



STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 15, 2023

11:00am – 1:00pm

City Hall, Room 201

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above or by calling in to the number below. Instructions for providing remote public comment by phone are below.

<https://sfgov.webex.com/sfgov/j.php?MTID=md1f6160da1acd2b8232249443494496e>

Meeting ID: 2481 279 3410 **Meeting Password:** 6Ffs8Hh2MaC (63378442 from phones) **Join by Phone at** +1-415-655-0001

(Public Comment Instructions available on page 6)

MEMBERS:

Mayor's Office (Chair) – Sarah Owens
Supervisor Dean Preston -- Preston Kilgore
Supervisor Connie Chan -- Kelly Groth
Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney's Office -- Rebekah Krell
Controller's Office -- Calvin Quock
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 on February 15, 2023.

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

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter: Katie Angotti

ACA 1 (Aguiar-Curry): Local government financing: affordable housing and public infrastructure: voter approval

Recommended Position: Support with amendments

This measure would reduce the voter threshold from two-thirds to 55% for a city, county, or special district to approve a bond measure that funds the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing. SFMTA and the City has taken a support position on similar bills in the past.

AB 1221 (Chen): Parking Meters

Recommended Position: Support

This bill removes the provision in the Vehicle Code that prohibits local authorities from requiring payment of parking meters fees by a mobile device. If passed, local authorities may require payment of parking fees by a mobile device but are not required to.

In practice, if this bill were to pass, cities can keep all of their parking meters, they could offer a combination of parking meters and pay by mobile device parking spots, or they can offer pay by mobile device only.

Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 663 (Haney): Pharmacy: Mobile Units

Recommended Position: Sponsor

The recently passed SB 872 (Dodd) allows local jurisdictions to operate mobile pharmacies that provides prescription medication within their city or county, including to persons experiencing homelessness, but does not allow any controlled substances to be dispensed from these mobile units. AB 663 would allow mobile pharmacies authorized under SB 872 to carry and dispense controlled substances used for the treatment of Opioid Use Disorder (OUD).

SB 339 (Wiener): HIV preexposure prophylaxis

Recommended Position: Support

Senate Bill 339 will improve access to Pre-exposure prophylaxis (or PrEP), the preventative HIV medication, by extending the length of time for which pharmacies may provide PrEP without a prescription, and by requiring health plans to cover the costs of pharmacists' time in preparing PrEP.

Department of the Environment

Presenter: Kyle Wehner

AB 660 (Irwin): Food Labeling: Quality Dates, Safety Dates, and Sell by Dates

Recommended Position: Support

AB 660 requires the use of clearer standards for food product labels, which have been voluntary for the past five years. These product labels include "best

if used by” and “best if used or frozen by” to indicate the quality date of a product, and “use by” and “use by or freeze by” to indicate a product’s safety. To reduce confusion resulting from labels intended for food retailers, AB 660 also prohibits the use of the term “sell by” in consumer labeling. Coded or machine readable “sell by” dates would remain available to retailers for inventory control. This bill would go into effect on January 1, 2025, and would provide a year for manufacturers to update their labels. The Environment Department is working to achieve the City and County of San Francisco’s goal to cut food waste in half by 2030, and AB 660 would support this effort by helping to reduce household food waste.

Department of Early Childhood

Presenter: Graham Dobson

AB 1352 (Bonta): Child care: statewide pilot policies: individualized county childcare subsidy plans

Recommended Position: Support

Senate Bill 701 (Migden), passed on September 8, 2005, authorized the San Francisco Child Care Individualized County Subsidy Plan, a county child care subsidy plan specifically tailored to the needs and goals of the local early education community. The Individualized Child Care Subsidy Program (also known as the ‘Pilot’) was conceived as a means to explore solutions to the problems that the state’s “one-size-fits-all” child care and development subsidy system presents, especially in higher cost counties. Without any additional funds allocated to the county, the Pilot seeks to demonstrate the effects of limited local control and flexibility in the administration of California Department of Education (CDE) and California Department of Social Services (CDSS) contracted funding and stakeholder efficiency to meet the goals of local increased family self-sufficiency, continuity of care for children and to stabilize a fragile early care and education infrastructure. San Francisco has utilized greater flexibility through the pilot program to meet local early education needs. Examples include 24-month eligibility for child care/early education for eligible families, increased family income eligibility ceilings, the ability to facilitate funding transfers from under earning agencies to programs able to serve more children and over earn their contracts. San Mateo was another original Pilot county, and there are now eleven additional pilot counties, for a total of thirteen in the state. These counties have all received approval for the implementation of an individualized child care subsidy pilot. The majority of these pilots are due to sunset in June 2023, with the consequence being that counties will lose flexibility in the management of state child care and early education subsidy funds and the ability to request any further policy changes.

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector

Presenter: Michelle Lau

AB 474 (Becker): The BASICs (Basic, Affordable Supplies for Incarcerated Californians) Act

Recommended Position: Support

This bill alleviates cost pressures for incarcerated people and their families by eliminating price markups on items purchased in California’s prison canteen stores.

AB 881 (Ting): Be The Jury CA

Recommended Position: Support

Be The Jury CA would raise juror pay in criminal cases from \$15 to \$100 per day for low- to -moderate-income jurors. This bill would ensure that all Californians have access to a jury of their peers as promised by the U.S. Constitution.

AB 1186 (Bonta): The REPAIR (Realizing Equity while Promoting Accountability and Impactful Relief) Act

Recommended Position: Support

This bill will provide crime survivors with more equitable, timely, and stable compensation while setting youth who have caused harm on a more meaningful path towards accountability.

SB 343 (Skinner): Child Support

Recommended Position: Support

The bill would require the Department of Child Support Services and Judicial Council to conform with federal rule changes, resulting in improved capacity for non-custodial parents to pay their child support orders and maximize assistance to custodial parents and their children.

