



STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 20, 2022

11:00am – 1:00pm

City Hall, Room 201

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. As authorized by California Government Code Section 54953(e) and Mayor Breed's 45th Supplement to her February 25, 2020 emergency proclamation, it is possible that some members of the State Legislation Committee may attend this meeting remotely via Webex. In that event, those members will participate and vote by video. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above or online at the link below. Everyone attending the meeting in person is required to wear a mask throughout the meeting. Instructions for providing remote public comment can be viewed on page 9 of this meeting agenda.

Join online at

<https://ccsf.webex.com/ccsf/j.php?MTID=m0ef5a5a47d150e47943d29266b2aa58d>

Meeting ID: 2481 277 3245

Meeting Password: 6guV8MCfef2 (64888623 from phones)

Join by Phone at +1-415-655-0001

(Instructions for providing remote public comment can be viewed on page 6)

MEMBERS:

Mayor's Office (Chair) -- Edward McCaffrey

Supervisor Dean Preston -- Preston Kilgore

Supervisor Connie Chan -- Kelly Groth

Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung (substitute for April Meeting--Tina Novero)

City Attorney's Office -- Rebekah Krell

Controller's Office -- Dan Kaplan

Treasurer's Office -- Eric Manke

AGENDA

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting of March 23, 2022.

III. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item). The City's state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

IV. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action). Discussion and possible action item: the Committee with review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

New Business

Office of the City Attorney

Presenter: Rebekah Krell

SB 1282 (Bates): Opioid Master Settlement Agreement

Recommended Position: Oppose

SB 1282 would undermine and nullify an existing statewide allocation agreement carefully negotiated between the California Attorney General's Office and local governments around the state to govern the distribution of California's over two-billion-dollar share of a nationwide settlement with opioid distributors and Johnson & Johnson.

Planning Department

Presenter: Aaron Starr

AB 2656 (Ting): Housing Accountability Act (HAA)

Recommended Position: Support with revisions

AB 2656 proposes to expand the definition of "disapprove housing development project" in the Housing Accountability Act (HAA) by also including any instance in which a local agency 1) delays or denies an HAA-eligible housing development project a CEQA exemption for which it is eligible, 2) requires further environmental study to adopt a negative declaration or addendum, or 3) to certify an EIR for the project when there is a legally sufficient basis in the record before the local agency to adopt a negative declaration or addendum or to certify an EIR without further study.

Planning recommends supporting AB 2656 with requested clarifications and possible suggested additions to the bill because we are interested in ensuring that the Bay Area's jurisdictions (as well as overall statewide) timely build the housing they are obligated to produce and that local agencies do not use CEQA to deny housing development projects.

San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency

Presenter: Katie Angotti

SB 1276 (Durazo): Shared Mobility Service Data

Recommended Position: Support and Sponsor

This bill has three major components:

- 1) It would affirm the authority of a state, county, regional or local government agencies ("regulating agencies") to collect shared mobility service data from a shared mobility service provider that it regulates. This bill would require regulating agencies to adopt data management policies to protect the privacy of a shared mobility device or service user.
- 2) To protect privacy and minimize risk of reidentification, this bill creates new requirements that govern the circumstances in which a regulating agency may disclose shared mobility service data to another public agency other than a law enforcement agency.
- 3) To protect privacy and minimize risk of reidentification, this bill creates new criteria that a regulating agency must follow if shared mobility service data is disclosed to the public to protect privacy and minimize the risk of reidentification.

Department of Technology

Presenter: Brian Roberts

AB 2635 (Levine): Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006

Recommended Position: Support

AB 2635 would require cable companies (aka Video Service Providers) to offer public, educational and government (PEG) access channels in high definition (HD) format.

Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 1930 (Arambula): Medi-Cal: Comprehensive Perinatal Services

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1930 ensures every Californian has a healthy start in life by extending coverage of comprehensive perinatal services for Medi-Cal members to one year postpartum, up from 60-days. The bill also allows perinatal health workers to provide preventive services outside of a clinic.

AB 2790 (Wicks): Reporting of crimes: mandated reporters

Recommended Position: Support

AB 2790 would eliminate mandatory requirements for healthcare providers to notify law enforcement of a broad range of injuries related to intimate partner violence (IPV), and instead mandate that victims of intimate partner and sexual violence receive counseling and referral to community-based or national intimate partner and sexual violence services.

SB 872 (Dodds): Pharmacies: mobile units

Recommended Position: Support and amend

SB 872 allows local jurisdictions to operate a mobile pharmacy that provides prescription medication within their city or county, including to persons experiencing homelessness.

San Francisco Human Services Agency

Presenter: Roderick Finetti

AB 1686 (Bryan): Child welfare agencies: enforcement

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1686 would clarify referral criteria to child support enforcement for parents whose children are placed into foster care.

AB 2262 (Calderon): In-home supportive services: needs assessment

Recommended Position: Support

AB 2262 would simplify the In-Home Supportive Services Program (IHSS) annual reassessment process for certain program recipients.

AB 2579 (Bennett): Child welfare: intensive family finding

Recommended Position: Support

AB 2579 requires counties, to the extent that funding is available and provided, to implement model practices for intensive family finding and support for children in the child welfare system.

SB 1054 (Ochoa Bogh): Public social services: records and confidentiality

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1054 allows multidisciplinary teams (MDT's) from Adult Protective Services (APS) and Child Welfare Services (CWS) to share relevant information across programs during investigations into abuse and neglect.

AB 2483 (Maienschein): Housing for individuals experiencing homelessness

Recommended Position: Support

AB 2483 will leverage existing resources to support the creation of supportive housing for older adults and people living with disabilities who are experiencing homelessness and risk institutionalization.

Department of Environment

Presenter: Kyle Wehner

AB 2247 (Bloom): Perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) products

Recommended Position: Support and Sponsor

This bill would require that any product introduced in California that contains per- and polyfluoro alkyl substances (PFAS) be disclosed in a statewide database.

SB 1215 (Newman) & AB 2440 (Irwin): Responsible Battery Recycling Act

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1215 and AB 2440 will enact the Battery and Battery-Embedded Product Recycling and Fire Risk Reduction Act of 2022. The act will create a statewide collection and recycling program for consumer batteries and battery-embedded products. It will require producers of batteries, battery packs, and battery-embedded products offered for sale or sold in this state to develop, finance, and implement a convenient and cost-effective stewardship program to recover and recycle batteries, battery packs, and battery-embedded products.

AB 1817 (Ting): Product safety:perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1817 would prohibit any entity/person from distributing, selling, or offering for sale in the state any textile articles that contain regulated PFAS, and require a manufacturer to use the least toxic alternative when replacing regulated PFAS in textile articles to comply with these provisions. If passed, the prohibition would go into effect January 2024.

AB 2771 (Friedman): Cosmetic Products: safety

Recommended Position: Support

This bill will prohibit the sale in California of beauty and personal care products containing perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).

AB 1690 (Rivas): Tobacco and cannabis products: single-use electronic cigarettes and integrated cannabis vaporizers

Recommended Position: Support

This bill aims to reduce litter and pollution from single-use tobacco (nicotine) and cannabis smoking products by transitioning the sale of cigarette/cigar filters and single-use electronic vaping devices (vapes) to reusable and rechargeable smoking products.

AB 2208 (Kalra): Fluorescent lamps: sale and distribution: prohibition

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would prohibit compact fluorescent lamps from being offered for final sale, sold at final sale, or distributed as a new manufactured product, on and after January 1, 2024. Compact fluorescent lamps are defined as compact low-pressure, mercury-containing, electric discharge light sources in which a fluorescent coating transforms some of the ultraviolet energy generated by the mercury discharge into visible light. This bill would also enact the same prohibitions to linear fluorescent lamps, which would take effect on and after January 1, 2025.

AB 1724 (Stone): Washing Machines: Microfiber Filtration

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would require, on or before January 1, 2024, that all washing machines sold as new in California contain a microfiber filtration system. State owned washing machines would also be required to contain a microfiber filtration system by that same date.

Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector

Presenter: Jacob DuMez

AB 2839 (Villapuda): California Financing Law: Pilot Program for Increased Access to Responsible Small Dollar Loans: monthly maintenance fees

Recommended Position: Oppose

AB 2839 would expand the allowable fees charged by lenders in a state small-dollar lending pilot to include monthly maintenance fees, further extending the timeline for the pilot.

AB 2540 (Berman): Qualifying Accounts For Direct Deposit of Publicly Administered Funds

Recommended Position: Oppose

AB 2540 would allow charges in the form of "tips" to be charged through accounts receiving unemployment, public benefits, and child support. This tips model is a way that fintech companies, in particular, evade lending laws.

