and fuel use are improving rapidly and no longer able to keep pace with transportation funding needs.”
- **Sales tax revenues:** Dedicate a portion of sales tax growth to pay-as-you-go infrastructure financing.
 - [California Business Roundtable \(1998\)](#): “California should dedicate one-quarter cent of the state sales tax for pay-as-you-go infrastructure financing. This could be accomplished by passage of a state constitutional amendment that would remain in effect for a fixed period—say ten years—so that the public could review its effects before deciding whether to continue it.”
- **Consider new funding sources:** A portion of Cap & Trade auction revenues could be reserved for transportation projects.
 - [California Economic Summit \(2013\)](#): “Allocate State’s Cap and Trade revenues derived from vehicle fuels to transportation system needs that achieve greenhouse gas reduction strategies and support sustainable communities.”
 - [California Transportation Coalition \(2013\)](#): “The Coalition has developed a proposal to invest cap and trade revenue to address both the greenhouse gas reduction goals of AB 32 and critical transportation system needs identified in the California Transportation Commission’s Statewide Transportation Needs Assessment over the next ten years. Our uniting principle is that auction revenues derived from vehicle fuels should be used to fund transportation system needs in a way that achieves AB 32 objectives and builds on the framework of SB 375 and other GHG reduction strategies.”

Private financing should be a focus of state infrastructure planning efforts, including strengthening the Infrastructure Bank and facilitating the use of private capital

- **Strengthen infrastructure bank:** The State’s existing I-Bank could play an important role in arranging a large portion of the State’s needed debt-financing.
 - [California Business Roundtable \(1998\)](#): “The State should capitalize the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank and should explore all available options for using the Bank to leverage public and private investment in public infrastructure.”
 - [California Economic Summit \(2012\)](#): “Empower the infrastructure bank with responsibility to advise and assist state and regional agencies in evaluating and negotiating potential infrastructure projects.”
 - [“A Public-Private Infrastructure Cooperative for California” - Julie Kim, Stanford University \(2012\)](#): “The State should reorganize the I-Bank to operate more like a credit union—or ‘I-Cooperative’—allowing the bank to raise money from private sources and vastly increase its lending capacity. If, for example, the I-Bank could raise \$4 billion from private sources—perhaps including some of the largest state pension funds, which might blunt political opposition to the idea—it could then lend out as much as \$40 billion to worthy projects across the State.”
- **Build state systems to support public-private partnerships:**
 - [“The California Infrastructure Initiative” - David Dowall, UC-Berkeley \(2008\)](#): “Support for state agencies and local governments negotiating complex procurement contracts is not now offered in California, but it is an element of [the CII] proposal.”

- [Think Long Committee for California \(2011\)](#): “The State should also create a ‘service bureau’ to work with the Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank to help state and local governments effectively negotiate complex public-private partnership procurement contracts and bundle small infrastructure projects, in order to lower transaction costs.”
- [California Economic Summit \(2012\)](#): “Create a new “center of expertise” to support an array of public-private partnerships across the State.” The Summit also made these legislative recommendations:
 - *Infrastructure Financing Act*: “Revise and clarify the Infrastructure Financing Act to make it easier to administer, manage, and implement public-private partnership programs.”
 - *SB 4 (2009)*: “Renew and extend [the authority for P3 projects beyond the 2016 sunset date.]”
- **Tap private equity**: Tap into what some experts believe could be a roughly \$30 billion private equity market for California infrastructure projects.
 - [“Time is right to tap private infrastructure financing” – Julie Kim, Stanford University](#): “All told, since 2005, private investors have contributed about 20 percent of their own equity in American public-private projects in roads and public transit systems. Assuming that same ratio holds for the \$150 billion worth of California projects that could lend themselves to public-private funding, the State could tap into roughly \$30 billion in private equity. I understand there’s a tremendous resistance to public-private partnerships in the U.S. But many people don’t have a good understanding of it, and a lot of the really important issues aren’t being discussed fully. There’s a way to do this without selling off all of our assets to the private sector.”
- **Consider private activity bonds**: Consider the State’s use of these tax-exempt bonds, which include a \$3.7b annual tax-exempt bonding capacity.
 - [“Time is right to tap private infrastructure financing” – Julie Kim, Stanford University](#): “This is easily accessible, additional capacity the private sector is responsible for. California has just not capitalized on the level of these bonds we can actually issue.”