San Francisco Human Services Agency

Presenter: Susie Smith

SB 408 (Ashby): Foster youth with complex needs

Recommended Position: Support

SB 408 would establish programs and services to support foster youth and youth at risk of foster care with significant trauma and complex needs. This investment is needed to ensure no youth are left behind in California's continuing effort to implement Continuum of Care Reform (CCR).

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.

View the meeting:

<https://sfgov.webex.com/sfgov/j.php?MTID=md1f6160da1acd2b8232249443494496e>

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 279 3410
Webinar password: 6Ffs8Hh2MaC (63378442 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.

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 Sarah Owens, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: sarah.owens@sfgov.org.

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.



STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 15, 2023
11:00am – 12:00pm
City Hall, Room 201 and WebEx

This meeting will be held in hybrid format pursuant to Section 1(b)(iii) of the Mayor’s 45th Supplement to the Proclamation of Local Emergency. Members of the public may attend and provide public comment in person at the meeting location identified above or may attend and provide public comment remotely via WebEx. To join the meeting via WebEx, please use the following access information:

<https://sfgov.webex.com/sfgov/j.php?MTID=m2e3b09e1e896a15e331e7974a1fdd51d>

Meeting ID: 2487 313 5279/ **Meeting Password:** MCpJsnPc354 (62757672 from phones) **Join by Phone at** +1-415-655-0001

MEMBERS:

Mayor’s Office (Chair) – Sarah Owens
Supervisor Dean Preston -- Preston Kilgore
Supervisor Connie Chan -- Kelly Groth (Substitute for February’s meeting—Ben Gurewitz)
Assessor’s Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney’s Office -- Rebekah Krell
Controller’s Office -- Calvin Quock
Treasurer’s Office -- Eric Manke

AGENDA

Meeting commenced at 11:02am.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Sarah Owens, Preston Kilgore, Ben Gurewitz, Holly Lung, Rebekah Krell, Calvin Quock
Absent: Eric Manke

II. FINDINGS TO ALLOW TELECONFERENCED MEETINGS UNDER CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e) (Action Item).

Discussion and possible adoption of a resolution setting forth findings required under Assembly Bill 361 (AB 361) that would allow the State Legislation Committee to hold meetings, or for members of the State Legislation Committee to attend meetings, when necessary, remotely according to the modified Brown Act teleconferencing set forth in AB 361.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Adopt Resolution Allowing Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953(e): Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore
Approved: 6-0

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on August 3, 2022.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Approve: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Ben Gurewitz
Approved: 6-0

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

Presenters: Paul Yoder, Partner, Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange
Karen Lange, Partner, Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange

V. 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

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter: Kathryn Angotti

AB 251 (Ward): California Transportation Commission: vehicle weight safety study

Recommended Position: Support and Seek Amendments

This bill would require the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to convene a task force to study the relationship between vehicle weight and injuries to vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and cyclists, and to study the costs and benefits of imposing a passenger vehicle weight fee. The bill also requires the CTC to prepare and submit a report of the task force's findings to the Legislature by January 1, 2026.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support and Seek Amendments to AB 251: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore
Approved: 6-0

Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Presenter: Ben VanHouten

SB 76 (Wiener): Alcoholic beverages: music venue license: entertainment zones: consumption

Recommended Position: Support

Senate Bill 76 would make two important changes to state alcohol laws to further support California's economic recovery. First, the bill would enable local jurisdictions to create outdoor "entertainment zones" that would enable bars and restaurants to sell takeout alcoholic beverages to patrons for consumption at street fairs, outdoor festivals, and other events.

SB 76 would also enable music venues to apply for catering licenses and event permits to offer alcohol service at a limited number of events, such as weddings or corporate events, that do not involve entertainment.

Public Comment: No Public
Comment Motion to Support SB 76:
Holly Lung Seconded by: Preston
Kilgore Approved: 6-0

VI. 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.

No Public Comment.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:38am.

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 Sarah Owens, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: sarah.owens@sfgov.org.

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



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	March 6, 2023
Submitting Department	SFMTA in partnership with SF Planning, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development and the Recreation and Park Department
Contact Name	Katie Angotti
Contact Email and Phone Number	Kathryn.angotti@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Katie Angotti
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 <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

ACA 1

Asm. Aguiar-Curry, District 4, Democratic

Local government financing: affordable housing and public infrastructure: voter approval

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe - Support with amendments.

Summary

This measure would reduce the voter threshold from two-thirds to 55% for a city, county, or special district to approve a bond measure that funds the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing. SFMTA and the City has taken a support position on similar bills in the past.

Background/Analysis

The California Constitution defines a “special tax” as any tax imposed for specific purposes, including funding local transportation projects. The California Constitution conditions the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of two-thirds of the voters of the city, county, or special district voting on that tax.

This measure would reduce the voter threshold from two-thirds to 55% for a city, county, or special district to approve a bond measure that funds the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing.

There is a precedent for a 55% approval threshold, which currently applies for school bond measures in California.

By lowering the voter-threshold for the imposition, extension or increase of a special tax by a local government or special district, this constitutional amendment would provide a city, county, or special district with the potential to generate additional resources to fund much-needed public infrastructure or affordable housing projects.

(4) “Public infrastructure” shall include, but is not limited to, the projects that provide any of the following: (A) Water or protect water quality.

- (B) Sanitary sewer.
- (C) Treatment of wastewater or reduction of pollution from stormwater runoff.
- (D) Protection of property from impacts of sea level rise.
- (E) Parks and recreation facilities.
- (F) Open space
- (G) Improvements to transit and streets and highways
- (H) Flood control
- (I) Broadband internet access service expansion in underserved areas
- (J) Local hospital construction.
- (K) Public safety buildings or facilities, equipment related to fire suppression, emergency response equipment, or interoperable communications equipment for direct and exclusive use by fire, emergency response, policy or sheriff personnel.
- (L) Public library facilities

Challenge

ACA 1 is targeted to the urgent needs of local communities. This measure gives local governments a more realistic financing option to fund an increase in the supply of affordable housing, and to address the numerous local public infrastructure challenges cities, counties, and special districts are facing.