SB 854 (Skinner): Hope, Opportunity, Perseverance, and Empowerment (HOPE) for Children Act of 2022

Recommended Position: Support

SB 854 would create Hope Savings Accounts for children from lower income families who've lost a parent or primary caregiver to COVID-19. Up to \$4,000 would be deposited for kids up to age 9 and up to \$8,000 for youth ages 10-17. Additionally, the bill would ensure that those children who are not eligible for federal survivor benefits would still receive survivor support from a new state program titled the CalSurvivor Program.

SB 1126 (Cortese): CalSavers: Retirement Savings

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1126 would expand definition of an eligible and covered employer for the CalSavers retirement savings program down to the smallest businesses (one or more employees, excluding sole proprietorships, self-employed individuals, or other business entities that do not employ any individuals other than the owners of the business).

SB 1341 (Cortese): Homeless pupils: California Success, Opportunity, and Academic Resilience (SOAR) Guaranteed Income Program

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1341 establishes a statewide guaranteed income pilot program to provide approximately 15,000 12th grade students experiencing homelessness with direct cash assistance to support their transition out of high school and their access to employment and postsecondary education.

Presenter: Michelle Lau

SB 1108 (Becker): Corrections: telecommunications

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1008 eliminates fees for all communications to and from currently incarcerated people in California's juvenile facilities, local jails, and state prisons. Telecommunication costs for currently incarcerated people and their families are an unnecessary financial barrier to basic communication. Free communication services will support strong relationships between incarcerated people and their loved ones, promoting successful reentry and reducing recidivism.

V. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

The government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at sotf@sfgov.org. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100 –2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Edward McCaffrey, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: (415) 554-6588.

Health Considerations

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

April 20, 2022 State Legislation Committee Remote Option

View the meeting:

<https://ccsf.webex.com/ccsf/j.php?MTID=m0ef5a5a47d150e47943d29266b2aa58d>

NOTE: Depending on your broadband/WIFI connection, there may be a 30- second to 2-minute delay when viewing the meeting live.

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: +1-415-655-0001 Access code: 2481 277 3245
Webinar password: 6guV8MCfef2 (64888623 from phones)

Information Regarding Providing Public Comment

- Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.
- Each individual may speak for up to 2 minutes; after which time the line is automatically silenced.
- To make public comment on a specific agenda item, dial in using the information above when the item is called.
- Dial *3 to be added to the public comment queue for this item.
- When it is your time to speak, you will hear "Your line has been unmuted."
- Ensure you are in a quiet location.
- Before you speak, mute the sound of any equipment around you including televisions, radios, and computers. It is especially important that **you mute your computer** so there is no echo sound when you speak.
- When the Commission Secretary states, "Next Caller," you are encouraged to state your name clearly. As soon as you speak, your 2 minute allotment will begin.
- After you speak, you will go back to listening mode. You may stay on the line to provide public comment on another item.



STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 23, 2022
11:00am – 1:00pm
City Hall, Room 201

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. As authorized by California Government Code Section 54953(e) and Mayor Breed’s 45th Supplement to her February 25, 2020 emergency proclamation, it is possible that some members of the State Legislation Committee may attend this meeting remotely via Webex. In that event, those members will participate and vote by video. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above or online at the link below. Everyone attending the meeting in person is required to wear a mask throughout the meeting. Instructions for providing remote public comment can be viewed on page 4 of this meeting agenda.

Join online at

<https://ccsf.webex.com/ccsf/j.php?MTID=meeec6260e04cb1e58c1287a6ea285271>
Meeting ID: 2499 474 3147/ **Meeting Password:** u6J93PyfGTA (86593793 from phones)

Join by Phone at +1-415-655-0001

(Instructions for providing remote public comment can be viewed on page 6)

Meeting commenced at 11:02am

MEMBERS:

Mayor’s Office (Chair) – Edward McCaffrey
Supervisor Dean Preston – Preston Kilgore
Supervisor Connie Chan -- Ian Fregosi
Assessor’s Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney’s Office -- Rebekah Krell
Controller’s Office -- Dan Kaplan
Treasurer’s Office -- Eric Manke

AGENDA

VII. ROLL CALL

Present: Edward McCaffrey, Preston Kilgore, Ian Fregosi, Holly Lung, Rebekah Krell, Dan Kaplan, and Eric Manke

Absent: None.

VIII. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).

Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting of February 23, 2022.

No public comment.

Motion to Approve: Edward McCaffrey

Seconded by: Ian Fregosi

Approved: 7-0

IX. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item). The City’s state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

Presenter: Karen Lange, Partner, Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange

X. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action).

Discussion and possible action item: the Committee with review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

New Business

Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development

Presenter: Sheila Nickolopoulos

AB 2094 (Rivas): General plan: Annual report: Extremely low-income housing
Recommended Position: Support

Existing law requires a city or county to adopt a general plan, which includes a housing element. The local planning department reports annually on the city or county’s progress in meeting its share of regional housing needs (RHNA) and local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.

AB 2094 would additionally require this annual report to include the locality’s progress in meeting the housing needs of extremely low-income (ELI) households. By requiring cities and counties to include additional information in their annual reports, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Eddie McCaffrey

Seconded by: Dan Kaplan

Approved: 7-0

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Presenter: Rebecca Peacock

AB 1814 (Grayson): Transportation electrification: community choice aggregators

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would authorize Community Choice Aggregators (CCAs) to file applications for transportation electrification programs and investments with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). AB 1814 will provide fair access for all ratepayers to these important funds. The SFPUC recommends a support position on AB 1814.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Ian Fregosi

Seconded by: Holly Lung

Approved: 7-0

Department on the Status of Women

Presenter: Elise Hansel

SB 975 (Min): Debt: coerced debts: right of action

Recommended Position: Support

Economic coercion plays a significant role in domestic violence and other forms of abuse, yet current law does not provide adequate protection for victims.

SB 975 will establish consumer and credit protections for individuals who have been coerced into taking on debt without their knowledge or consent.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Eric Manke

Seconded by: Ian Fregosi

Approved: 7-0

Department of Public Health

Presenters: Max Gara

SB 1035 (Eggman): Mental health services: assisted outpatient treatment

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1035 would clarify that medication can be included as part of a treatment plan ordered under assisted outpatient treatment (AOT). DPH recommends a support position on this bill, as the change would provide counties an important tool for ensuring that individuals with serious mental illness receive the recommended medication that helps them maintain stability in the community.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Eddie McCaffrey

Seconded by: Holly Lung

Approved: 7-0

Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector

Presenter: Michelle Lau

SB 1106 (Wiener): Criminal resentencing: restitution

Recommended Position: Support

Senate Bill 1106 removes barriers to criminal record relief by ensuring outstanding restitution and restitution finds are not used to deny a request for expungement.

We recommend supporting this bill. Ensuring successful re-entry for people with past convictions benefits the broader community; expungement petitions should not be denied due to outstanding restitution debt.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Ian Fregosi

Seconded by: Eric Manke

Approved: 7-0

XI. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting concluded at 11:58pm.

settlement would be undone. It would also undermine the credibility of the California Attorney General's Office, who negotiated the state allocation agreement with local governments on behalf of the state.

Additionally, SB 1282 would seriously undermine future efforts to bring settlement funds from opioid litigation into

California. Localities will not sign on to future settlements if the Legislature is simply going to void them. Nearly one hundred local governments in California have brought opioid cases, and must release their claims in order for a settlement to be effectuated. The "state-takes-all" approach by SB 1282 is a nonstarter for those local government litigators who have been leading the charge against the opioid defendants in court. If SB 1282 passes, California's litigating cities and counties will not agree to dismiss our claims, preventing any future settlements.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The funds that SB 1282 would allow the Legislature to appropriate are badly needed to address the opioid crisis in California. The statewide allocation agreement already directs these funds to state-approved, priority uses for alleviating the opioid crisis. These funds are directed through the statewide allocation agreement to the state and to local governments that provide safety net public health services and have borne the brunt of responding to the opioid crisis. Our office sued the settling defendants in order to hold them accountable for their role in causing the opioid epidemic that plagues our communities, especially victimizing vulnerable and unhoused persons. Just as hard-won settlement funds are finally about to shore up our efforts, SF 1282 would snatch them away.

Departments Impacted & Why

Any/all departments that would receive funding under the settlement agreement: HSH, DPH, HSA.

