

FINANCIAL ELEMENT

Background

The Financial Element identifies the current and anticipated revenue sources and financing techniques available to fund the planned transportation investments described in the Action Element. The intent of the Financial Element is to define realistic financing constraints and opportunities. Discussion will center on three main topics: current funding revenues, transportation expenditures, and potential funding sources for the future.

The purpose of the Financial Element is to:

- Estimate the costs and revenues to implement the projects identified in the Action Element
- Identify potential funding shortfalls
- List the candidate projects with available funding, and
- List the candidate projects if funding becomes available

Financial Assumptions

This section describes anticipated revenues over the next 27 years. Also discussed is the potential for other revenue sources. To determine the level of available funding for each project mode and type, several assumptions were made. Assumptions regarding available funds are moderate and clearly identified. There are three primary funding sources for implementing the projects and programs included in the Regional Transportation Plan. These include federal, state, and local funds.

BCAG used current and past Regional Transportation Improvement Program and the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (documents) funding levels as a reference and to be consistent with the five-year STIP Fund Estimate adopted by the CTC for the 2008 cycle. Thus, it was assumed that state, federal, and local funding programs and levels would remain constant at current funding levels over the 27-year horizon.

All projects identified in the 2008 RTP are within the financial projections through the horizon of the plan. All projects are consistent with the Goals, Policies and Objectives identified in the Policy Element of the RTP.

Current Funding Sources and Projected Revenues and Expenditures

FEDERAL

Federal funds are used for all modes, including highways and transit projects. These funds normally require a non-federal match of between 11.47 – 20% for road projects, and up to 50% match for transit projects. However, in certain instances such as safety projects, they may not require a match at all.

The Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users: SAFETEA-LU, signed into law on August 10, 2005, was enacted 22 months after its precursor, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), expired. In the interim, a series of 12 stopgap extension acts provided the authority for continuance of the Federal-Aid Highway Program, which provides financial assistance to the States for transportation projects and programs.

With overall funding authorization totaling \$244.1 billion, SAFETEA-LU enacted the largest highway program in the history of the nation. At the same time, it changed the structure and requirements of longstanding programs, introduced new initiatives, added oversight responsibilities, and altered transportation policies.

SAFETEA-LU addresses many of the challenges facing the transportation system today, such as enhancing safety, reducing traffic congestion, improving efficiency in freight movement, increasing intermodal connectivity, and protecting the environment.

Table 13-1
Federal Funding Sources

| Fund Source | Abbreviation | Primary Mode |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Surface Transportation Program | STP | Streets (Local) |
| Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality | CMAQ | Air Quality |
| Transportation Enhancements | TE | Bicycle, Pedestrian, Landscaping |
| Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 | FTA 5307 | Urban transit |
| Federal Transit Administration Section 5311 | FTA 5311 | Rural transit |
| Federal Transit Administration Section 5309 | FTA 5309 | Discretionary transit |
| Federal Transit Administration Section 5316 | FTA 5316 | Discretionary transit |
| Federal Transit Administration Section 5317 | FTA 5317 | Discretionary transit |
| Highway Bridge Program | HBP | Bridges (Local) |
| Hazard Elimination / Safety | HES/HSIP | Streets (Local) |
| Federal Airport Improvement Program | FAIP | Aviation |

Table 13-2
Federal Funding Sources - Projected Revenues (rounded)

| Fund Source | Decision Maker | Guarantee | Annual Funding | 27 Year Funding |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| STP | Locals | Yes (SAFETEA) | 2,269,897 | 61,287,219 |
| CMAQ | BCAG | Yes (SAFETEA) | 2,201,851 | 59,449,977 |
| TE | BCAG | Yes (SAFETEA) | 500,000 | 13,500,000 |
| FTA 5307 | BCAG | Yes (SAFETEA) | 1,445,000 | 39,015,000 |
| FTA 5311 | BCAG | Yes (SAFETEA) | 511,000 | 13,797,000 |
| FTA 5309 | Federal | No | 75,000 | 2,025,000 |
| FTA 5316 | Caltrans | No | 30,000 | 810,000 |
| FTA 5317 | Caltrans | No | 51,000 | 1,377,000 |
| HBP | Caltrans | No | 2,137,000 | 57,699,000 |
| HSIP | Caltrans | No | 350,000 | 9,450,000 |
| FAIP | Caltrans | No | 90,000 | 2,430,000 |
| FAA | Caltrans | No | 1,442,416 | 38,945,250 |
| Totals | | | \$ 11,103,164 | \$ 299,785,446 |

Surface Transportation Program (STP): This funding pot guarantees counties 110% of their allocation under the old Federal Aid Urban/Federal Aid Secondary (FAU/FAS) program. These funds may be spent on streets and roads projects, however, jurisdictions may also use the funds for bikeway, pedestrian, transit, safety, ridesharing, traffic management, parking, environmental enhancements, and transportation control measure projects.