In San Francisco, the passage of this bill is crucial to the success of a regional housing bond measure, which could generate \$1-2B for affordable housing in San Francisco and well as future bonds to fund the SFMTA’s billion dollar backlog of capital projects.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Reduce the voter-threshold from 2/3rd to 55% for the imposition, extension or increase of a special tax. In addition, we would like to suggest to the author to amend the bill so that certain maintenance activities can also be funded by a bond.

The amendment we are seeking is to “lower the voter threshold for measures that provide **and/or maintain** public infrastructure.”

GO Bonds cannot be used for general, everyday maintenance activities such as street sweeping, but can be used for one-off repairs that would substantially extend the useful life of an asset.

Therefore, we define maintain as: activities that will substantially extend the useful life of an asset.

Departments Impacted & Why

Parks and Recreation Department, MOCHD, SFPUC, Port as these are all departments that manage, maintain and build public infrastructure as defined in the bill.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact but would create an opportunity for increased bond measure revenue.

Support / Opposition

Support:	
California Professional Firefighters (cosponsor)	State Building and Construction Trades Council (cosponsor)
Housing California (cosponsor)	California Labor Federation (cosponsor)



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Alpine Village-Sequoia Crest Community Services District
American Planning Association
Association of California Healthcare Districts
Association of California Nonprofits
Association of California Council of Governments
Association of California Housing Authorities (CAHA)
Association of California Recreation & Park Districts
Association of California Sanitation Agencies
Bay Area Council
Bay Area Housing Advocacy Coalition
Bear Valley Community Services District
Beaumont Library District
Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District
Brooktrails Township Community Services District
Burbank Housing
California Apartment Association
California Association of Electrical Workers
California Association of Fire Chiefs
California Association of Housing Authorities (CAHA)
California Association of Nonprofits
California Association of Recreation & Park Districts
California Association of Sanitation Agencies
California Coalition for Rural Housing
California Contract Cities
California Fire Chiefs Association
California Housing Consortium
California Housing Partnership
California Library Association
California Library Services Board
California Nurses Association
California Park & Recreation Society
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation (CRLAF)
California Special Districts Association

California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
California State Council of Laborers
California State Pipe Trades Council
California Transit Association
California State Treasurer, Fiona Ma
Cameron Park Community Services District
Chicano Federation of San Diego County
Chico Area Recreation and Park District
Chino Valley Fire District
Cities Association of Santa Clara
City of Alameda
City of Albany
City of Arvin
City of Burbank
City of Camarillo
City of Ceres
City of Chowchilla
City of Davis
City of East Palo Alto
City of Emeryville
City of Goleta
City of Gustine
City of Laguna Beach
City of Lathrop
City of Lodi
City of Long Beach
City of Manteca
City of Marin
City of Merced
City of Milpitas
City of Moorpark
City of Napa
City of Novato
City of Oakland
City of Oceanside
City of Placentia
City of Ripon
City of Riverbank
City of San Luis Obispo
City of Santa Monica
City of Stockton
City of Ventura
City of Walnut Creek

City of West Hollywood
City/County Association of Governments of
San Mateo County
Coalition for a New Community Library and
Resource Center
Conejo Recreation District
County Mono
County of Marin
County of Monterey
County of Napa
County of Santa Clara
County of Solano
County of Yolo
Crestline Sanitation District
Cucamonga Valley Water District
Desert Recreation District
EAH Housing
East Bay for Everyone
East Bay Housing Organizations
East Bay Municipal Utilities District
East Bay Regional Park District
East Contra Costa Fire Protection District
Eden Housing
Environmental Defense Fund
Fallbrook Public Utility District
Fallbrook Regional Health District
Feather River Recreation and Park District
Fire Districts Association of California
Foundation for Monterey County Free
Libraries
Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District
Fulton-El Camino Recreation and Park
District
Goleta West Sanitary District
Greater Merced Chamber of Commerce
Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley
Hayward Area Recreation and Park District
International Union of Elevator Constructors
International Union of Operating Engineers
League of California Cities
League of Women Voters of California
Los Angeles County Metropolitan
Transportation Authority
Marin County Transit District
Marin County Council of Mayors and
Councilmembers
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
MuniServices

Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern
California
North Bay Leadership Council
North County Fire Protection District
North Tahoe Fire Protection District
Oceano Community Services District
Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Orange County Cemetery District
Palomar Health
Palos Verdes Library District
Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District
Professional Engineers in California
Government (PECG)
Salinas Valley Memorial Healthcare System
San Diego City Council President, Georgette
Gómez
San Diego Habitat for Humanity
San Joaquin County Hispanic Chamber of
Commerce
San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)
San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District
Santa Clara Valley Water District
Santa Ynez Community Services District
Shafter Parks and Recreation District
Silicon Valley @ Home
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Solano Irrigation District
Solano Transportation Authority
South Coast Water District
Southern California Association of NonProfit
Housing
SPUR (San Francisco Bay Area Planning and
Urban Research Association)
Rural County Representatives of California
(RCRC)
Stege Sanitary District
The Two Hundred
Town of Discovery Bay Community Services
District
Town of Yountville
United Contractors
Urban Counties of California
Ventura Council of Governments
Western Center on Law and Poverty
Western States Council Sheet Metal, Air, Rail,
and Transportation



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	March 6, 2023
Submitting Department	SFMTA
Contact Name	Kathryn Angotti
Contact Email and Phone Number	Kathryn.angotti@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kathryn Angotti
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 1221
Asm. Chen, District 59, Republican
Parking Meter Fees

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill removes the provision in the Vehicle Code that prohibits local authorities from requiring payment of parking meters fees by a mobile device. If passed, local authorities **may** require payment of parking fees by a mobile device but are not required to.