Fiscal Impact

Up to \$61M in SF - <https://www.sfcityattorney.org/2022/02/25/9362/>

Support / Opposition

Santa Barbara County
Los Angeles County
City of San Clemente
City of Encinitas

The San Francisco City Attorney has already submitted a letter of opposition to the Chairs of the Senate Health and Senate Judiciary Committees.



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor’s Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 8, 2022
Submitting Department	Planning Department
Contact Name	Devyani Jain, Aaron Starr
Contact Email	devyani.jain@sfgov.org
Contact Phone	628.652.7574
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2656 Asm. Ting, District 19, Democrat Housing Accountability Act (HAA): disapprovals: California Environmental Quality Act

Recommended Position

- SPONSOR
- SUPPORT *with Amends*
- OPPOSE
- OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 2656 proposes to expand the definition of “disapprove housing development project” in the Housing Accountability Act (HAA) by also including any instance in which a local agency 1) delays or denies an HAA-eligible housing development project a CEQA exemption for which it is eligible, 2) requires further environmental study to adopt a negative declaration or addendum, or 3) to certify an EIR for the project when there is a legally sufficient basis in the record before the local agency to adopt a negative declaration or addendum or to certify an EIR without further study.

Planning recommends supporting AB 2656 with requested clarifications and possible suggested additions to the bill because we are interested in ensuring that the Bay Area’s jurisdictions (as well as overall statewide) timely build the housing they are obligated to produce and that local agencies do not use

CEQA to deny housing development projects.

Background/Analysis

The HAA was enacted to establish limitations to a local government’s ability to deny, reduce the density of, or make infeasible housing development projects, emergency shelters or farmworker housing that are consistent with objective local development standards and contribute to meeting housing needs. Specifically, the HAA, prohibits a local agency from disapproving an HAA-eligible housing development project, unless it makes certain written findings based on a preponderance of the evidence in the record. HAA defines “disapprove the housing development project” as any instance in which a local agency either disapproves a housing development project application, including any land use approvals or entitlements necessary for the issuance of a building permit, or fails to comply with specified time periods.

The HAA does not currently address the issue of local agency using CEQA to deny housing development projects.

The Planning Department does not have data on the number of HAA-eligible housing projects in San Francisco. The majority of the large residential development projects in the City are not HAA eligible because they require discretionary approvals or entitlements that deviate from the City's zoning code. This may change and its possible we may see more HAA- eligible project proposals in San Francisco in the future.

Challenge

AB 2656 is proposing to close a perceived loophole in the current HAA legislation where local agencies can effectively disapprove or delay an HAA-eligible housing development project by creating obstacles through CEQA.

In the Planning Department's estimation, AB 2656's impact on San Francisco is not anticipated to be substantial. This is because the majority of the large residential development projects in San Francisco are not HAA-eligible projects. Furthermore, relative to the large number of housing development projects approved each year in the city (the vast majority of which require CEQA determinations), it is rare for San Francisco's CEQA appellate body, the Board of Supervisors, to deny a project a CEQA exemption for which the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) has determined it is eligible, or require further environmental study to adopt a negative declaration or addendum or to certify an EIR after issuance by the ERO.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2656 would benefit from certain clarifications and additions to make it more effective:

First, it would be useful to clarify who would be the arbiter of a challenge to a local agency's compliance with the provisions of AB 2656; for instance, would it be the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the courts, or some other entity? Secondly, it would also be useful to clarify the standard of review for

disputes over whether there is a legally sufficient basis in the record before the local agency to support the issuance of a CEQA exemption or adoption of a negative declaration or addendum or certification an EIR for an HAA-eligible project. AB 2656 should also clarify how to reconcile that review standard with established legal standards that guide CEQA lead agencies in the preparation of CEQA documents (e.g., the fair argument).

Departments Impacted & Why

Planning Department and related City decisionmakers.

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

None Listed

mobility devices in the public right-of-way. For example, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and SFMTA have structured permit programs and terms to regulate mobility services. The collection of shared mobility service data by regulating agencies is necessary to effectively regulate the operation and use of the share mobility devices and services, monitor the impacts, (especially as it pertains to equitable access) to enforce permit requirements, and to carry out regulating a agency's responsibilities to design, maintain and operation the public rights-of-way for safe and efficient multimodal use.

Providers of shared mobility services operators and their employees have real-time access to information about the location of their users, as well as their payment methods and home addresses. In contrast, the shared mobility device data that providers are required to report to regulating agencies is largely deidentified, meaning that it does not contain personal information related to drivers or users. Examples include start and end time of trip, duration of trip, point or origin, route and end point. Shared mobility devices are not inherently linked to individual users because they are offered to the public to serve as many users as possible.

We understand that disclosure of deidentified shared mobility device data could raise privacy concerns to the extent that it documents the location where a particular trip begins and ends. State and local agencies are subject to the Public Records Act and may be required to disclose information to the public. State and local agencies also have a duty to protect the privacy rights of individuals under the California Constitution. State and local agencies currently use a variety of methods to protect the privacy rights of users of shared mobility devices so that deidentified data released in response to public records requests appropriately serves regulatory and public accountability goals while protecting individual privacy.

Challenge

The private shared mobility device and service industry has made several attempts in previous years to limit the ability of State

and local regulating agencies to collect the information necessary to properly manage, enforce, and ensure compliance with permit programs and to serve other important public purposes, such as mitigating environmental effects, supporting planning for public transportation services and planning for safe multi-modal public infrastructure. There are at least two bills that have been introduced this year that try to limit State and local regulating agencies' ability to collect data, and would apply to share mobility device data.

The industry often cites both protection of individual privacy and protection of trade secrets to justify opposition to collection of service data by State and local agencies. In addition, privacy advocates are concerned about use of this data by law enforcement agencies for surveillance of individuals or public assemblies. However, this data collection is often critical to evaluating compliance with reasonable regulations that are designed to protect public safety and achieve other critical California and local public goals.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The State and local agencies have existing authority to manage and enforce the requirements governing private shared mobility service permit programs. This bill would affirm SFMTA's authority to collect shared mobility service data to regulate the operation and use of shared mobility devices and services in the City. SB 1276 addresses privacy concerns by prohibiting data disclosure to law enforcement agencies without a warrant, court order or subpoena and by instituting data security requirements that limit the risk of reidentification of individual users.

This bill would authorize a regulating agency such as the CPUC to disclose deidentified, shared mobility service data with another public agency, such as the SFMTA. A receiving public agency must comply with the same data security requirements as the regulating agency and is subject to the same limits on public disclosure of data.

To protect individual privacy, this bill would prohibit a regulating or public agency from disclosing deidentified shared mobility service data to the public unless certain criteria are met to protect individual privacy and to minimize the risk of reidentification.

Departments Impacted & Why

This bill would govern the data management practices of the SFMTA, the SFCTA and the Airport but would not make significant changes to current practices. The bill would prevent these agencies from sharing data with SFPD or other law enforcement agencies. The bill would preclude these agencies from disclosing shared mobility service data with local, state or federal law enforcement agencies other than as required by law pursuant to a warrant, court order, subpoena or other legal processes. This provision would apply to local law enforcement agencies.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact to the City. SFMTA staff already implement the data privacy and security measures detailed in the bill.

Support / Opposition

Support:

Los Angeles Department of Transportation
California Labor Federation
USCW

Opposition:

ACLU
Electronic Frontier Foundation

Support / Opposition

Support:

Media Alliance

Opposition:

*California Cable & Telecommunications
Association*



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor's Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	4/8/2022
Submitting Department	SF Department of Public Health
Contact Name	Max Gara; 415-554-2621 Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org
Contact Email	
Contact Phone	Sneha Patil; 415-554-2795 Sneha.patil@sfdph.org
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

AB 1930 Asm. Arambula, District 31, Democrat Medi-Cal: Comprehensive Perinatal Services

Recommended Position

- SPONSOR **SUPPORT**
 SUPPORT if amended **OPPOSE**
 OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 1930 ensures every Californian has a healthy start in life by extending coverage of comprehensive perinatal services for Medi-Cal members to one year postpartum, up from 60-days. The bill also allows perinatal health workers to provide preventive services outside of a clinic.

Background/Analysis

In San Francisco, a persistent and consistent pattern emerges when examining birth data by race and ethnicity. Socio-economic hardships, pregnancy complications and barriers to prenatal care remain significantly higher for Black/African American and Pacific Islander women, despite small improvements over the past decade. For example, Black/African American (22%) birthing people were significantly more likely to report prenatal depression than White (9%) birthing people. One of the programs provided under Medi-Cal that aims to address these inequities, and improve

overall birth and post-partum outcomes, is the Comprehensive Perinatal Services Program (CPSP).