Counties with urbanized areas less than 200,000 are considered “rural” counties (such as Butte). As such, BCAG is eligible to exchange these federal dollars for state dollars to Caltrans. This process is known as “Regional STP Exchange”. The advantage to this fund exchange is that federal monies have more stringent requirements, including a 20% local match, while state monies do not require any local match. In total, Butte County can expect to receive approximately \$61.3 million in RSTP Exchange funds during the 27-year period of the Plan.

RSTP funds are apportioned back to each of the cities, town and county, generally for road maintenance. All RSTP funds exchanged for state only funds will be spent on any eligible use as allowed under Article XIX of the State Constitution.

Assuming constant-funding levels over the horizon of this plan, total-funding revenues expected through STP exchange amounts to roughly \$2.27 million per year. This money is expected to be allocated mainly to local streets and roads projects.

Transportation Enhancement Activities (TE): TE funds can be used for transportation-related capital improvement projects that enhance quality-of-life, in or around transportation facilities. Projects must be over and above required mitigation and

the project must be directly related to the transportation system. Butte County can expect to program \$13.5 million in TE funds over the next 27 years. TE funds are now programmed as part of the STIP process. Caltrans maintains a TE website at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/TransEnhAct/TransEnact.htm>.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ): The purpose of the CMAQ program is to fund transportation related projects to help improve the region's air quality. The BCAG Board of Directors programs projects by approving or amending the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). Projects are subject to "Timely Use of Funds" provisions identified in Assembly Bill 1012, Chaptered in 1999. Each year, CMAQ funds are made available for programming at the discretion of the BCAG Board of Directors. Funding levels are prepared by Caltrans with final apportionments developed in December. Based on current estimates provided by Caltrans as part of the development of the 2009 FTIP, BCAG may expect to receive approximately \$59.5 million through 2035.

All CMAQ funds received will be programmed throughout the nonattainment areas in Butte County. Due to the flexibility in programming CMAQ funds, BCAG has determined that a "lump sum" category for CMAQ projects be established for the RTP. All projects must demonstrate a reduction in emissions for the respective non-attainment pollutant. Caltrans maintains a CMAQ website at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/reports/Official_CMAQ_Web_Page.htm.

Federal Crossing Improvements Program (FCIP): The Federal Crossing Improvements Program provides funding grants for grade crossing improvements along rail lines. Such improvements may include flashers, gates, cantilevered flashing lights, surface improvements, and realignment of roads at railroad crossings. Total funding revenues expected through the FCIP is \$2.43 million.

All FCIP funds will be spent on local streets and roads. As such, BCAG has determined that a "lump sum" category for FCIP projects be established for the RTP.

National Highway System (NHS): The NHS is somewhat unique, as it focuses on the location of the expenditure more than the purpose. NHS funds are targeted for use on roads that are the most important to interstate travel and national defense, roads that connect with other modes of transportation, and roads essential for international commerce. Funds may be used for planning, road construction & maintenance, alternative transportation modes, establishment of management systems, safety improvements, transportation control measures, and other purposes. Specific funding is not attached to the NHS program, but there are provisions for funding assistance for emergency repairs due to disasters, such as earthquakes and floods. In Butte County, the NHS system includes portions of SR 70, all of SR 149 and a portion of SR 99.

Highway Bridge Program (HBP): This funding provides for construction and maintenance of bridges. Depending on the size and scope of the project, the range of HBRRP funds is typically between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000, but may be more

depending on the project. Based on feedback from the public works directors on which bridge projects are planned, Butte County can expect to receive approximately \$57.7 million over the horizon of the RTP.

A list of specific HBP candidate projects has been included in the Action element of the RTP. Caltrans and FHWA ultimately decide whether or not a project is approved for HBP funding.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP): Section 1401 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act - Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) amended Section 148 of Title 23 to create a new, core Highway Safety Improvement Program. This new Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) replaced the Hazard Elimination Safety Program, (23 U.S.C §152).

This program provides funds to correct safety problems on roadways in the Federal-aid system, as well as rural minor collectors and local roads. Projects are nominated for funding by local jurisdictions and selected by Caltrans. These funds are spent on local streets and roads. Assuming conditions remain constant, funding revenue can be expected to be approximately \$264,000 annually or about \$7.1 million over the horizon of the RTP. All HSIP funds will be spent on local streets and roads. As such, BCAG has determined that a “lump sum” category for FCIP projects be established for the RTP.

Public Lands Highway Program (PLH): The Public Lands Highway Program (PLH) funds projects through construction for roads that are designated as a federal forest highway. Butte County has two “forest highway” routes that are located in parts of the Lassen and Plumas National Forest. BCAG currently has a programming commitment from the PLH program for \$7.9 million to finish the Forest Highway 119 project and \$5 million for the Forest Highway 171 (Skyway) project. These are the only two projects BCAG anticipates over the horizon of the RTP. As of May 2008, most of the \$20 million previously programmed for FH 119 has been spent and constructed. Funds for the FH 171 project are for the construction component.