In practice, if this bill were to pass, cities can keep all of their parking meters, they could offer a combination of parking meters and pay by mobile device parking spots, or they can offer pay by mobile device only.

Background/Analysis

The CA Vehicle Code Section 22508(e) suggests that physical parking meters are required for cities to require parking payment at on-street spaces: "A local authority may allow but shall not require the payment of parking meter fees by a mobile device."

This requires extensive, expensive, and unsightly infrastructure throughout city streets in order to implement paid parking.

This impedes cities' ability to install paid parking to create parking availability, which benefits businesses and anyone trying to find a parking space, reduces circling and double-parking, reduces emissions, speeds public transit, and makes streets safer and more efficient.

Challenge

Paid parking is the best tool cities have to create parking availability; more parking availability means it is easier for drivers to find a space. This brings in more customers to spend money at local businesses by reducing the chance that a customer gives up and goes somewhere else because they can't find parking, or avoids an area altogether because of parking challenges). More parking availability also means less circling and less double-parking, which reduces congestion, helps transit move faster, reduces distracted driving, and improves safety for people walking and biking.

Benefits

Better targeting of paid parking hours: By not requiring cities to have extensive on-street infrastructure in the form of parking meters, paid parking can be more targeted in the days/hours of operation and limited to only when it's needed. For example, there are areas in San Francisco that see very heavy parking demand on Saturdays and Sundays, but very low parking demand during the week. Paid parking in the form of parking meters would be far too costly to install for only two days of revenue generation per week, which means that parking stays free and drivers will endure delay to find available parking on the weekends. Those drivers circling for parking cause traffic backups into nearby neighborhoods, and businesses and attractions lose customers if those drivers cannot find somewhere to park. If the city could install paid parking with less expensive infrastructure, it could be limited to the days and times when it's most needed.

Reduces theft: Parking meters pose risks of theft from customers that pay by mobile phone does not. This includes credit-card skimmers, coin-slot jams, and fake QR codes are a few of the ways that fraudsters use parking meters to steal customers' money and identities—these risks are nearly eliminated with mobile payment.

Significant Cost Savings: This bill would reduce the City's costs of purchase, installation and maintenance for parking meters. SFMTA pays significant costs to maintain broken/inoperable meters, which are specifically targeted so that people can park for free. Cities can invest significantly more in providing payment options that most people want to use, including: payment via payment apps, payment via text, Apple/Google pay, payment via in-vehicle navigation systems, payment via mobile mapping apps, payment via local stores, or payment via mailed invoice. This would free up more staff and resources for other SFMTA operations teams that address other pressing issues, like signage, paint, and traffic signals.

For reference:

San Francisco has about 27,000 paid parking spaces. The city recently spent \$22M for parking meter hardware, and \$45M for transaction and management fees, on a 10-year parking meter procurement/maintenance contract, and spends about \$13M per year installing and maintaining meters and meter-related signage. Paystations (about \$5500 each) and single-space meters (about \$750 each) need to be replaced every 5-10 years (assuming no vandalism/destruction). Signs that provide information about how an individual can pay using a mobile device cost about \$20 each and can last decades.

Enhance Neighborhood Aesthetics and Improve Disability Access: Reducing the number of meters on sidewalks means less clutter and more space on the sidewalk for: people, especially people with disabilities; and activations like outdoor dining, seating, etc. Fewer meters also means fewer opportunities for vandalism that causes blight and increases maintenance costs.

How SFMTA would Maintain the Cash Option

Less than 10% of people who pay at meters in San Francisco use cash, and that number is dropping lower every year. **Nevertheless, San Francisco is committed to providing a cash-payment option for this small percentage of people, and will continue to collect data on cash utilization to see how cash payment trends change over time.** (A demonstration of San Francisco's commitment to offering cash payments: the city's Board of Supervisors passed an ordinance in 2019 requiring all brick-and-mortar businesses to accept payment in cash.) Cash payment options for parking would include: physical pay stations for people to pay cash

distributed throughout paid-parking areas (similar to many cities' current multispace paystation arrangements, with paystations more dispersed); partnering with a physical storefront vendor to accept cash payment; or requesting a mailed invoice by calling a number (while this would require a phone, 97% of the US population owns either a mobile phone according to the PEW Research Center, this percentage is likely higher in San Francisco). We would also explore other ways to offer a cash option.

If passed, in addition to developing one or more of the cash options discussed above, the SFMTA would not remove parking meters overnight. We would take a phased approach, gradually converting areas with single-space meters to paystations, and reducing the number of paystations where data indicates that cash payment is low. This will naturally give parkers time to adapt to the new parking policy.

Managing impacts to seniors and people with disabilities

As with people who may not have a phone or a credit card, San Francisco would ensure that seniors and people with mobility disabilities are not adversely impacted by any changes in parking payment technology. Most people who have trouble with mobility also have a phone, meaning they could pay for parking without having to leave their car. In addition, many people with disabilities have disabled parking placards or license plates, which exempt them from the requirement to pay for on-street public parking. So the population of people with mobility challenges who are required to pay for parking and also do not have the ability to pay by phone is very small. Nevertheless, as discussed above, San Francisco will endeavor to develop other cash payment options that do not require a walk to a nearby paystation. In addition, any disadvantages of making this small population walk to a nearby paystation should be balanced against the advantages of making cities' oft-crowded sidewalks more accessible. Finally, the vast majority of the millions of dollars saved on parking meter infrastructure can help support SFMTA's programs and projects that directly benefit seniors and people with disabilities, like improved transit service, free transit service for seniors and people with disabilities, paratransit, and accessible taxi and van service.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Amend Section 22508(e) as follows: "A local authority may ~~allow but shall not~~ require the payment of parking meter fees by a mobile device."

This gives cities the option to use only mobile payment for on-street paid parking and to experiment with fewer pay stations per block and other cash options that are not parking meters.