The CPSP is a program under Med-Cal that provides a wide range of culturally competent services to pregnant people, from conception through 60-days postpartum. In addition to standard obstetric services, women receive enhanced services in the areas of nutrition, psychosocial, and health education. These services are provided in clinical settings by multidisciplinary teams that also include Comprehensive Perinatal Health Workers (CPHW). In San Francisco, there are 16 providers who provide services under the program, and 2021 1,500 births were covered under Medi-Cal.

Challenge

Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) are potentially traumatic events that occur while we are young. A significant body of research has shown that the more ACEs one is exposed to as a child, the greater one's health risks are as an adult. The primary prevention strategy for ACEs is to address the source by creating a stable, safe, and nurturing relationships and environments for

children, starting before birth. Providing comprehensive health and social services, especially when provided by perinatal health workers, is an important tool to promote primary prevention of ACEs. Perinatal health workers help screen for behavioral and physical health issues, promote preventative healthcare, and support stronger parent-child bonds.

A 2020 Department of Health Care Services report found only one in four children covered by Medi-Cal received developmental screenings or child well visits in the first 15 months. Given that many ACEs and negative impacts of postpartum depression may not manifest until well after childbirth, the 60-day window of CPSP provided to some of the most vulnerable parents in California leaves a gap in support that can significantly impact a child's development and future. Further, perinatal health workers are restricted to providing services only within clinics, and therefore are not able to meet individuals where they reside and feel most comfortable receiving care. These factors can collectively work to prevent pregnant and post-partum persons receiving important health and social services.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1930 would expand the CPSP program to cover the full year duration of postpartum eligibility for Medi-Cal beneficiaries, up from 60-days post-partum. It will direct the DHCS and CDPH to determine the extent of benefits to provide adequate postpartum care. It will also require DHCS to seek federal approval for coverage of in-home visits of perinatal health workers to beneficiaries of CPSP.

By expanding the duration and location that CPSP services can be provided, this bill would allow San Francisco's CPSP providers to better support the needs of pregnant and postpartum people, such as mental health care, lactation support, parenting support and other social determinant of health needs that occur during this period. Allowing CPSP services to be provided in-

home visits by perinatal health workers would provide additional support to pregnant and postpartum people who participate in public health nurse home visiting programs. The addition of CPHWs to home visiting teams will expand the current limited workforce and provide support for assessment of the need for referrals to programs before it is too late or issues in home escalate.

Departments Impacted & Why

DPH: (1) will have to provide training and technical assistance to CPSP providers on administering the new benefits to patients.

(2) Provide training & technical assistance to programs that will be working with perinatal health workers for in home CPSP services.

Fiscal Impact

This will allow CPSP providers (in DPH and outside of DPH) to receive additional revenue for providing services for the duration of the 12-month extension. Information on the impact to State general fund is not yet available.

Support / Opposition

Supporters: County Health Executives of California (CHEAC), California American Academy of Pediatrics, First 5 Association of California, March of Dimes, First 5 Center for Children's Policy, The Children's Partnership, Maternal Child Health Access, National Health Law Program, Children Now, Black Women for Wellness Action Project, PACEs Connection, California Nurse-Midwives Association, Nurse-Family Partnership, Western Center on Law & Poverty, California Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians, Mothers Care

Opposition: none known at this time



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor’s Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 8, 2022
Submitting Department	Department of Public Health
Contact Name	Max Gara; 415-554-2621
Contact Email	Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org
Contact Phone	Sneha Patil; 415-554-2795 Sneha.patil@sfdph.org
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2790 Asm. Wicks, District 15, Democrat Reporting of crimes: mandated reporters

Recommended Position

- SPONSOR **SUPPORT**
 SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE
 OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 2790 would eliminate mandatory requirements for healthcare providers to notify law enforcement of a broad range of injuries related to intimate partner violence (IPV), and instead mandate that victims of intimate partner and sexual violence receive counseling and referral to community-based or national intimate partner and sexual violence services.

Background/Analysis

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a hidden epidemic that results in adverse health effects including acute injuries, chronic pain, mental health disorders, increased risk of sexually transmitted infections, and poor overall health. In the United States, 1 in 4 women and 1 in 11 men experience sexual or physical violence and/or stalking over

their lifetime. Among women patients cared for in emergency departments (EDs), 14%-30% have experienced IPV in the past year. Despite this high prevalence, only 5.8% or fewer of people experiencing IPV victimization are identified. People have many reasons not to disclose IPV to healthcare providers including fear of the person perpetrating IPV, worry about unhelpful actions or reactions from the healthcare provider, shame, and lack of familiarity with laws or helpful resources. These barriers are present to a greater degree among immigrant minority women, especially undocumented women.¹

Given that IPV is often underreported, it is difficult to assess the full extent to which San Franciscans experience this issue. In FY 2020, there were 7,241 IPV -related calls to 911 in San Francisco and based on a breakdown of intimate partner violence victims from the Police Department by race/ethnicity, Black/African American and Latinx communities were overrepresented among IPV-victims (29% and 27%, respectively).²

¹ Kimberg, L., Vasquez, J. A., Sun, J., Anderson, E., Ferguson, C., Arreguin, M., & Rodriguez, R. M. (2021). Fears of disclosure and misconceptions regarding DV

reporting amongst patients in two US emergency departments. PLOS ONE, 16, e0260467.
² Department on the Status of Women. (2021). 2021 Family Violence in San Francisco Report. San Francisc

Challenge

San Francisco Department of Public Health's (DPH's) San Francisco Health Network has worked to implement a standardized screen procedure throughout its patient services to identify individuals who experience IPV. For example, screening procedures are now fully integrated into primary care clinics - identified individuals experiencing IPV can receive referrals to onsite behavioral health specialists, patient advocates, and community organizations that provide support to IPV victims (e.g., La Casa de las Madres). One of the impediments to making the screening process more effective in identifying IPV-victims are the current mandatory reporting laws that require providers to notify law enforcement if they suspect an individual has experienced IPV.

Under current law, health providers must make a report to law enforcement when they suspect a patient has suffered physical injury caused by assault or abuse, such as conduct stemming from IPV. As a result, IPV survivors are less likely to seek help or share information with their health care providers due to fear of unwanted contact with police. California is one of only three states that require health providers to report to law enforcement if they are treating patients for violent physical injuries – even if the patient does not want the report to be made.

Research shows that these types of laws can make IPV situations worse and discourage survivors from seeking health care due to fear that law enforcement involvement.

Research has also shown that, when providers are able to have open, trauma-informed conversations with patients about abuse, survivors are four times more likely to access an intervention, such as intimate partner violence advocacy. This research underscores the importance of consistent, trusting, patient-centered health care responses.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2790 aims to address the challenges associated with mandatory law

enforcement reporting, and provide a more survivor-centered, trauma-informed approach. Under the bill, health providers will only be required to report firearm injuries to law enforcement, and would remove the requirement that a health provider make a report to law enforcement when they suspect a patient has suffered physical injury caused by assault or abuse.

In addition, if a health provider knows or suspects a patient is experiencing any kind of intimate partner or sexual violence, they will be required to provide brief counseling and a referral to local and national intimate partner violence or sexual violence advocacy services. Patients can still work with law enforcement if that is what they choose.

This bill will support DPH's efforts to make IPV screening more effective and widely available throughout its patient services. By mandating that counseling and referrals be provided, the bill also helps to build institutional support to enhance current counseling and linkage services to better address the needs of individuals who experience IPV.

Departments Impacted & Why

No other departments would be directly impacted by this legislation.

Fiscal Impact

The City General fund would not be directly impacted by this policy changes in the bill.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT: Futures Without Violence (Co-Sponsor), Alliance for Boys and Men of Color (Co-Sponsor), UC Irvine Domestic Violence Law Clinic (Co-Sponsor), ACLU CA Action, CA Partnership to End Domestic Violence Family Violence

OPPOSE: Police Officer Associations

Solution/Recommended Proposal

To reduce barriers to health care for PEH, SB 872 would change state law and authorize counties and cities to operate licensed mobile vans to provide prescription medication within their city or County boundaries, including to PEH.

Specifically, the bill would allow a mobile unit (e.g., van) to provide prescription medication pursuant to a valid prescription if the county meets certain requirements for licensure, staffing, and operations. For example, mobile units would be required to be licensed by California State Board of Pharmacy and staffed by a pharmacist and a pharmacy technician.

