



**California Special
Districts Association**
Districts Stronger Together



April 22, 2026

Mr. Ian Choudri
Chief Executive Officer
California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: 2026 Draft Business Plan Comments on Proposed Tax Increment Financing Authority

Dear Mr. Choudri:

On behalf of California's statewide organizations representing local agencies, the League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties, California Special Districts Association, Rural County Representatives of California, and Urban Counties of California, we write to express our opposition to the California High-Speed Rail Authority's indication in the 2026 Draft Business Plan they are seeking authority to establish Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFD).

While we recognize the significant financial challenges facing the High-Speed Rail project and appreciate the Authority's efforts to identify innovative funding strategies, the proposed value-capture framework raises profound legal, fiscal, and policy concerns for local governments and the communities we serve.

Constitutional and Legal Concerns

As outlined on page 32 of the Authority's 2026 Draft Business Plan, the proposal to divert local tax increment to a state entity appears inconsistent with multiple provisions of the California Constitution. Local sales tax revenues are expressly protected for local governmental purposes, and the Legislature is prohibited from reallocating or transferring those revenues. Similarly, Proposition 1A (2004) guarantees that cities, counties, and special districts retain their constitutionally protected

share of property tax allocations. Mandatory diversion of property tax increment to a state authority that is not a constitutionally recognized taxing entity violates these protections and would almost certainly invite extensive litigation.

Equally concerning is the proposal's suggestion that the Authority could exercise regulatory influence over land within station areas. Land use authority is constitutionally reserved to cities and counties. While the state may set standards, it cannot assume direct local planning powers. Any attempt to do so would represent a significant encroachment on local governance.

Threats to Local Fiscal Stability

The proposed TIF model would divert future property tax growth—revenues that local governments rely upon to fund essential public services, including public health and safety, infrastructure maintenance, parks, housing programs, and local transportation improvements. Over the potential 45-year lifespan of a TIF district, these diversions would significantly constrain local fiscal capacity, particularly in communities already struggling with service demands and infrastructure backlogs.

Although school district property tax shares are typically excluded from existing TIF structures such as EIFD's and Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities (CRIAs), the broader fiscal ecosystem is interconnected. Reduced city and county revenue capacity can indirectly affect school support services, public safety coordination, and community investment.

Departure from Established California TIF Frameworks

California's existing TIF tools—including EIFDs and CRIAs—are locally initiated, voluntary, and governed by public financing authorities with local representation. Participation by taxing entities requires affirmative consent, and project priorities are determined through locally adopted financing plans.

By contrast, the High-Speed Rail 2026 Draft Business plan proposed that the authority be given the authority to initiate value-capture models that would override local initiation, governance, and consent principles. This represents a fundamental departure from decades of established public finance policy in California.

Risk of Overlapping Districts and Financial Conflicts

Many proposed station areas already fall within existing EIFDs, redevelopment successor areas, or other financing districts with pledged increment streams. Creating overlapping state-directed TIF districts could create significant legal conflicts, impair existing bond obligations, and undermine local economic development planning efforts.

Conclusion

California's cities, counties and special districts support the vision of a modern, statewide high-speed rail system. However, funding that system must not come at the expense of constitutionally protected local revenues, local land-use authority, or the fiscal stability of our communities.

If additional state funding is necessary to advance this project, it should be pursued through constitutionally sound statewide mechanisms—such as voter-approved bonds or dedicated state revenue sources—rather than by diverting local tax increment or weakening local governance.

We respectfully urge the Authority to eliminate this language from their Draft 2026 Business Plan and instead engage collaboratively with local governments to identify funding strategies that consider both statewide infrastructure goals and local fiscal integrity.

Sincerely,



Damon Conklin
Legislative Advocate
League of California Cities
dconklin@calcities.org



Ethan Nagler
Legislative Representative
California Association of Recreation and
Park Districts
enagler@publicpolicygroup.com



Marcus Detwiler
Legislative Representative
California Special Districts Association
marcusd@csda.net



Mark Neuburger
Legislative Advocate
California State Association of Counties
mneuburger@counties.org



Sarah Dukett
Senior Policy Advocate
Rural County Representatives of California
sdukett@rcrcnet.org



Jean Kinney Hurst
Legislative Representative
Urban Counties of California
jkh@hbeadvocacy.com

CC: The Honorable Monique Limón, California Senate President pro Tempore
The Honorable Robert Rivas, California Assembly Speaker
The Honorable John Laird, Chair of the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
The Honorable Jesse Gabriel, Chair of the Assembly Budget Committee