Federal Transit Administration

The federal government provides financial assistance to transit operators throughout the country through the Federal Transit Act. There are various sections of the law under which funding is allocated based on purpose, type of transit service, and size of the community. There are three specific programs which Butte County typically receives grants from, they include:

Section 5307: Under this section, funds are provided on a formula basis for capital and operating expenses for small urban transit systems. BCAG currently receives funding from this program to support the urban area of Chico transit service on Butte Regional Transit, also known as B-Line. In fiscal year 2007/08, BCAG received approximately \$1,538,119 to fund transit capital and operations. BCAG can expect to receive approximately \$41.5 million over the period of the RTP.

Section 5311: Under this section, funds are provided to non-urbanized transit systems. Funds are provided on a formula basis for capital and operating expenses. BCAG is the designated recipient of these funds as the operator of B-Line serving the non-urbanized areas of Butte County.

The fiscal year 2007/08 apportionments for Section 5311 funds were \$484,098. During the horizon of the RTP, it is anticipated that Butte County will receive approximately \$13.1 million for operating and capital expenses.

Section 5310: This program provides discretionary grants to private, non-profit organizations for capital expenses in transporting the elderly and disabled. Social service transportation providers in Butte County, such as the Work Training Center, regularly apply for and receive Section 5310 grants to purchase accessible vehicles. BCAG will also be applying for these funds for paratransit vehicles. Though this program is a statewide competitive grant, during the horizon of the RTP, it is anticipated that \$8 million will be awarded to eligible recipients such as the Work Training Center, BCAG and other eligible agencies in Butte County. While Caltrans administers the program, the approval is made by the California Transportation Commission. Projects for 5310 funds are required to be included in a Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan.

Section 5316: Job Access Reverse Commute Program (JARC) provides funding for services to provide transportation for low income individuals who may live in the city core and work in suburban locations. Projects for 5316 funds are required to be included in a Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan.

Section 5317: New Freedom Program funds are directed to elderly and disabled transportation services that go beyond those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Projects for 5317 funds are required to be included in a Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan.

Federal Aviation Administration

Federal Airport Improvement Program: The Federal Aviation Administration allocates grant funds to Primary Commercial Service Airports on a formula, based on the number of passengers annually served. For small commercial service airports with less than 10,000 passengers per year, FAA grant funding is discretionary. Chico Municipal Airport is the primary commercial service airport and can reasonably anticipate receiving approximately \$30.6 million while Oroville can expect \$8.3 million according to Caltrans' FAA Capital Improvement Program from the Division of Aeronautics report for projects between 2008 and 2017.

All FAA funds will be spent on eligible aviation projects. Specific projects can be found in the Aviation Chapter of the RTP. Because FAA funds will represent a portion of the total costs of the project, a lump sum category has been established for the RTP.

STATE

State funds are generated by license fees, truck fees, sales and fuel taxes, and other state apportioned funds.

Table 13-3
State Funding Sources

| Fund Source | Abbreviation | Primary Mode |
|--|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Interregional Improvement Program/STIP | IIP | State Highways – SR 70 |
| Regional Improvement Program/STIP | RIP | Regional Needs |
| State Highways Operations and Protection Program | SHOPP | State Highways – Safety/Rehab |
| TDA: Local Transportation Fund | LTF | Transit needs first, streets (Local) |
| TDA: State Transit Assistance Fund | STA | Transit |
| State Fuel Tax | Fuel Tax | Streets (Local) |
| Bicycle Transportation Account | BTA | Bicycle Projects |
| State – Safe Routes To Schools Program | SR2S | Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects |
| BCAQMD – DMV Grant Funds | DMV | Transit |
| California Aid to Airports Program FAA/State | CAAP | Aviation |

Table 13-4
State Funding Sources - Projected Revenues

| Fund Source | Decision Maker | Guarantee | Annual Funding | 27 Year Funding |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| IIP | Caltrans | No | Not available | 110,000,000 |
| RIP | BCAG | Yes (State Law) | 7,158,097 | 193,268,611 |
| SHOPP | Caltrans | No | 7,207,312 | 194,597,428 |
| LTF | BCAG | Yes (State Law) | 6,820,000 | 184,140,000 |
| STA | BCAG | Yes (State Law) | 1,106,000 | 29,862,000 |
| Fuel Tax | Locals | Yes (State Law) | 7,272,000 | 196,344,000 |
| BTA | Caltrans | No | 50,000 | 1,350,000 |
| SR2S | Caltrans | No | 50,000 | 1,350,000 |
| DMV | AQMD | No | 20,000 | 540,000 |
| CAAP | Caltrans | No | 3,915,000 | 39,150,000 |
| Totals | | | 33,598,409 | 840,602,039 |

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

The STIP identifies all major transportation improvements for state highways and other programs by county. SB 45 consolidated several transportation funding programs into essentially two programs that make the STIP, a local discretionary pot (Regional Improvement Program-RIP) and the state discretionary pot (Interregional Improvement Program-IIP).