DPH is supportive of the bill's aims to increase access to Californians, including PEH, who otherwise would not be able to receive needed prescriptions. Allowing counties to operate mobile pharmacies could support programs like DPH's Street Medicine Team by ensuring they can more comprehensively care for PEH outside the normal boundaries of a clinic.

In addition to supporting the bill, DPH recommends the proposal be amended to ensure it is not unnecessarily restrictive, aligns with the medication needs of PEH patients, and better facilitates access to medications for hard-to-reach individuals.

Proposed Amendments

Medications for the Treatment of Opioid Use Disorder (MOUD): Under the proposed bill, controlled substances would not be allowed to be provided by the mobile units. This exclusion includes MOUD medications such as buprenorphine, which a significant number of PEH clients use to treat their substance use disorder (SUD). While the controlled substance prohibition has been included to address potential safety concerns associated with theft of these medications, the bill could be amended to address these concerns as well as ensure access to important SUD medications. We suggest either (a) allowing for medications specific for the treatment of SUD; or (b) restricting to non-CII classes of controlled

substances, and only in reasonable quantities based on prescription volume for the mobile unit. These limitations would allow for critical SUD medications, but continue to prohibit more theft-prone medications such as morphine, oxycodone, and fentanyl.

Nurse Practitioners: Currently, the bill specifies that prescriptions for medication can only be provided by physicians. We recommend amending the bill to clarify that medications prescribed by all legal prescribers, such as nurse practitioners, can be provided by the mobile units. This would ensure that the bill aligns with the full continuum of providers that engage with populations most in need of improved access.

This bill creates critical access to potentially life-saving drugs that will improve the lives of the most vulnerable Californian. For these reasons, we recommend support the bill, and amending as specified.

Departments Impacted & Why

No other department would be impacted by the bill.

Fiscal Impact

- Potential long-term cost savings by reducing utilization of higher acuity services for individuals who are currently unable to access medication to address their health conditions.
- Prescription medications for clients that have drug coverage, such as Medi-Cal or a Part D plan, would be reimbursable. For those clients that remain in Healthy San Francisco or SF County Mental Health coverage, DPH would not receive reimbursement.
- If DPH pursued mobile units as allowed for under the bill, funding would be needed to develop and maintain program services and staff the units.

Support / Opposition

Support: San Diego County (sponsor), Santa Clara County (sponsor), Contra Costa County, CHEAC.

Oppose: None known at this time.



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor's Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	March 14, 2022
Submitting Department	SFHSA
Contact Name	Susie Smith
Contact Email	Susie.smith@sfgov.org
Contact Phone	415 307 3291
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

AB 1686 Asm. Bryan, District 54, Democrat Child welfare families: child support enforcement

Recommended Position

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SPONSOR | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SUPPORT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SUPPORT if amended | <input type="checkbox"/> OPPOSE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER & Describe | |

Summary

AB 1686 would clarify referral criteria to child support enforcement for parents whose children are placed into foster care.

Background/Analysis

Currently, the Department of Child Support Services and local child support agencies are responsible for collecting and enforcing child support obligations, including child support delinquencies. A child welfare department can make a referral for child support collections in certain instances where collection is not a barrier to reunification for children that have been involuntarily separated from their parents.

Challenge

Families who are supported by public systems are better able to successfully complete the requirements of the dependency court in order to reunify with

their children. Conversely, enforcing payment of child support by parents who are financially struggling generally serves to make reunification with their children harder to achieve and can further destabilize the family. Research shows that for every \$100 child welfare-involved parents pay, their child's duration in care lengthens for 6.6 months. The effects are especially pronounced for families of color, who are significantly over-represented in California's child welfare system.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1686 provides clarification of current law, indicating a presumption that a child support referral is likely to pose a barrier to reunification for families engaging in that process. This change effectively narrows the circumstances that would allow child welfare professionals to refer parents to child support enforcement, while keeping California law within the parameters of federal law. As a result, this bill will improve outcomes for foster youth by assisting them in reunifying with their families.

Departments Impacted & Why

SFHSA & DCSS

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

Support:

The County Welfare Directors of California
(sponsoring);

Children NOW

Children's Defense Fund



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor’s Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	March 14, 2022
Submitting Department	SFHSA
Contact Name	Susie Smith
Contact Email	Susie.smith@sfgov.org
Contact Phone	415 307 3291
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2262

Asm. Calderon, District 57, Democrat

In-home supportive services: needs assessment

Recommended Position

- SPONSOR SUPPORT
 SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE
 OTHER & Describe

Challenge

By law, IHSS consumers must have an annual reassessment for services, which are performed by county social workers. Current law, enacted in 2004, allows for a “variable reassessment” at county option and on a case-by-case basis if specified conditions are met. However, in practice this option does not apply to many of our consumers who have relatively stable health conditions, and counties are thus unable to utilize this option to streamline most assessments. The variable reassessment process also requires a significant amount of work to determine if the consumer is eligible. Some of the criteria are not tracked directly by the Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS), and some criteria may not be known to IHSS staff at the time of reassessment.

Summary

AB 2262 would simplify the In-Home Supportive Services Program (IHSS) annual reassessment process for certain program recipients.

Background/Analysis

IHSS provides various services, from house cleaning and grocery shopping to protective supervision and paramedical services, to eligible older adults and adults and children with disabilities. The program helps recipients by giving them essential care that allows them to live independently in their own homes. Demand for services provided through IHSS is set to increase significantly. By 2030, one in five Californians will be age 65 or older— double what the over-65 population is today. Many of these individuals will also have a disability, cognitive impairment, or other condition that affects their ability to live independently without help.

IHSS applicants and recipients with more complex needs require additional focus by IHSS social workers during the assessment process to support accurate and timely assessments. This includes, for example, individuals who lack other support systems and those with behavioral health needs. Improving the variable reassessment tool to

ensure it can be applied to more consumers with relatively stable needs would help the already-underfunded IHSS program keep pace with the growing number of consumers and the growing proportion of those with higher acuity.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2262 accomplishes this by requiring the Department of Social Services to establish an alternative annual reassessment process, as specified, for program recipients with stable needs and whose IHSS hours do not fluctuate, or fluctuate very little, each year. Upon a determination that an IHSS consumer qualifies for an alternative annual reassessment, county IHSS staff would reach out to the consumer using a pre-filled, simplified CMIPS-generated form containing questions to be answered at a phone/video assessment.

This new alternative reassessment process would still allow the social worker to document and process changes in services as needed by the consumer and would be applicable for two years. Every third year, IHSS social workers would be required to conduct a face-to-face visit during the reassessment. IHSS consumers could opt out at any time and request an in-person re-assessment.

In all, this bill will reduce barriers for IHSS recipients to receive the care they need and assist program providers in meeting increasing demand while grappling with chronically underfunded administrative work.

Departments Impacted & Why

Only SFHSA/DAS

Fiscal Impact

Minimal TBD costs, if any.

Support / Opposition

CWDA & Justice in Aging are co-sponsoring this bill.

Departments Impacted & Why

Only SFHSA

Fiscal Impact

This bill has an accompanying \$15M in state general fund budget proposal, also sponsored by the County Welfare Directors of California.

Support / Opposition

The County Welfare Directors of California (sponsoring); child advocacy groups like Children NOW and Children's Defense Fund are likely to support.

measure creates a streamlined process for the purposes of information sharing that will improve efficiency and better ensure a well-informed response to reports of abuse or neglect.

Departments Impacted & Why

Only SFHS

Fiscal Impact

Minimal TBD costs, if any.

Support / Opposition

County Welfare Director's Association is a CO-SPONSOR of SB 1054, along with the County of Riverside,

intensive services trigger licensing requirements.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Under AB 2483, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) will offer incentive points to developers seeking funding through the Multifamily Housing Program to build projects that include housing units for people experiencing homelessness eligible for PACE, ALW, or HCBAW. Specifically, it requires developer applying for HDC Multifamily Housing Program funding to set aside a percentage of units for people experiencing homelessness who are receiving the above-specified Medi-Cal services.

Minor changes in State law will also clarify that these independent housing sites will not require licensing.

Finally, the bill requires HCD to work with our Medi-Cal agency, the Department of Health Care Services, to align services and connect developers with Medi-Cal-funded service providers. By aligning eligibility between these Medi-Cal programs and California's Multifamily Housing Program, the bill will scale up best practices that allow older adults and people with disabilities experiencing homelessness to avoid nursing home admissions, to exit homelessness for good, and to receive the services they need and want.

Departments Impacted & Why

MOHCD indirectly as the proposal impacts how HCD affordable housing grants are evaluated.

Fiscal Impact

Unknown but seemingly minor because it is leveraging existing funding streams.

