

Date of Hearing: June 17, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Gail Pellerin, Chair

SB 830 (Arreguín) – As Amended June 4, 2026

SENATE VOTE: (vote not relevant)

SUBJECT: Public Transit Revenue Measure District: revenue measure: election procedures.

SUMMARY: Establishes the measure designation and ballot position for a Public Transit Revenue Measure District (District) tax measure on the November 2026 general election ballot. Allows the District to choose the supporting and opposing arguments that appear in county voter guides. Specifically, **this bill**:

- 1) Requires a District ballot measure that would impose a transactions and use tax (TUT) to appear on the ballot immediately after statewide ballot measures and before all local ballot measures.
- 2) Requires the District's TUT ballot measure to be designated on the ballot by the designation "Regional Transit Measure" rather than by a letter designation (e.g., "Measure A") that would otherwise apply.
- 3) Requires the arguments in favor of and in opposition to the proposed ballot measure to be selected by the district, instead of being selected by the county elections official for the lead county in the district. Permits the district to select different arguments for and against the measure for each of the counties in the district.
- 4) Requires the lead county of the District—Santa Clara County, in this case—to perform the duties imposed on a lead county under existing law other than selecting the arguments for and against the measure that will appear in voter information guides.
- 5) Requires the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), in the event a TUT measure appears on the ballot and is not approved, to identify funds and directly reimburse each county for incremental costs incurred in conducting the election, and to reimburse the lead county of the District for its costs associated with performing duties as the lead county.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the District, including Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties, and the City and County of San Francisco. Requires the District to be governed by the same board that governs the MTC, and to be staffed by the existing staff of the MTC or any successor agency. Permits a proposal to impose a TUT in the District to be placed on the ballot for the November 3, 2026, statewide general election, either by the District's governing board or by a qualified voter initiative. Requires the elections officials of the counties where the measure will appear on the ballot to mutually agree on the letter designation for the ballot measure. (Government Code §§67710, 67730-67734, 67740)

- 2) Specifies the order in which offices and measures appear on the ballot. Provides, generally, that ballot measures appear after offices, and that state measures appear on the ballot followed by school district measures, county measures, city measures, and district measures. (Elections Code §13109)
- 3) Requires all local ballot measures to be designated on the ballot by a letter (e.g. “Measure A”). Permits elections officials to agree to use letter designations for ballot measures that will not conflict or confuse voters in situations where two or more nearby counties or cities are placing measures on the ballot at the same time. (Elections Code §13116)
- 4) Provides, for the purposes of a ballot measure in a special district or school district that includes more than one county, that ballot arguments shall be submitted to the elections official for the lead county, as specified, and that elections official shall select the arguments that are printed in the voter information guides for all voters in the district. Requires the lead county to transmit copies of the selected arguments, along with any accompanying forms, to each other county in the district. Provides that in a special district, the lead county is the county with the most voters within the district boundaries. (Elections Code §9611)

FISCAL EFFECT: None. This bill is keyed non-fiscal by the Legislative Counsel.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **New Bill:** This bill recently was amended at the request of the author to delete its prior contents and add the current provisions. As a result, prior votes and analyses are not relevant. The current version of this bill proposes policy changes that have not been heard in an Assembly or Senate policy committee during this legislative session.
- 2) **Author’s Amendments:** After the committee’s deadline for pre-committee author’s amendments, the author proposed amendments to this bill to provide a process for reimbursing counties for their election expenses in the event that the public transit sales tax measure fails on this November’s ballot. Those amendments would specify that in the event that the measure is not approved, the MTC, which provides staffing for the District, would identify funds and directly reimburse each county for incremental costs incurred, and would reimburse the lead county for additional costs associated with performing the duties of the lead county. This analysis reflects those proposed author’s amendments.
- 3) **Purpose of the Bill:** According to the author:

SB 63 authorized a 14-year regional public transit sales tax measure on the November 2026 ballot. If approved by voters, revenue from the tax would provide critically needed transit operations funding and save BART, Caltrain, Muni, and AC Transit from collapse, while also providing new revenues for local transit priorities and institute new accountability and financial efficiency requirements.

SB 830 makes minor, targeted changes to SB 63 to improve transparency across the five Bay Area counties placing this measure on the ballot by allowing different arguments to be filed at each county to consider the different expenditures across the region. The bill would also clarify election duties and

standardize how and where this multi-county public transit measure will appear on voters' November 2026 General Election ballots.

SB 830 does not change these accountability measures, nor does it change SB 63's ironclad requirements on how funding from the regional funding measure shall be distributed.

- 4) **Bay Area Transit Measure and Previous Legislation:** SB 63 (Wiener), Chapter 740, Statutes of 2025, created the District, and authorized a proposed TUT in the District to be placed on the November 2026 ballot to fund operations for specified Bay Area transit operators. In October 2025, a coalition of labor, business, and public transit supporters launched the Connect Bay Area Transit Committee to qualify an initiative under SB 63 on the November 2026 ballot. The proponents of that measure began collecting signatures in January, and they announced late last month that they had submitted more than 305,000 signatures to qualify the measure for the November ballot. Based on the number of registered voters in the counties that are part of the District, approximately 187,000 valid signatures are required for the measure to qualify for the ballot.