Regional Improvement Program (RIP): The regional improvement program funds are made available to the regional transportation planning agencies (BCAG), and now make up 75% of the STIP. Regions have the discretion to select and program transportation improvement projects on state highways, local roads, and for transit, bike lanes, etc. within the region. Projects for RIP funding are identified in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP document). The California Transportation Commission is required to adopt the entire regional program or reject it in its entirety.

The STIP projections prepared for the 2008 RTP are based on historical trends as of the 1992 STIP. BCAG has taken a conservative approach to identify what is realistic for the region. Over the next 27 years, Butte County can expect to have a programming capacity of approximately \$193 million. Of this amount, nearly \$33.4 million is already programmed or committed for the 2008 STIP cycle. Based on current funding levels, this averages out to about \$7 million per year for RIP programming. The RIP projections also include funds that are projected to be made available as a result of the passage of Proposition 42.

The specific list of financially constrained projects can be found in the Action Element – Highways and Local Streets and Roads.

Interregional Improvement Program (IIP): Caltrans has the discretion for programming “interregional” funds which constitute 25% of the STIP. Projects will focus on SR 70 Corridor interregional highways. These projects will primarily address safety as well as people and goods movement from region to region.

It is difficult to make an estimate of how much funding will be contributed to the state highways in Butte County because Caltrans districts are not provided with a “bid target”. In order to project Caltrans’ funding commitment in Butte County, BCAG looked at those projects that can realistically be jointly funded. Without committing, Caltrans has indicated that joint funding can be expected on the SR 70 corridor in Butte County. Assuming projects on the SR 70 corridor are jointly funded at 50%, Butte County can expect to program \$110 million in IIP funds. The specific jointly funded projects can be found in the Action Element of the RTP.

State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)

Biennially, Caltrans is required to prepare a State Highway Operations and Protection Program for expenditure of transportation funds for major capital improvements that are necessary to preserve and protect the state highway system. Projects included in the program are limited to capital improvements relative to maintenance, safety, and rehabilitation of state highways and bridges that do not add new traffic lanes to the system. Caltrans is required to review a draft of the proposed SHOPP program with the RTPAs prior to submitting the SHOPP to the California Transportation Commission for adoption. Projects can also include bridge replacement and seismic retrofitting. The 2008 SHOPP was adopted on March 13, 2008 by the CTC. The 2008 SHOPP covers 2008/09 through 2011/12. As part of the 2009 FTIP, BCAG has identified \$75.8 million in SHOPP projects.

BCAG used the adopted SHOPP and Caltrans' 10 year SHOPP plan to forecast what Butte County can expect to receive over the next 27 years. Based on the funding level for the projects identified in the short-term, Butte County can expect to receive nearly \$194.6 million in SHOPP funds over the next 27 years. However, because it is at Caltrans' discretion where projects are recommended, this level of funding cannot be assured. As such, BCAG has developed, for the purposes of the RTP, a lump sum category for the expenditure of SHOPP funds beyond the 10-Year SHOPP. The adopted 2008 SHOPP can be found at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/shopp.htm>.

Transportation Development Act (TDA)

Passed in 1971, this legislation provides a regular, guaranteed source of funds for local transit. These funds are administered by the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and apportioned to jurisdictions on a per-capita basis. There are two funding programs provided under TDA:

Local Transportation Fund (LTF): ¼% of the 7% statewide sales tax is returned to the county in which it was generated for use in local transit. Under strict provisions of how the funds may be allocated and spent, the RTPA annually allocates these funds to jurisdictions for transit. The law also permits local agencies to use LTF on local streets and roads, provided that all unmet transit needs that are found reasonable to meet are funded. Each year, BCAG performs the annual unmet transit needs process with extensive public outreach.

For fiscal year 2007/08, Butte County received \$6.8 million in LTF funds. Projecting over the 27-year period of the RTP, total funding estimated to be available for LTF is \$184.1 million. LTF funds are apportioned back to the cities and county to fulfill their transit obligations. In some cases, local street and road improvements, typically maintenance, are also funded with LTF as allowed by TDA Statute.

State Transit Assistance (STA): In the annual state budget process, additional transit funding may be made available. Under Section 99313, funding is apportioned to jurisdictions on a per capita basis, while Section 99314 funding is apportioned to transit operators based on farebox revenues.

Based on current funding levels of \$1,106,000 for FY 2007/2008, the total estimate for the 27-year plan is \$29.9 million. For the most part, annual apportionments are assumed to remain constant with no significant increases. STA funding is specifically for transit purposes. However, over the last couple of years, there has been no consistency in actual funds received from the State Controller's Office.