Support / Opposition

Support; Corporation for Supportive Housing (Sponsor) California Apartment Association California Housing Partnership Corporation CalPACE Cardea Health East Bay Innovations, Housing California Institute on Aging National Health Foundation On Lok Senior Health Services

This bill would require HCD to:

1. Award reasonable incentives to Multifamily Housing Program project applicants that agree to set aside at least 25% of the project's units for individuals that are either experiencing homelessness or eligible to receive the above listed Medi-Cal-funded supportive services;
2. Partner with the State Department of Health Care Services to determine the most effective way to align qualifying services in housing projects funded by the Multifamily Housing Program; and
3. Evaluate whether incentives are meeting the desired program outcomes.

California Association of Sanitation Agencies
(of which SFPUC is a member)
Clean Water Action
Environmental Working Group
Natural Resource Defense Council
Wastewater agencies (likely)

Opposed by:
None on record



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor's Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	4/8/2022
Submitting Department	Environment
Contact Name	Huy Le
Contact Email	Huy.le@sfgov.org
Contact Phone	415-355-3760
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

SB 1215 (Newman, D) & AB 2440 (Irwin, D) Responsible Battery Recycling Act of 2022

Recommended Position

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SPONSOR | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SUPPORT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SUPPORT if amended | <input type="checkbox"/> OPPOSE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER & Describe | |

Summary

SB 1215 and AB 2440 will enact the Battery and Battery-Embedded Product Recycling and Fire Risk Reduction Act of 2022. The act will create a statewide collection and recycling program for consumer batteries and battery-embedded products. It will require producers of batteries, battery packs, and battery-embedded products offered for sale or sold in this state to develop, finance, and implement a convenient and cost-effective stewardship program to recover and recycle batteries, battery packs, and battery-embedded products.

Background/Analysis

Because of the hazardous metals and corrosive materials that batteries contain, California classifies batteries as hazardous waste and bans them from solid waste landfills. When improperly discarded, batteries pose serious fire, health and safety hazards that disrupt our waste stream and

poison our environment. Unfortunately, as the result of a combination of increased consumption and a lack of convenient disposal options for end users, higher numbers of toxic batteries are entering the waste stream. This has resulted in increased number of fires in material recovery facilities, waste collection trucks, and landfills caused by improperly disposed of Li-ion batteries. Such fires not only pollute the atmosphere and surrounding areas while causing extensive damage to city and county waste collection vehicles, equipment, and facilities, they also endanger the lives of workers involved with the handling of consumer waste.

Challenge

Resource Recycling Systems estimates that 75% to 92% of expended Li-ion batteries are discarded improperly. As the result of innovations in manufacturing and packaging, Li-ion batteries have made it harder for the average consumer to distinguish and segregate them from other trash going into the waste stream.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Opposed by:
None on record

SB 1215 and AB 2440 will create a collection and recycling program that more efficiently and effectively collects used batteries while ensuring that improperly disposed of batteries will no longer pose a danger to the companies and employees charged with managing our waste stream. Key aspects include:

- Consumer access to free and easily accessible battery collection sites at select locations across the state.
- Acceptance of loose and product-embedded batteries for all common household battery types, including Li-ion, alkaline, nickel-cadmium, and nickel-metal hydride batteries in order to avoid consumer confusion.
- Requirement that producers of batteries and product-embedded batteries sold in the state develop, finance, and implement this program in collaboration with CalRecycle to recover and recycle their products.

Departments Impacted & Why

SFE has two staff that manage a network of approximately 65 retail collection sites that collect household batteries from San Francisco residents. The bill would establish a stewardship organization to manage these collection sites and SFE staff would help with the transition and ensure the stewardship organization's compliance with the law. In addition, existing retail collection sites do not currently accept batteries embedded in products, so San Francisco residents would benefit from an expanded stewardship program that includes these products.

Fiscal Impact

The fiscal impact on the City would be negligible. However, the cost to manage the existing retail sites will shift toward the stewardship organization, potentially decreasing cost to rate payers.

Support / Opposition

Supported by:
California Against Waste
California Product Stewardship Council
Rethink Waste

water systems serving up to 16 million people have already been found to have PFAS contamination, and contamination is more prevalent in disadvantaged communities.

San Francisco has made efforts to curb PFAS pollution through local policies such as our Plastics, Toxics, and Litter Reduction Ordinance, which bans the use of food-ware containing PFAS. Our Green Purchasing program for City Departments restricts PFAS in carpets. Those policies have been effective, but when the entire state of California enacts a policy restricting the use of PFAS, it creates a much larger impact that truly shifts the market.

The California legislature recently passed SB 1044 (Allen), AB 1200 (Ting), and AB 652 (Friedman) to prohibit the use of PFAS in firefighting foam, paper-based food packaging, and children’s products. AB 1817 would add another product category (textiles and clothing) to the existing items that must be made without PFAS to be sold in California.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Companies like Levi’s, Gap, H&M, Puma, Keen, Osprey, Patagonia, Ikea, and Zara, have either eliminated or made commitments to eliminate PFAS from their products. PFAS is an unnecessary use in clothing and textiles, and as such, we believe it should be phased out. This bill would do that, giving companies until January of 2024 to comply.

Departments Impacted & Why

All departments that purchase textiles for furnishings, wall and window coverings, etc. will benefit from this legislation, making it easier to comply with City purchasing requirements to eliminate PFAS from these purchases.

Fiscal Impact

There is no anticipated fiscal impact.

Support / Opposition

Supported by:

Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
Association of California Water Agencies
Bay Area Pollution Prevention Group
Breast Cancer Action
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners
California Black Health Network
CALPIRG
Clean Water Action
Natural Resources Defense Council
Northern California Recycling Association
Physicians for Social Responsibility – Bay Area Chapter
San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility
San Francisco Baykeeper
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Sierra Club California
Upstream
Wishtoyo Chumash Foundation
Zero Waste USA

Opposed by:

American Chemistry Council
American Forest & Paper Association
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
California Retailers Association
Juvenile Products Manufacturers Association
National Council of Textile Organizations

chemicals. However, there are 9,000 different PFAS chemicals on the market today and banning the entire class of PFAS chemicals (which this bill does) will help ensure that one harmful PFAS is not replaced with another.

Departments Impacted & Why

SFPUC will benefit from passage of this legislation because cosmetics are washed off, down drains and go to wastewater treatment. Because PFAS are not removed by wastewater treatment, PFAS are either discharged to the Bay and Ocean or sorb to the solids fraction of wastewater and contaminate biosolids. We have discussed this bill with SFPUC and they agree with a recommendation to support.

Fiscal Impact

There is no anticipated fiscal impact to the City & County of San Francisco.

Support / Opposition

Supported by:
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners
Clean Water Action
Environmental Working Group

environment for decades and degrade into microplastics instead of decomposing. Both combustible and electronic cigarette products can leach toxic chemicals such as arsenic, lead and nicotine into the surrounding environment as they degrade. These chemicals can harm aquatic wildlife in even small amounts and can also be hazardous to children and pets when ingested or handled.

<u>Solution/Recommended</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
	This bill would transition smoking products away from single-use formats toward reusable and/or refillable alternatives that are already widely available. The bill would prohibit the sale of a cigarette/cigar that utilizes a single-use filter made of any material; a single-use plastic device meant to facilitate manual manipulation or filtration of a cigar (<i>tiparillo</i>); a single-use electronic cigarette; or a single-use integrated cannabis vaporizer. A city attorney, county counsel, or district attorney would be authorized – but not required – to assess a \$500 civil fine for each violation.

<u>Departments Impacted & Why</u>
The San Francisco Cigarette Litter Abatement Fee charges a \$1.05 fee per pack of cigarettes sold in San Francisco. This fee is set by the Treasurer Tax Collector’s office. Fee is reduced in response to this bill. However, the Fee is required to cover actual litter abatement costs, so a reduction in the Fee would correspond to a reduction in Public Works’ actual cigarette litter abatement costs. The net fiscal impact to Public Works may be positive because this bill would reduce litter from other smoking products such as vapes and <i>tiparillos</i> that are not covered by the Fee. Other departments that maintain public spaces, such as the Recreation and Parks Department, may experience reduced litter abatement costs due to reductions in the amount of smoking product waste litter. Similarly, SFPUC may experience reduced pollution prevention and capture costs due to reductions in the amount of smoking product waste entering storm drains and other infrastructure.

Fiscal Impact

Potential reduction in litter abatement and pollution prevention costs to Public Works, Recreation and Parks Department, and SFPUC. See “Departments Impacted” above for more details.