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A paid parking is within SFMTA's jurisdiction.

Fiscal Impact

SFMTA is facing a fiscal cliff and is looking at creative ways to create revenue and save scarce resources. Reducing the amount of money that the agency spends on purchasing, installing and maintaining parking meters will result in significant cost savings.

Support / Opposition

California Mobility and Parking Association – SUPPORT/SPONSOR



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	2/26/22
Submitting Department	Department of Public Health
Contact Name	Max Gara
Contact Email and Phone Number	Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org ; 415-554-2621
SLC Meeting Presenter	Max Gara
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 663
Asm. Haney, District 17, Democrat
Pharmacy: Mobile Units

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

The recently passed SB 872 (Dodd) allows local jurisdictions to operate mobile pharmacies that provides prescription medication within their city or county, including to persons experiencing homelessness, but does not allow any controlled substances to be dispensed from these mobile units. AB 663 would allow mobile pharmacies authorized under SB 872 to carry and dispense controlled substances used for the treatment of Opioid Use Disorder (OUD).

Background/Analysis

People experiencing homelessness (PEH) are often unable to receive needed medical and behavioral health treatment due to barriers accessing health care services. PEH, are disproportionately people of color, have poorer health, and have life expectancies 30-years shorter than the general population in part due to barriers in accessing care. Two of the most impactful health considerations for PEH are mental health and substance use disorders (SUD). Within SUD, Opioid Use Disorder (OUD) is a key driver of overdose death here in California. Between March 2020 and April 2022, 1,460 people in San Francisco have died from accidental overdose. Of those deaths, 35% occurred in PEH. As a comparison, in that same period, 870 people died from COVID in San Francisco.

To help address the issues PEH face, the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) established Whole Person Integrated Care (WPIC), which brings together existing non-traditional primary care, urgent care, and behavioral health clinical services primarily serving PEH. One example program under WPIC is the Street Medicine team. This team provides street-based clinical services to PEH who have medical, mental health, and/or substance use needs regardless of insurance coverage. The Street Medicine Team operates at locations where individuals are comfortable or residing – including streets, parks, encampments, sobering centers, harm reduction centers, navigation centers, and in open-access clinic spaces. During 2021, the WPIC program served over 7,000 patients, most of whom are PEH.

Challenge

One of the challenges DPH's WPIC team faces is providing prescription medications to patients outside the normal walls of a primary care home and retail pharmacy. Until recently, California law required that most pharmacies must operate in a fixed location (i.e., retail pharmacy). This creates difficulties with trying to find legal ways to store and provide medications to WPIC patients who are primarily homeless and receiving care in non-traditional settings.

The recently passed SB 872 (Dodd) aims to address these access issues by allowing local jurisdictions to operate a mobile pharmacy and dispense medications pursuant to a valid prescription. The bill, and now law, will help to provide better access to care and medications for PEH. While SB 872 allows expansion to medication access, it currently does not allow dispensing of key Medications for Opioid Use Disorder (MOUD), including buprenorphine.

Treatment with buprenorphine is a foundational part of OUD treatment. In populations with barriers to accessing traditional healthcare, such as PEH, buprenorphine availability at the point of care is key for reducing overdose deaths and bridging to ongoing care. In San Francisco, buprenorphine is available as a discharge prescription at the emergency department and through our Street Outreach Response Team. Buprenorphine has repeatedly been shown in meta-analyses to decrease all-cause mortality by 50% in individuals with OUD compared to treatment without medications. It has also been shown to increase retention in treatment and decrease opioid use. Treatment guidelines recommend that medications for the treatment of OUD should be available to all patients.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The proposed bill would allow for mobile pharmacies authorized under SB 872 to dispense controlled substances used for the treatment of Opioid Use Disorder. Further, mobile pharmacy units would be required to securely store these and only carry reasonable quantities based on prescription volume. Controlled substances for MOUD are primarily limited to methadone and buprenorphine. This change would not apply to controlled substances for indications outside of OUD, such as more theft prone medications such as morphine, oxycodone, fentanyl. While the controlled substance prohibition was previously included in SB 872 to address potential safety concerns associated with theft of these medications, the proposed bill has been drafted to address these concerns while still ensuring access to important SUD medications.

Dispensing MOUDs, like buprenorphine, at the point of care will expand access to life-saving care to individuals who may otherwise be unable to access due to their own individual circumstances and/or barriers to care. It also provides an additional point of interaction with the healthcare system, allowing for connection to additional services. For these reasons, we recommend **sponsoring** the bill.

Departments Impacted & Why

No other department would be impacted

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.
- Adoption could increase the drug budget for San Francisco if there is a large increase in the use of MOUD for people without any healthcare insurance; there would be no net increase in spending for people with Medi-Cal, Medicare, or private insurance.
- If DPH pursued mobile units, as allowed under the bill, funding would be needed to develop and maintain program services and staff the units.

Support / Opposition

CBHDA Support



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	2/26/22
Submitting Department	Department of Public Health
Contact Name	Max Gara
Contact Email and Phone Number	Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org ; 415-554-2621
SLC Meeting Presenter	Max Gara
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 339

Sen. Wiener, District 11, Democrat

HIV preexposure prophylaxis

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Senate Bill 339 will improve access to Pre-exposure prophylaxis (or PrEP), the preventative HIV medication, by extending the length of time for which pharmacies may provide PrEP without a prescription, and by requiring health plans to cover the costs of pharmacists' time in preparing PrEP.

Background/Analysis

San Francisco has long been internationally recognized as a leader in the treatment and care of patients with HIV/AIDS. For many years, the City of San Francisco and the Department of Public Health (SFDPH) have worked to reduce the incidence and transmission of HIV, and have also made great strides in supporting the needs of individuals living with HIV. The City's Getting to Zero initiative, of which SFDPH is a member, has a goal to reduce both HIV infections and HIV deaths by 90% by 2025. SFDPH programs also provide a wide array of health prevention, promotion, navigation and treatment services.