California Aid to Airports Program (CAAP)

State Annual Grant: This program is made up of two components, the first is an acquisition and development program (A&D), and the second is made up of annual grants through which recipients may receive \$10,000 annually. Airports designated as "commercial" or "reliever" are not eligible. Thus, the only eligible recipient is the Oroville Municipal Airport, which receives \$10,000 annually as a result of AB 597. Total long-term funding for aviation improvements in Butte County under this source is estimated at \$270,000.

State Aeronautics Program: The funding for the Capital Improvement Plan is generated by the tax on aviation fuels. The program provides funding for capital improvements such as new taxiways, pavement maintenance & rehabilitation, security enhancement, and Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plans, with a 10% local match required.

The respective airport master plans for the Chico and Oroville Municipal Airports list projects through 2009 for a combined FAA funding total of \$38.9 million. Specific projects are defined in Chapter 9 (Aviation) of the RTP.

FAA Grant Match: The amount set aside for this is at the discretion of the California Transportation Commission (CTC). CTC's goal is to match every eligible, federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant that benefits GA. Aviation projects are identified under the Action Element in the Aviation chapter of this document.

Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program

The Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program provides \$10 million annually in statewide grants. The purpose of the funding is to mitigate the environmental impact of new or modified transportation facilities under the possible categories of: highway landscape & urban forestry, resource lands, and roadside recreation. Various transportation enhancements are allowable under these three categories, including the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, such as roadside trails and landscaping projects. However, projects must be related to a transportation construction project, such as a highway, transit facility, or park-and-ride lot. Grants are on a statewide competitive basis and are approved by the CTC.

LOCAL

Traffic Mitigation/Impact Fees

This category includes the various types of local assessments on new development projects which, as a result of their construction, are expected to generate additional traffic. Criteria and location of impact areas are set by the local jurisdictions. Most jurisdictions employ some type of traffic or transportation impact fee. Fees may be assessed area-wide, only in target sections of the jurisdiction, on a project-by-project basis as dictated by project impacts, or a combination of these. Several impact fee programs are currently in effect in Butte County, including those covering the Chico Urban Area, the Thermalito area, and the West side of Paradise.

General Funds

Local jurisdictions may choose to use general fund moneys to help finance transportation projects or services, including airport operations, or as local matching funds for transportation grants. Because of the impacts of the recession and Proposition 13 on local government general fund budgets, this is neither a popular nor commonly used option.

State Fuel Tax

The state fuel tax to local cities and county is derived from the State Controllers Report for Local Streets and Roads for fiscal year 2005-06. The annual apportionment figure was projected out to the year 2027. These funds are typically used for road maintenance. The specific fund source sections include 2105, 2106, 2107 and 2107.5. The respective figures are included in the following Summary of Revenues by Agency tables.

Maintaining the Transportation System in Butte County

The following table identifies the functional classification of the federal aid system in Butte County by total miles. Typically, gas tax revenue is used to operate and maintain the system. The following financial tables are revenues for which the local agency can use to operate and maintain the freeways, highway and transit system within the region. BCAG will refine its GIS system over the next couple of years to better capture the federal aid system and transportation investments made on it.

Based on the following table, the average cost to maintain a road off the state highway system is \$1.1 million. Butte County has 182.32 of state highways miles to maintain according to the 2006 California Public Road Data reported for the Highway Performance Monitoring System. Therefore, the cost to maintain the system could be as high as \$200 million. At the local level, BCAG surveyed the local Cities and County to develop an average cost per mile of \$200,000. The total cost to maintain the rest of the system is estimated at \$395 million for a total of \$595 million. The funding for the transit element

identified in Chapter 7 as FTA fund are restricted to be used for operations and capital. Transit would be supported by FTA and the TDA funds identified.

Table 13-5
Functional Classification for Federal Aid System

| Rural Functional Classification | Miles | Urban Functional Classification | Miles | Total ALL | |
|--|--------------|--|--------------|------------------|---------|
| Interstate | 0.00 | Interstate | 0 | | |
| Other Principal Arterial | 55.03 | Other Fwys & Expressways | 12.04 | | |
| Minor Arterial | 84.00 | Other Principal Arterial | 53.94 | | |
| Major Collector | 166.64 | Minor Arterial | 85.88 | | |
| Minor Collector | 125.70 | Collector | 155.04 | | |
| Local | 961.43 | Local | 456.04 | | |
| Total Rural Miles | 1392.80 | Total Urban | 762.94 | | 2155.74 |