Support / Opposition

Supported by:
 The 5 Gyres Institute
 African American Tobacco Control Leadership Council
 Action on Smoking and Health
 African American Tobacco Control Leadership Council
 Association of CA Healthcare Districts
 Bay Area Pollution Prevention Group
 Breathe Southern California
 Californians Against Waste
 California Product Stewardship Council
 The Center for Oceanic Awareness, Research, and Education
 Cigarette Butt Pollution Project
 Families Advocating for Chemical and Toxics Safety
 Heal the Bay
 National Stewardship Action Council
 Northern California Recycling Association
 Ocean Conservancy
 Oceana
 Plastic Oceans International
 Plastic Pollution Coalition
 RethinkWaste
 San Francisco Tobacco Free Coalition
 Save Our Shores
 Seventh Generation Advisors
 Surfrider Foundation
 Upstream
 Wishtoyo Chumash Foundation
 Zero Waste Sonoma
 Zero Waste USA

Opposed by:
 American Petroleum and Convenience Store Association
 California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce
 California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
 California Grocers Association
 California Licensed Beverage Association

California Manufacturers and Technology
Association
California Retailers Association
Neighborhood Market Association
Peace Officers Research Association of
California



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor's Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	4/8/2022
Submitting Department	Environment
Contact Name	Gabriel Hernandez
Contact Email	gabriel.hernandez@sfgov.org
Contact Phone	415-355-3757
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

AB 2208 Asm. Kalra, District 27, Democrat Fluorescent lamps: sale and distribution: prohibition

Recommended Position

- SPONSOR SUPPORT
 SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE
 OTHER & Describe

inside the lamps when they break. Improper disposal of lamps can also lead to contamination of waste streams and the environment.

Summary

This bill would prohibit compact fluorescent lamps from being offered for final sale, sold at final sale, or distributed as a new manufactured product, on and after January 1, 2024. Compact fluorescent lamps are defined as compact low-pressure, mercury-containing, electric discharge light sources in which a fluorescent coating transforms some of the ultraviolet energy generated by the mercury discharge into visible light. This bill would also enact the same prohibitions to linear fluorescent lamps, which would take effect on and after January 1, 2025. Both compact and linear fluorescent lamps must meet certain characteristics for the bill to apply; there are exemptions.

Challenge

Mercury is a neurotoxin that can negatively impact humans and the natural environment, like contaminating bodies of water. San Franciscans who possess fluorescent lamps can be exposed to mercury when the bulbs break. Also, fluorescent lamps improperly disposed of in a landfill bin pose a health hazard to waste management workers. The mercury can contaminate waste streams and enter the atmosphere and the San Francisco environment.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill will prohibit new fluorescent lamps from being sold and circulated in the marketplace. Through the prohibition of mercury-containing fluorescent lamps, the bill aims to reduce human exposure to mercury and prevent environmental contamination. It also will reduce the presence of these hazardous waste items.

Background/Analysis

Existing laws regulate mercury-containing items, like thermostats. Mercury poses a health and environmental hazard as it is a neurotoxin and poisonous to wildlife. Consumers may be exposed to the mercury

Departments Impacted & Why

The Department of the Environment may need to conduct additional outreach to the public regarding the bill, fluorescent lamps, and proper disposal of hazardous waste. The Department may need to coordinate with Recology to increase opportunities for the public to dispose of fluorescent lamps.

Fiscal Impact

There is no anticipated fiscal impact to the City of San Francisco. There may be potential State costs associated with enforcing the bill.

Support / Opposition

Supported by:

Californians Against Waste (likely)
California Product Stewardship Council
(likely)
National Stewardship Action Council

Opposed by:

None on record

washing machines to contain microfiber filtration systems will help reduce the amount of microfiber pollution in the ocean and other waterbodies.

Departments Impacted & Why

Anticipated impacts to CCSF departments are minimal Any CCSF department that uses washing machines may incur increased washing machine purchase costs to the extent that redesign of washing machines results in price increases.

Fiscal Impact

The anticipated fiscal impact is minimal. See "Departments Impacted" section above for details.

Support / Opposition

Supported by:
None on record

Opposed by:
None on record



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor’s Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	4/8/22
Submitting Department	TTX/OFE
Contact Name	Jacob DuMez
Contact Email	Jacob.dumez@sfgov.org
Contact Phone	415-554-4868
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2839
Asm. Villapuda, District 13, Democrat
California Financing Law: Pilot Program for Increased
Access to Responsible Small Dollar Loans: monthly
maintenance fees

Recommended Position

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SPONSOR | <input type="checkbox"/> SUPPORT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SUPPORT if amended | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OPPOSE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER & Describe | |

Summary

AB 2839 would expand the allowable fees charged by lenders in a state small-dollar lending pilot to include monthly maintenance fees, further extending the timeline for the pilot.

Background/Analysis

The Pilot Program was created to support alternatives to payday loans and increase access to “responsible” installment loans to help individuals to build credit and avoid more expensive debt. Unfortunately there is little evidence showing that the program achieves these goals currently. AB 2839 would only make things worse by further driving the program away from its original intent.

As an initial matter, there is no evidence that the Pilot Program is achieving its aims. Data from participating pilot loan lenders¹ does

not reflect whether the products currently offered meet any standard to be called safe or non-predatory loans, or if these loans are continuing to trap borrowers in the debt cycle consistent with abusive lending. Of additional concern, the Department of Financial Protection and Innovation (DFPI) reports no information on the number of loans that end up in debt collection or the debt collection practices of the lenders in the program. Oportun – a long-time pilot program lender – has recently been the subject of investigation for filing extremely high volume of debt collection lawsuits against low-income borrowers in California and Texas.

The Pilot Program allows loans that are still considered high cost, for example, with APRs of up to 78% on a \$300 loan and nearly 70% on loans of \$1,000. This concern was also flagged by Governor Brown in 2018 when he signed AB 237, which increased the dollar amount of loans allowable under the program. The Governor stated he “remain[ed] concerned that increasing the cap on these loans without stricter regulatory

oversight may create unintended consequences.”

Given the high cost of Pilot Program loans, it makes no sense to allow lenders to charge additional monthly fees. Especially in light of the lack of sufficient data reporting ensuring that low income borrowers are not being exploited, passing AB 2839 would be a failure to provide strict regulatory oversight and a failure to guarantee the program’s stated intent.

The proposal also includes a provision for DFPI to make available on its website a list of approved credit education programs or seminar providers. We do not think this would offer substantive improvement to the Pilot Program, or offset the additional cost of loans if maintenance fees are allow

Challenge

Under the cover of providing responsible and affordable small dollar loans, a small group of lenders has continued to lobby to increase allowable fees and extend the timeline of this pilot lending program – so that the lenders can make more profit.

The SF Office of Financial Empowerment was initially supportive of the Small Dollar Lending Pilot, but as lobbyists have warped this bill over the years (and kept extending the end of the pilot), this is no longer a good idea for consumers.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Lenders would argue that the fees charged remain reasonable, and that allowing monthly maintenance fees are necessary to encourage more lenders to participate, and offer more alternatives to payday loans and other fringe financial products.

However, this warps the original intent of the pilot, makes these loans increasingly expensive, and we really need to see the results of the pilot (i.e., have an end date) in order to understand whether continuing this policy is worthwhile.

Departments Impacted & Why

No departmental impacts projected.

Fiscal Impact

Limited or no fiscal impacts

Support / Opposition

None officially recorded as yet; the bill is supported by prominent fintech lending advocate James Gutierrez and other alternative lenders. It is opposed by Californians for Economic Justice, among other consumer advocate organizations.



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor's Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	4/8/22
Submitting Department	TTX/OFE
Contact Name	Jacob DuMez
Contact Email	Jacob.dumez@sfgov.org
Contact Phone	415-554-4868
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2540

Asm. Berman, District 24, Democrat

Qualifying Accounts For Direct Deposit of Publicly Administered Funds

Recommended Position

- SPONSOR SUPPORT
 SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE
 OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 2540 would allow charges in the form of "tips" to be charged through accounts receiving unemployment, public benefits, and child support. This tips model is a way that fintech companies, in particular, evade lending laws.

Background/Analysis

AB 2540 reverses protection adopted just last year and carves out a loophole for a growing form of fintech payday loan in the form of "tips."

California primarily pays unemployment benefits, public assistance and state-collected child support through state-sponsored debit cards. For those receiving payments by direct deposit, only "qualifying accounts" are eligible: checking or savings accounts offered directly by financial institutions, and prepaid accounts and similar types of nonbank deposit accounts that meet certain standards, including no fees or

charges, **voluntary or required**, for overdraft or credit features unless they comply with the prepaid account rules adopted by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). The word "voluntary" was used in SB 497 to prevent evasions that AB 2540 would allow.