As of December 31, 2021, there were 15,631 San Francisco residents diagnosed and living with HIV. Between 2013 and 2021, there has been a steady decline in new HIV diagnoses in the City. While new diagnoses have been declining over the past 10 years across all racial/ethnic groups, disparities remain, with HIV diagnosis rates in 2021 3.3 and 2.8 times higher among Black/African American and Latino men compared with white men, respectively.

A key strategy in preventing new HIV infections has been to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP). In 2019, SB 159 was signed into law, which aimed to improve access to PrEP by authorizing pharmacists to provide this medication without a physician prescription. The bill also prohibited insurance companies from requiring prior authorizations in order to obtain PrEP coverage.

Challenge

Unfortunately, there have been significant challenges with the law's implementation, creating barriers to increasing PrEP access for populations most in need of HIV prevention services, such

as patients who may not have access to a healthcare provider. A recent study found that less than 3% of pharmacies in the San Francisco Bay Area furnished PrEP under SB-159 one year following the law going into effect.¹ Barriers identified related to the cost to pharmacies to implement and refill limitations:

Refill limitations: Under SB 159, pharmacists can only provide up to 60 days of PrEP in 2 years. This limit is a major barrier as the amount of work required to set up a PrEP program for a patient is not financially viable for most pharmacies if the patient can only to initiate once every 2 years. Since 2019, a number of states have passed similar bills to SB159 with some states allowing pharmacists to provide ongoing PrEP.

Reimbursement: Currently, reimbursement levels under Medi-Cal and private insurance plans limit the viability for pharmacies to participate in the provisions under SB 159. Under the law, pharmacist services for initiating PrEP is a covered benefit of the Medi-Cal program, but DHCS has implemented payment at 85% the physician rate to pharmacists for these services. Private insurance plans could cover pharmacists' PrEP services, but historically have not done so in CA unless mandated. Further, insurance coverage for laboratory testing required for PrEP care in a pharmacy is not clearly mandated under SB159.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 339 would address the current barriers that are limiting the number of pharmacies providing PrEP by addressing the current limitations on prescription refills and health plan reimbursements. Specifically, the bill will:

- Authorize a pharmacist to provide up to a 90-day course of PrEP, or PrEP beyond a 90-day course, if specified conditions are met.
- Require a health care service plan and health insurer to cover PrEP furnished by a pharmacist, including costs for the pharmacist's services and related testing.
- Require Medi-Cal to include PrEP provided by a pharmacist as a pharmacist service on the schedule of benefits

Departments Impacted & Why

No departments would be directly impacted by this legislation.

Fiscal Impact

This bill does not require appropriation of S City General Funds. Bill likely to result in state budget impact due to expanded reimbursement of Medi-Cal services.

By reducing the number of new HIV infections in San Francisco, the City will be able to reduce health care costs associated with life-long HIV treatment and care.

Support / Opposition

Sponsor: California Pharmacists Association, Equality California, and the SF AIDS Foundation

¹ Bellman, R., Mohebbi, S., Nobahar, N., Parizher, J., & Apollonio, D. E. (2022). An observational survey assessing the extent of PrEP and PEP furnishing in San Francisco Bay Area pharmacies. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association*, 62(1), 370-377.e3.



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	March 6, 2023
Submitting Department	Environment
Contact Name	Kyle Wehner
Contact Email and Phone Number	Kyle.wehner@sfgov.org , 415-355-3709
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kyle Wehner
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 660

Asm. Irwin, District 42, Democrat

Food Labeling: Quality Dates, Safety Dates, and Sell By Dates

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 660 requires the use of clearer standards for food product labels, which have been voluntary for the past five years. These product labels include “best if used by” and “best if used or frozen by” to indicate the quality date of a product, and “use by” and “use by or freeze by” to indicate a product’s safety. To reduce confusion resulting from labels intended for food retailers, AB 660 also prohibits the use of the term “sell by” in consumer labeling. Coded or machine readable “sell by” dates would remain available to retailers for inventory control. This bill would go into effect on January 1, 2025, and would provide a year for manufacturers to update their labels. The Environment Department is working to achieve the City and County of San Francisco’s goal to cut food waste in half by 2030, and AB 660 would support this effort by helping to reduce household food waste.

Background/Analysis

Current labeling standards, introduced in 2017, are voluntary. AB 660 strengthens these standards by making them required. Since the voluntary standards went into effect, many companies continue to use phrases such as “expires on” and “enjoy by,” which can create confusion about a food product’s safety. AB 660 will not only reduce waste and save consumers money; it will also help reduce landfill emissions of methane, which is over 80 times more powerful than carbon dioxide, and help San Francisco achieve the goals of its Climate Action Plan.

Challenge

Forty percent of food production in the United States ends up in landfills, resulting in harmful greenhouse gas emissions. One third of that food waste originates from households, and 20-30% of household food waste results from confusion among consumers regarding date labeling, according to the Food and Drug Administration. By

simplifying date labeling to the public, California will help reduce household food waste and reduce its greenhouse gas emissions.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill will help San Francisco progress toward its zero waste goals, including curbing recycling, composting, and trash by 15% – and by cutting landfilled material and food waste in half – by 2030.

Departments Impacted & Why

None.

Fiscal Impact

None.