Table 13-6
2006 Highway Performance Monitoring System
Butte County Maintained Miles

| Agency | Rural | Urban | Total | Estimated Cost to Maintain |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| Biggs | 10.90 | 0.00 | 10.90 | \$ 2,180,000 |
| Chico | 4.53 | 194.68 | 199.21 | \$ 39,842,000 |
| Gridley | 8.98 | 17.47 | 26.45 | \$ 5,290,000 |
| Oroville | 2.28 | 72.92 | 75.20 | \$ 15,040,000 |
| Paradise | 2.59 | 95.73 | 98.32 | \$ 19,664,000 |
| Bureau of Indian Affairs | 8.00 | 0.00 | 8.00 | \$ 1,600,000 |
| County Unincorporated | 1,023.66 | 329.67 | 1353.33 | \$ 270,666,000 |
| State Highway | 129.84 | 52.48 | 182.32 | \$ 200,552,000 |
| State Park Service | 53.78 | 0.00 | 53.78 | \$ 10,756,000 |
| US Forest Service | 148.24 | 0.00 | 148.24 | \$ 29,648,000 |
| Totals | 1392.79 | 762.95 | 2,155.74 | \$ 595,238,000 |

Table 13-7
Summary of Revenues by Agency

| Biggs | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Totals |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 08/09-09/10 | 10/11-17/18 | 18/09-24/05 | 25/26-34/35 | |
| Prop 42 | 34,868 | 94,545 | 75,636 | 151,272 | 356,321 |
| State Fuel Tax | 80,440 | 321,760 | 281,540 | 402,200 | 1,085,940 |
| RSTP "State Exchange" | 21,953 | 87,811 | 76,835 | 109,764 | 296,362 |
| TDA - LTF | 110,650 | 442,600 | 387,275 | 553,250 | 1,493,775 |
| TDA - STA | 17,501 | 70,005 | 61,255 | 87,507 | 236,268 |
| Totals | 265,412 | 1,016,721 | 882,540 | 1,303,992 | 3,468,666 |

| Chico | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Totals |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | 08/09-09/10 | 10/11-17/18 | 18/09-24/05 | 25/26-34/35 | |
| Prop 42 | 1,663,500 | 4,510,595 | 3,608,476 | 7,216,952 | 16,999,523 |
| State Fuel Tax | 2,842,234 | 11,368,936 | 9,947,819 | 14,211,170 | 38,370,159 |
| RSTP "State Exchange" | 1,377,062 | 5,508,248 | 4,819,717 | 6,885,310 | 18,590,336 |
| TDA - LTF | 5,278,886 | 21,115,544 | 18,476,101 | 26,394,430 | 71,264,961 |
| TDA - STA | 839,810 | 3,359,240 | 2,939,335 | 4,199,050 | 11,337,435 |
| Prop 1B - Balance Remaining | 1,280,265 | | | | 1,280,265 |
| Totals | 13,281,757 | 45,862,563 | 39,791,448 | 58,906,912 | 157,842,679 |

| Gridley | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Totals |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | 08/09-09/10 | 10/11-17/18 | 18/09-24/05 | 25/26-34/35 | |
| Prop 42 | 121,555 | 329,600 | 263,680 | 527,360 | 1,242,195 |
| State Fuel Tax | 233,734 | 934,936 | 818,069 | 1,168,670 | 3,155,409 |
| RSTP "State Exchange" | 114,627 | 458,506 | 401,193 | 573,133 | 1,547,458 |
| TDA - LTF | 385,740 | 1,542,960 | 1,350,090 | 1,928,700 | 5,207,490 |
| TDA - STA | 58,601 | 234,403 | 205,102 | 293,003 | 791,109 |
| Totals | 914,256 | 3,500,405 | 3,038,134 | 4,490,866 | 11,943,661 |

| Oroville | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Totals |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 08/09-09/10 | 10/11-17/18 | 18/09-24/05 | 25/26-34/35 | |
| Prop 42 | 284,681 | 771,915 | 617,532 | 1,235,064 | 2,909,192 |
| State Fuel Tax | 524,948 | 2,099,792 | 1,837,318 | 2,624,740 | 7,086,798 |
| RSTP "State Exchange" | 277,595 | 1,110,380 | 971,583 | 1,387,976 | 3,747,534 |
| TDA - LTF | 903,396 | 3,613,584 | 3,161,886 | 4,516,980 | 12,195,846 |
| TDA - STA | 135,108 | 540,432 | 472,878 | 675,540 | 1,823,958 |
| Prop 1B - Balance Remaining | 51,982 | | | | 51,982 |
| Totals | 2,177,710 | 8,136,103 | 7,061,197 | 10,440,300 | 27,815,310 |

**Table 13-7
Summary of Revenues by Agency - Continued**

| Paradise | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Totals |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 08/09-09/10 | 10/11-17/18 | 18/09-24/05 | 25/26-34/35 | |
| Prop 42 | 518,371 | 1,405,565 | 1,124,452 | 2,248,904 | 5,297,292 |
| State Fuel Tax | 1,038,592 | 4,154,368 | 3,635,072 | 5,192,960 | 14,020,992 |
| RSTP "State Exchange" | 535,152 | 2,140,609 | 1,873,033 | 2,675,762 | 7,224,557 |
| TDA - LTF | 1,644,976 | 6,579,904 | 5,757,416 | 8,224,880 | 22,207,176 |
| TDA - STA | 260,342 | 1,041,368 | 911,197 | 1,301,710 | 3,514,617 |
| Prop 1B - Balance Remaining | 398,949 | | | | 398,949 |
| Totals | 4,396,382 | 15,321,814 | 13,301,170 | 19,644,216 | 52,663,583 |