Challenge

AB 2540 would legitimize the use of "tips" as a disguised form of interest and undermine DFPI's recent clarification that tips are "charges" under California law.

The "tips" model is a growing practice used to evade California and federal laws governing fees and interest. The use of "tips" can now be found in nonbank banking apps, fake earned wage access products, cash advance apps, and payday loan platforms.

The California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation (DFPI) just clarified that, under the Consumer Financing Law (CFL), a "charge" subject to the CFL's credit cost protections is "any cost 'received by a licensee' in connection with a loan." DFPI sent a strong signal that it will be considering "whether optional payments, such as tips or gratuities, result in payments that exceed the CFL credit cost protections when assessing

whether a transaction is structured to evade the CFL." It is impossible to police the myriad of ways in which companies that depend on tips will push people into paying them, and California simply should not allow the use of "tips" to evade its laws.

Vulnerable Californians receiving state payments have many options that will not drain critical funds through tips. In addition to traditional bank accounts, people can receive funds on the state's low-fee debit cards, which have no overdraft fees. At least 20 banks and credit unions in California offer accounts that meet the Bank-On National Account Standards, with no overdraft fees and low monthly fees. Under SB 497, people can also receive payments on any prepaid card or banking app that complies with credit and overdraft rules of the CFPB's prepaid account rules.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 497 protects unemployed workers, families on public assistance, and single parents who have difficulty collecting their child support. The law ensures that public funds are going towards the intended purpose of supporting these vulnerable families in need. The cost to these fragile Californians is the same whether a payment is called voluntary or not.

Departments Impacted & Why

No direct impacts expected.

Fiscal Impact

Minimal costs associated with oversight/regulation at state level (CDSS, AG, DFPI).

Support / Opposition

None on record, bill is supported primarily by Chime, a fintech company, and likely joined by other fintech providers who utilize the tips model to charge fees.

Opposition includes National Consumer Law Center.

and break cycles of intergenerational poverty by ensuring everyone has access to capital they can use to establish long-term financial stability.

The bill would require, no later than March 1, 2023, the California Health and Human Services Agency to submit a report to the Legislature that identifies the authority necessary to expand the HOPE Account Program to include all children born into low-income circumstances and assesses the funding to do that, among other things.

Departments Impacted & Why

No departmental impacts projected.

Fiscal Impact

No costs for City and County; fiscal analysis not complete for this legislation.

Support / Opposition

No opposition on record, support includes:

End Child Poverty in California (Sponsor)
End Poverty in California (Sponsor)
GRACE (Sponsor)
Liberation in a Generation (Sponsor)
Acterra
Agee Global Solutions
California Association of Food Banks
California Catholic Conference
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice
California Women's Law Center
Children's Law Center of California
City of San José
Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations
Courage California
Covid Survivors for Change
Fresno Economic Opportunities Commission
Friends Committee on Legislation of California (FCLCA)
Golden State Opportunity
John Burton Advocates for Youth
Marked By COVID
National Council of Jewish Women California
St. John's Community Health
The Children's Partnership
unBox

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impacts.

Support / Opposition

None recorded as yet.

City and County previously supported Secure Choice/Cal Savers establishing legislation, and worked with the Treasurer's Office to advise on outreach and implementation.

are disproportionately impacted by “summer melt.”

The summer following high school graduation is a critical time for youth. During this transition period, youth lose the robust support system provided by schools, which includes food assistance, shelter, and school counselors, and must learn how to navigate adulthood. For youth experiencing homelessness, the transition to adulthood and becoming responsible for their own care and well-being can be incredibly challenging due to unstable housing conditions and unmet basic needs.

Challenge

Postsecondary success is perhaps the biggest driver of economic mobility. Yet homelessness and other basic costs of living can pose insurmountable barriers to college access and success for Californians as they transition out of high school.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

In recognition of the need to support youth experiencing homelessness during the bridge between high school graduation and postsecondary education or employment, SB 1341 establishes a statewide guaranteed income pilot program that provides direct, unconditional cash payments to these youth beginning on April 1, 2023 through August 1, 2023.

The bill defines an eligible participant as a 12th grade student who is homeless as defined by the McKinney-Vento Act, and who has completed a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) or California Dream Act Application. Additionally, the bill seeks to create protections from any impact to public assistance programs, student financial aid, and the California Earned Income Tax Credit. Lastly, the bill directs the program administrator to conduct an evaluation of the program that measures educational and economic security outcomes for award recipients..

Departments Impacted & Why

No departmental impacts projected.

Fiscal Impact

No costs for City and County; fiscal analysis not complete for this legislation.

Support / Opposition

Support:
Economic Security Project (sponsor)
All Home
Community Financial Resources
End Poverty in California (EPIC)
Glide
John Burton Advocates for Youth
National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter
Schoolhouse Connection
Silicon Valley Community Foundation
Universal Income Project

No opposition on record



State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor's Office at edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	4/8/2022
Submitting Department	Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector
Contact Name	Eric Manke
Contact Email	Eric.manke@sfgov.org
Contact Phone	415-554-0889
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

SB 1008 Sen. Becker, District 13, Democrat Corrections: telecommunications

Recommended Position

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SPONSOR | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SUPPORT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SUPPORT if amended | <input type="checkbox"/> OPPOSE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER & Describe | |

Summary

SB 1008 eliminates fees for all communications to and from currently incarcerated people in California's juvenile facilities, local jails, and state prisons.

Telecommunication costs for currently incarcerated people and their families are an unnecessary financial barrier to basic communication. Free communication services will support strong relationships between incarcerated people and their loved ones, promoting successful reentry and reducing recidivism.

Background/Analysis

Telecommunication costs for currently incarcerated people and their families are an unnecessary financial barrier to basic communication. These services include: phone calls, video conferencing, electronic messages, and other communication services. Currently, county fees are capped at 7 cents per minute for phone calls, with money that must be preloaded into

counties' unique telecom systems. Rate caps have greatly increased access to communication services; however, charging any rate at all creates an additional cost burden for connection between incarcerated people and their families.

There is national momentum to make telecommunications services free for incarcerated people and their families. San Francisco was the first California county to make jail phone calls free in 2020; San Diego made jail phone calls free in 2021; and Los Angeles is considering a similar measure. In San Francisco, incarcerated people and their families are now saving \$1.1 million annually on jail phone calls and spending 81 percent more time in communication with their loved ones.

Challenge

The current structure of telecommunications in local and state prisons prioritizes profits over people. Communication is not only a basic right, but an essential part of creating an environment for successful reentry.

Under existing laws, money acts as a barrier to reentry services and limits supportive capacities for incarcerated people and their families. Navigating the reentry process can

be difficult for anyone, but when all communications require additional fees, it disincentivizes support in the first place.

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, one-third of families in the United States with an incarcerated loved one went into debt attempting to stay connected. A disproportionate amount of these costs fell on women, with 87% of women carrying the burden of these communication fees. The economic downfalls of the pandemic have only exacerbated the financial impact of staying in contact with incarcerated loved ones.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 1008 eliminates fees charged for telephone and other communication services between people held in local jails and state prisons and loved ones on the outside.

Free communication services will support strong relationships between incarcerated people and their loved ones, promoting successful reentry and reducing recidivism. SB 1008 will also support reentry by making outside resources more accessible to all parties, without the additional fees associated with basic communication.

By establishing free communication, incarcerated people can connect with their support systems to plan for their release, including finding a job and housing. Communication and support systems are an integral part of the human experience. Cutting incarcerated people off from their loved ones hurts the individual, the family, and a chance at successful reintegration.

Departments Impacted & Why

No departmental impact.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impact on San Francisco.

Support / Opposition

Support

Empowering Women Impacted by Incarceration (co-sponsor)
Insight Center for Community Economic Development (co-sponsor)
Jesse's Place Organization (co-sponsor)
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children/All of Us or None (co-sponsor)
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition (co-sponsor)
Western Center on Law and Poverty (co-sponsor)
Worth Rises (co-sponsor)
Bay Area Legal Aid
Center for Responsible Lending
Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice
Freedom 4 Youth
GLIDE
HomeRise
Impact Investors
Indivisible CA: State Strong
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area
Life After Next
National Consumer Law Center
Nia Impact Capital
Public Counsel
Returning Home Foundation
SF Pretrial Diversion Project

Oppose

None on file