AT A GLANCE: A COMPREHENSIVE LOOK AT EXPERT RECOMMENDATIONS

"Smart Infrastructure" Elements	How to get there: Past recommendations	CA Econ Summit Initiatives	CA Econ Summit Briefing Book	Think Long	CA Business Round Table	David Dowall, UC-Berkeley	Mark Pisano, former dir SCAG	GoCalifornia & CA Transpo Commission	Julie Kim, Stanford Univ	Nat'l Research Council	Treasurer Phil Angelides Report	Transpo Coalition for Livable Comms	Glenda Humiston - USDA	
		2012	2013	2011	1998	2008	2013	2004/2011	2012	1996	1999	2013	2013	
Focus on results	Spend resources on investments that support long-term growth; be transparent about ROI	X	X			X		X		X	X			
	Develop robust system for tracking results	X	X			X		X		X	X			
Assign responsibility & integrate efforts	Connect financing authority with level of government (local, regional) responsible for investment			X	X		X							
	Integrate state investments, prioritizing spending based on how it achieves state goals of economic sustainability, environmental protection, and community equity					X	X	X			X		X	
Find new ways to pay for it	Public Funding													
	Lower local vote thresholds	X		X							X			
	Expand existing revenues: VLF, gas tax, GO bonds, sales tax revenues, user fees	X	X	X	X									
	Consider new revenues: Cap & Trade		X									X		
	Private Finance													
	Strengthen and reorganize infrastructure bank	X	X	X	X		X			X				
	Build state support for private financing	X	X	X		X	X			X				
	Private equity									X				
Private activity bonds									X					

SOURCES

Chronological order

[“Measuring and Improving Infrastructure Performance,”](#) Committee on Measuring and Improving Infrastructure Performance, National Research Council, 1996

[“Building a Legacy for the Next Generation,”](#) California Business Roundtable, 1998

[“Smart Investments: a special update of California’s Debt Affordability Report,”](#) by Philip Angelides, State Treasurer, 1999

[“GoCalifornia Action Plan,”](#) Hamed Benouar, California Center for Innovative Transportation, University of California-Berkeley, and Randy Iwasaki, California Department of Transportation, 2004

[“Grading the States,”](#) Pew Center on the States: Government Performance Project, 2008

[“The California Infrastructure Initiative,”](#) David E. Dowall, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, UC-Berkeley, and Robin Ried, Department of City and Regional Planning, UC-Berkeley 2008.

[“A Blueprint to Renew California,”](#) Think Long Committee for California, 2011

[“2011 Statewide Transportation System Needs Assessment,”](#) California Transportation Commission, 2011

[“Tracking Progress of the Signature Initiatives,”](#) California Economic Summit 2012

[“A Public-Private Infrastructure Cooperative for California,”](#) Julie Kim, senior fellow and founder of Global Projects Center, Stanford University, 2012. (For a caeconomy.org profile of Kim and her recommendations beyond reorganizing the state infrastructure bank, see: [“Viewpoints – Julie Kim: Time is right for California to tap private infrastructure financing.”](#))

[“Briefing Book: How the 2013 Summit Process Works,”](#) California Economic Summit 2013

[“3-D Infrastructure: Building the Next California,”](#) Mark Pisano, former SCAG director; senior fellow, USC’s Price School of Public Policy, 2013. (For a caeconomy.org profile of Pisano and his recommendations, see: [“Viewpoints – Mark Pisano: California demographic changes demand new way to pay for infrastructure.”](#))

[“California’s Working Landscapes: Leveraging Regional Industry Clusters and Value Chains for Growth and Jobs,”](#) Glenda Humiston, USDA Rural Economic Development, 2013

[Recommendations of the Transportation Coalition](#) (2013):

- California Transit Association
- League of California Cities
- California State Association of Counties
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District,
- CALCOG
- Major Metropolitan Planning Organizations including: SACOG, MTC, SCAG, SANDAG and San Joaquin Valley Policy Council
- Natural Resources Defense Council
- California Alliance for Jobs
- Transportation California
- Environmental Defense Fund
- Self-Help Counties Coalition
- California Center for Sustainable Energy