Support / Opposition

Support: California Product Stewardship Council, Californians Against Waste, and National Stewardship Action Council, among others



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	3/3/23
Submitting Department	Department of Early Childhood (DEC)
Contact Name	Graham Dobson
Contact Email and Phone Number	graham.dobson@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	
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 1352
Asm. Bonta, District 18, Democrat
Child care: statewide pilot policies: individualized county childcare subsidy plans

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Senate Bill 701 (Migden), passed on September 8, 2005, authorized the San Francisco Child Care Individualized County Subsidy Plan, a county child care subsidy plan specifically tailored to the needs and goals of the local early education community. The Individualized Child Care Subsidy Program (also known as the ‘Pilot’) was conceived as a means to explore solutions to the problems that the state’s “one-size-fits-all” child care and development subsidy system presents, especially in higher cost counties. Without any additional funds allocated to the county, the Pilot seeks to demonstrate the effects of limited local control and flexibility in the administration of California Department of Education (CDE) and California Department of Social Services (CDSS) contracted funding and stakeholder efficiency to meet the goals of local increased family self-sufficiency, continuity of care for children and to stabilize a fragile early care and education infrastructure. San Francisco has utilized greater flexibility through the pilot program to meet local early education needs. Examples include 24-month eligibility for child care/early education for eligible families, increased family income eligibility ceilings, the ability to facilitate funding transfers from under earning agencies to programs able to serve more children and over earn their contracts. San Mateo was another original Pilot county, and there are now eleven additional pilot counties, for a total of thirteen in the state. These counties have all received approval for the implementation of an individualized child care subsidy pilot. The majority of these pilots are due to sunset in June 2023, with the consequence being that counties will lose flexibility in the management of state child care and early education subsidy funds and the ability to request any further policy changes.

Background/Analysis

Existing law requires CDSS and CDE, on or before June 30, 2022, to review the existing individualized county child care pilot program and provide a report to the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature. Existing law requires the report to include recommendations on what flexibilities currently available to individualized county child care pilot programs should be adopted statewide, and what flexibilities available to individualized county childcare pilot programs are no longer justified given statewide policy changes.

Existing law requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to, in consultation with the Director of Social Services and the executive director of the State Board of Education, convene a statewide interest holder workgroup to provide recommendations on best practices for increasing access to high-quality universal preschool programs for 3- and 4-year-old children (the Universal PreK Mixed Delivery Quality and Access Workgroup).

Challenge

This bill establishes a mechanism for existing pilot counties to continue to have the ability to request and implement pilot policies for state subsidized child care and early education. However, these would now be applied statewide equitably, as opposed to be limited to the current thirteen pilot counties, allowing early learning and child care providers in all 58 counties to access regulatory flexibilities that maximize services for children and families.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The bill would expand the childcare pilots statewide and allow all counties to access regulatory flexibilities that help providers maximize services to children and families by requiring the establishment of a statewide child care pilot subcommittee of the statewide interest holder workgroup and specifying the membership. The bill would require the subcommittee to propose, evaluate, and collect evidence to support the creation of statewide pilot policies for child care and early education programs by CDE and CDSS. The bill would require the subcommittee to submit proposals to create new statewide pilot policies to the departments. The bill would authorize the statewide pilot policies to supersede state law with respect to specified factors. The bill would establish a process for the departments to approve, respond, or deny the proposal, as provided.

Departments Impacted & Why

Department of Early Childhood (DEC): Title 5 contractors who are part of the Pilot are the majority of center-based agencies supported by DEC as part of our Early Learning SF network. They serve the highest percentage of DEC priority populations. As DEC leverages state funding and policies, state impacts to these agencies can influence DEC funding and policy decisions.

Fiscal Impact

Potential fiscal impact to funding from DEC as a result of changes to state subsidized child care and early education services, e.g., reductions to state reimbursement rates might result in increased support from DEC to these impacted agencies by increasing local funding to cover the actual cost of providing high quality early education. Conversely, increased state reimbursement rates may result in a corresponding reduction of local funds to these agencies. DEC might also mirror potential pilot policies, e.g., family fee waiver, earning of contracts based on enrollment vs attendance. The bill would streamline and economize state agency time by creating a single process and pilot subcommittee (under the existing UPK Mixed Delivery Quality and Access Workgroup) that would replace the existing 11 individualized pilot review processes. However, the CA Department of Finance may assign a fiscal impact to this bill, i.e., cost to CDE/CDSS of administering ongoing pilot policies.

Support / Opposition

Support:

*Santa Clara County Office of Education
(Sponsor)*



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	3/6/2023
Submitting Department	Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector
Contact Name	Eric Manke
Contact Email and Phone Number	eric.manke@sfgov.org ; 415-554-4509
SLC Meeting Presenter	Michelle Lau
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

SB 474

Sen. Becker, District 13, Democrat

The BASICs (Basic, Affordable Supplies for Incarcerated Californians) Act

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill alleviates cost pressures for incarcerated people and their families by eliminating price markups on items purchased in California’s prison canteen stores.

Background/Analysis

A prison canteen is a storefront used by incarcerated people to supplement the basic necessities provided by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). Incarcerated people can purchase goods such as food, hygiene products, and stationery.

The price of canteen goods are not currently regulated under California law, leading to significant markups on products. In combination with minimal wage earnings, any additional purchases can be extremely costly and represent an unnecessary barrier to basic essentials.

Challenge

Incarcerated people in California’s prisons receive limited resources outside of the basics provided by CDCR, resulting in a need for additional goods from the prison canteen. However, current law does not limit pricing on these items which can lead to expensive markups that make goods inaccessible for many incarcerated people.

Depending on the CDCR skill level classification, most incarcerated people make between \$0.08 and \$0.37 an hour, or \$12 to \$56 a month before fees and deductions. In contrast, an 8 oz package of coffee grounds can cost up to \$9, representing 16%-75% of their monthly income.

Without support from family, incarcerated people are extremely limited in their ability to keep up with basic needs including personal hygiene. For example, recent price lists at California State Prison Solano indicate markups on toothpaste from the market rate of \$1.38 to the canteen sale price of \$4.45, a markup of over 200% that can take up to 37% of an incarcerated person’s monthly income.