| County | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Totals |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | 08/09-09/10 | 10/11-17/18 | 18/09-24/05 | 25/26-34/35 | |
| Prop 42 | 6,650,706 | 16,626,765 | 13,301,412 | 26,602,824 | 63,181,707 |
| State Fuel Tax | 9,824,542 | 39,298,168 | 34,385,897 | 49,122,710 | 132,631,317 |
| RSTP "State Exchange" | 2,396,487 | 9,585,949 | 8,387,706 | 11,982,437 | 32,352,579 |
| HBP - Highway Bridge Program | 9,700,000 | 26,500,000 | 21,500,000 | - | 57,700,000 |
| TDA - LTF | 5,316,352 | 21,265,408 | 18,607,232 | 26,581,760 | 71,770,752 |
| TDA - STA | 900,901 | 3,603,603 | 3,153,152 | 4,504,503 | 12,162,159 |
| Prop 1B - Balance Remaining | 6,351,563 | | | | 6,351,563 |
| Totals | 41,140,551 | 116,879,893 | 99,335,399 | 118,794,234 | 376,150,077 |

| FUND SOURCE | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | 27 Year Period |
|---|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 08/09-09/10 | 10/11-17/18 | 18/09-24/05 | 25/26-34/35 | |
| Transit | | | | | |
| FTA Sec. 5307 - BCAG/B-Line | 2,890,810 | 11,563,240 | 10,117,835 | 14,454,050 | 39,025,935 |
| FTA Sec. 5311 BCAG/B-Line | 995,989 | 4,095,128 | 3,583,237 | 5,118,910 | 13,793,264 |
| FTA Sec. 5310 Various Non Profit Agencies | 589,933 | 2,359,733 | 2,064,767 | 2,949,667 | 7,964,100 |
| FTA - Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) | 60,000 | 240,000 | 210,000 | 300,000 | 810,000 |
| FTA - New Freedom (NF) | 102,000 | 408,000 | 357,000 | 510,000 | 1,377,000 |
| Prop 42 Transit Funding - TCRP (B-Line) | 428,398 | 2,956,737 | 2,365,389 | 4,730,778 | 10,481,303 |
| Totals | 5,067,131 | 21,622,838 | 18,698,228 | 28,063,405 | 73,451,602 |

| FUND SOURCE | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | 27 Year Period |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | 08/09-09/10 | 10/11-17/18 | 18/09-24/05 | 25/26-34/35 | |
| BCAG | | | | | |
| CMAQ (Local & Transit Projects) | 4,404,038 | 17,616,152 | 15,414,133 | 22,020,190 | 59,454,513 |
| BCAG LTF Admin | 810,000 | 3,240,000 | 2,835,000 | 4,050,000 | 10,935,000 |
| Prop 1B - 99 Auxil Project | 23,520,000 | | | | 23,520,000 |
| PLH - FH 171 Project Only | 5,000,000 | | | | 5,000,000 |
| SAFETEA-LU - FH 171 Only | 2,370,000 | | | | 2,370 |
| SAFETEA-LU Transit Center | 350,000 | | | | 350,000 |
| SAFETEA-LU SR 70 Georgia Pacific | 2,028,000 | | | | 2,028,000 |
| RIP/STIP | 33,424,000 | 29,858,145 | 49,995,489 | 79,990,977 | 193,268,611 |
| Totals | 69,538,408 | 50,714,297 | 68,244,622 | 106,061,167 | 294,558,494 |

OTHER FUNDING SOURCES

Butte County should strongly consider additional revenue sources to complete many of the needed transportation improvements. Some methods of enhancing the revenues available for transportation are discussed below.

Regional Impact Fee

Growth and development pressures continue in Butte County. Planning an efficient and affordable transportation system to alleviate existing traffic congestion and support future development within the region will need a new revenue source. Leveraging regional funds for other state and federal funds such as the STIP has increasingly become more important.

Could regional development impact fees be used to finance regional facilities? Such a system could integrate infrastructure provision and tax policy to create equity both across jurisdictions and between the different levels of government.

There are examples of regional impact fees in California and Nevada. The cities of the Coachella Valley (Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, La Quinta, Indio and Coachella) and Riverside County have collected impact fees on new development since 1986 to protect endangered wildlife. The fee is \$600 per acre. The Coachella Valley has also collected regional impact fees for transportation since 1988. This Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee is tied to a ½ cent sales tax approved by voters. That proposition included a “return to source” concept, where the TUMF fees are to be split between the cities (35%), the region (40%), and regional transit (25%). Funding is revoked for cities in the region that do not require regional impact fees.