SB 63 included procedures governing an election on the TUT measure in the District. Those procedures generally are consistent with existing law governing ballot measures in special districts, with the following notable exceptions:

- a) SB 63 requires the impartial analysis of the measure that appears in county voter information guides to be prepared by legal counsel for the district. Under existing law, the county counsel in Santa Clara County (the county in the district with the most registered voters) would be required to prepare that analysis.
 - b) SB 63 provides for counties to use uniform translations of ballot materials into languages other than English, and to use the same letter designation for the ballot measure. While existing law does not *require* this type of uniformity for multi-county district ballot measures, it also does not appear to prevent elections officials from different counties from coordinating on those items and agreeing to uniform translations and letter designations.
 - c) SB 63 requires the District to reimburse counties only for the *incremental costs* incurred by county elections officials related to submitting the measure to the voters. Existing law generally requires districts to reimburse counties for *actual costs* incurred. Additionally, SB 63 requires any reimbursement of election expenses to come from revenues generated from the approved ballot measure; if the ballot measure fails and there are no revenues generated, county elections officials would not be reimbursed for the costs of conducting the election.
- 5) **Ballot Designation:** Under existing state law, state ballot measures are designated on the ballot by a number (e.g., "Proposition 42"), while local ballot measures are designated by a letter (e.g., "Measure E"). Under SB 63, a TUT measure in the District would be designated by a letter as is standard for local ballot measures, but all counties in the district would be required to use the same letter designation.

This bill instead requires the District's TUT ballot measure to be designated on the ballot as "Regional Transit Measure." While unusual, this type of designation is not unprecedented. In June 2018, a ballot measure that appeared on the ballot in the San Francisco Bay Area to increase tolls on state-owned bridges appeared on the ballot as "Regional Measure 3" in accordance with SB 595 (Beall), Chapter 650, Statutes of 2017.

- 6) **Ballot Arguments, Previous Legislation, and Proposed Amendments:** AB 773 (Pellerin), Chapter 664, Statutes of 2021, established the concept of a "lead county" for multi-county district ballot measures, and made the lead county responsible for receiving and selecting the ballot arguments for and against the ballot measure. AB 773 also required, for a multi-district ballot measure, that the same ballot arguments for and against the measure appear in the voter information guide of all voters in the district. Prior to the enactment of AB 773, it was possible that each county in a multi-county district could have different arguments in the voter information guide for and against the multi-county ballot measure.

This bill overrides certain provisions of AB 773 by expressly allowing for different ballot arguments to appear in the voter information guides in each of the District's five counties. Proponents of this bill argue that such a policy is appropriate for the District's TUT measure that may appear on the ballot this November because the ballot measure has a variable tax rate and the eligible expenditures vary by county.

This bill also provides for the District to select the arguments for and against the measure that appear in the voter information guide in each county. Under existing law, county elections officials generally are responsible for selecting the ballot arguments when more than one set of arguments are submitted in support of or in opposition to a ballot measure. Allowing the District to select the ballot arguments could present concerns that the District could make its selection in an effort to influence the likelihood of the TUT measure's passage. To avoid any such concerns, committee staff recommends that this bill be amended to specify that ballot arguments shall be submitted to each county within the District, and the county elections official in each county shall select the arguments for and against the measure that will appear in the voter information guide pursuant to the criteria in existing law for selecting arguments for county ballot measures.

- 7) **Urgency Clause and Proposed Amendments:** The author has proposed amendments to add an urgency clause to this bill so that it may take effect in time for this November's election. Under Joint Rule 58, however, amendments adding an urgency require Rules Committee approval before adoption.

The Assembly Rules Committee agenda for its June 15, 2026, hearing included an item to approve the addition of an urgency clause to this bill. At this time this analysis was prepared and released, the Rules Committee had not yet met and acted on that item.

If the Assembly Rules Committee approves the addition of an urgency clause before this committee's hearing, committee staff recommends that any motion to approve this bill include an amendment adding the urgency clause.

- 8) **Arguments in Support:** In a joint letter of support, many of the organizations identified below as supporting this bill write:

SB 63 (Chapter 740, Statutes of 2025) authorized a regional public transportation sales tax measure on the November 2026 ballot in five Bay Area counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara). If approved by the voters, revenue from the tax would provide critically needed transit operations funding and save BART, Caltrain, Muni, and AC Transit from collapse, while also providing new revenues for local transit priorities and instituting new accountability requirements.

The proposed legislation includes three narrow clean-up provisions consistent with the needs of a multi-county measure, like those that came before it:

1. The legislation would ensure that the ballot measure appears uniformly in each county as “Regional Transit Measure”.
2. The legislation directs the measure to be placed immediately after statewide ballot measures and before local ballot measures.
3. This legislation allows different ballot arguments and signatories in favor of, and against, the measure in the voter information guide for each of the five counties in the district.

Different arguments are needed in each county because the measure is structured as a variable tax rate (1 cent in San Francisco, ½ cent in all other counties) and because some counties will be able to invest significant return-to-source funds into local transit priorities. Allowing each county to have their own ballot arguments will ensure that the ballot arguments are relevant to each county and perspectives about the measure and the respective local investment strategies are represented.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

350 Bay Area Action
 Abundance Network
 AFSCME Council 57
 Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit)
 All Home
 Amalgamated Transit Union
 American EV Jobs Alliance
 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 3993
 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 3916
 Bay Area Council

Boma San Francisco
California State Legislative Board of the Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers -
Transportation Division (SMART-TD)
Climate Action California
Coalition for Clean Air
East Bay for Everyone
East Bay Housing Organizations
East Bay Leadership Council
El Cerrito Richmond Annex Walk & Roll
Elders Climate Action
Greenbelt Alliance
National Union of Healthcare Workers
NRDC
Public Advocates
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Transit Riders
San Mateo County Economic Development Association
Seamless Bay Area
SEIU California
Senior & Disability Action
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
SPUR
St Forward
Streets for All
Sunflower Alliance
Sustainable San Mateo County
Sv@home Action Fund
Transbay Coalition
Transform
Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO
Walk Bike Berkeley
Walk San Francisco
Westside Family Democratic Club of San Francisco

Opposition

None on file.

Analysis Prepared by: Ethan Jones / ELECTIONS / (916) 319-2094