In Placer, Solano, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, and Yuba Counties, the county and some or all of the cities have instituted joint county facilities fees. The cities collect the fees and pass them on to the county, where they are used for new construction and expansion of regional facilities, including regional transportation, habitat preserves, and county facilities such as jails. The Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County (Reno, Nevada) has the authority for regional transportation impact fees. Regional impact fees outside of Reno are about 15% higher than those inside the city. Inside Reno, regional transportation impact fees range from \$500/1,000 square feet for manufacturing, to \$3,700/1,000 square feet for large box retail.

Sales Tax Increase

The State legislature has given local jurisdictions the ability to increase the retail transaction use tax, or sales tax, up to 1 percent, which can be earmarked for specific purposes. A majority vote is required on such an increase. A number of California counties, including Sacramento, San Francisco, Contra Costa, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Mendocino, and Lake Counties have voted to increase the sales tax by ½ percent to finance specific transportation improvements. In Sacramento County, this ½ percent sales tax is expected to raise \$920 million over 20 years. In 2007, 19 counties in California have special transportation taxes. These counties are referred to as “Self-Help” Counties.

Fuel Tax Increase

The State has raised the gas tax through the passage of Proposition 111. The tax will eventually rise to 18 cents per gallon. Similar to the retail transaction use tax, local counties can ask the voters for an increase in the motor vehicle fuel tax. Successful passage requires 2/3 approval by the voters.

Traffic Mitigation Fees

Currently used in several areas of Butte County, traffic mitigation fees can be a means to fund roadway, transit, bicycle, and other improvements through assessment of trip-end fees on new development. A capital improvement program is developed based on needs established for future development. A per-trip fee is then calculated based on the total trip generation of new development.

Chico and Butte County use a similar system to fund transportation improvement needs in the Chico Urban Area. A fee is charged to each housing unit based on the land use density capacity at buildout divided into the transportation improvements required at buildout. This Street Facilities Fund then finances the improvements, as they are needed.

Air Quality Mitigation Fees

Similar to traffic mitigation fees, air quality mitigation fees are assessed on new residential and commercial construction based on the amount of pollutants expected to be generated. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) currently combines traffic and air quality mitigation fees based chiefly on the number of trips expected to be generated by a development, using one method to mitigate both the congestion and air quality degradation that may be expected as a result of additional vehicle trips. These fees are then claimed by jurisdictions for transit and roadway capital improvement programs.

Motor Vehicle Fee

The State currently charges a fee on those who own and operate vehicles in the State of California, for registration and for licensing. Two special programs have been authorized to assess special fees on the motor vehicle tax; \$1 is assessed to fund freeway call box systems and up to \$4 is assessed for air quality programs. Counties are not currently authorized to impose a vehicle registration fee; enabling legislation would have to be enacted by the State legislature to allow such a program.

Parking Fee/Tax

A parking fee is charged for vehicles to park in a particular space, and can be effectively used for on-or-off street parking. The fee could be linked with the transportation-system impact of persons using those parking spaces. A parking tax is a levy on the use of off-street commercial or employer provided parking spaces. The tax is typically collected as a percentage of the total parking charge paid by the motorist and forwarded to the agency (e.g. city) by the parking lot owner or operator.

Counties are not presently authorized to levy parking taxes, however, cities in California may implement a tax under their individual charters. In order for a county to levy a parking tax, state-enabling legislation would have to be passed. A 2/3 voter approval is then needed before such a tax could be implemented in a jurisdiction to be used specifically for transportation improvements.

In general, a parking fee would not provide as much revenue as parking taxes due to the need to directly link costs and benefits. A fee may not require a public vote but would need to be adopted by each of the city and town councils where it is implemented. The fee or tax, while raising additional funds, has secondary benefits for transportation systems. The imposition or increase of parking charges creates a disincentive to the use of single occupancy vehicle by increasing the cost of driving versus other forms of transportation. As a result, public transportation becomes a more attractive substitute for driving.

Joint Development

Joint development describes an improvement that results from the cooperative efforts of a private company and public agency. Examples of joint development include the private development of a public facility, cooperative financing of public facilities, transfer of development rights, and density bonuses. The legal basis for joint development depends on the circumstances of the agreement. In general, however, the authority to require dedication of land or exactions as a condition of development derives from the agency's police power to protect public interests.

Peak Hour Congestion Pricing

This is a fee charged to those using transportation facilities during the peak period. As a user charge, it is neither a tax nor a toll, and therefore not subject to state or federal tax restrictions.

Congestion pricing, while raising additional funds, has secondary benefits for transportation systems. The imposition of such charges creates a disincentive to the use of transportation systems during peak periods through increased cost. This provides financial motivation for transportation system users to spread their use to non-peak hours. As a result, systems demand is more evenly distributed, thus creating greater efficiency of use.

Bond Measures

Cities and counties may issue general obligation bonds payable through increased property taxes by a 2/3 majority vote of the general electorate. These bonds may be used to fund government services, such as transportation improvements.