Given the extremely low wages in prisons, the burden of paying for items in the canteen often falls on family members who are supporting their loved ones inside. If a family is able to support

an incarcerated loved one, the markups create a significant financial burden, as nearly 2 in 3 families with incarcerated family members are unable to meet their own basic needs.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 474 eliminates markups on products sold in prison canteens so that the price of the product does not exceed the price paid by CDCR to product vendors. SB 474 is estimated to save incarcerated people and their families \$30 million each year.

SB 474 builds on first-in-the-nation reforms in San Francisco. In 2020, San Francisco was the first county in California to eliminate mark-ups on items in the commissary (jail store). We came to this decision after seeing that commissary costs are a significant economic drain on low-income people and people of color, especially women of color who are supporting their loved ones inside. On average, prices in the commissary decreased by 43 percent following this reform. This action has saved incarcerated people and their families hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

Departments Impacted & Why

No impact to City and County of San Francisco departments.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impact to the City and County of San Francisco.

Support / Opposition

Support

Women’s Foundation California (co-sponsor)
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights (co-sponsor)
Legal Aid at Work (co-sponsor)
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children (co-sponsor)
MILPA Collective (co-sponsor)

No opposition on record.



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	3/6/2023
Submitting Department	Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
Contact Name	Eric Manke
Contact Email and Phone Number	eric.manke@sfgov.org ; 415-554-4509
SLC Meeting Presenter	Michelle Lau
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 881
Asm. Ting, District 19, Democrat
Be The Jury CA

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Be The Jury CA would raise juror pay in criminal cases from \$15 to \$100 per day for low- to moderate-income jurors. This bill would ensure that all Californians have access to a jury of their peers as promised by the U.S. Constitution.

Background/Analysis

The Constitution guarantees the right to a trial by a jury of peers. While juries should draw jurors from different races, genders, and socioeconomic classes, stakeholders agree that juries are trending whiter and wealthier, and not reflective of our communities' economic or racial diversity.

California, like many states, requires employers to provide time off for employees who are summoned to jury duty. While time off work is guaranteed, paying employees is not. If a juror's employer does not cover their salary, jurors earn nothing on their first day of service and only \$15 per day after that.

To address this issue, the San Francisco Public Defender's Office, San Francisco District Attorney's Office, San Francisco Superior Court, the San Francisco Bar Association, and The Financial Justice Project in the Treasurer's Office collaborated on a joint effort to increase juror pay by launching "Be The Jury," a pilot program at San Francisco Superior Court, where jury pay for criminal cases was increased to \$100 for low- to moderate-income San Franciscans. In an analysis of the pilot program's first 6-months, results show: (1) the diversity of program participants matched San Francisco's at-large population where 63 percent of participants identified as "people of color;" (2) the average household income for participants was under \$40,000, significantly below the \$97,000 area median household income in San Francisco; (3) 81 percent of participants said they would not have been able to participate in jury duty without financial assistance from the pilot program.

Challenge

Because many low-income families cannot afford to forfeit days, weeks, or months of their salary, they file a claim of financial hardship and are excused from service. Consequently, jury pools tend to be composed of people who can afford to serve unpaid or whose employers will pay them while they're serving.

Low juror compensation prevents too many people from being able to participate in jury service, and as income inequality correlates with race and ethnicity, low jury pay excludes many Black and Latinx community members from ever serving as jurors.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 881 increases daily juror compensation to \$100 if their household income is less than 80 percent of their area median income and they meet one of the additional criteria: (1) their employer does not compensate for any jury service; (2) their employer will not compensate for the estimated duration of the trial; (3) they are self-employed; or (4) they are unemployed.

Increasing juror compensation for low-income households can improve the racial and economic diversity of jury pools, thereby paving the way for all Californians to receive their constitutional right to a jury by their peers.

Departments Impacted & Why

No impact to City and County of San Francisco departments.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impact to the City and County of San Francisco.

Support / Opposition

Support:

San Francisco's Treasurer's Office (co-sponsor)
San Francisco Public Defender's Office (co-sponsor)
San Francisco's District Attorney's Office (co-sponsor)
San Francisco Bar Association (co-sponsor)

No opposition on record.

AB 881 directly builds on the San Francisco Be The Jury pilot program, which was made possible through the passage of AB 1452 (Ting), signed by Governor Newsom in 2021.



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	3/6/2023
Submitting Department	Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
Contact Name	Eric Manke
Contact Email and Phone Number	eric.manke@sfgov.org ; 415-554-4509
SLC Meeting Presenter	Michelle Lau
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 1186

Asm. Bonta, Asm. District 18, Democrat

The REPAIR (Realizing Equity while Promoting Accountability and Impactful Relief) Act

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill will provide crime survivors with more equitable, timely, and stable compensation while setting youth who have caused harm on a more meaningful path towards accountability.

Background/Analysis

Currently, California law mandates that judges order all youth who have been found to cause someone to suffer a loss or injury to pay direct monetary compensation, or restitution, to the person their actions harmed. Judges are prohibited from considering the young person’s ability to pay when ordering this compensation.

Young people who are ordered to pay restitution often live in poverty, as do crime survivors. Relying on people in poverty—young people or their families—to make crime survivors whole, simply does not work. As a result, this system does more harm than good. Under the current system, crime survivors rarely receive any restitution.

Upon ordering, restitution can be converted into civil judgments which are enforceable through wage garnishment, tax refund intercept, and bank levies. This debt is not dischargeable in bankruptcy and can follow youth well into adulthood.

Challenge

California’s current restitution system is broken and fails survivors, youth and their families, and society as a whole.

Often, young people and their families cannot afford to pay restitution and face significant financial burdens from these orders. The inability to pay restitution often creates barriers that prevent young people from moving forward in their lives.

Because most youth cannot afford to pay even small restitution orders, people harmed rarely receive restitution. This is particularly harmful for crime survivors, as they often need immediate

compensation and are unable to receive it through the current youth restitution system to be made whole.

Public records data received by the Berkeley Law Policy Advocacy Clinic shows that statewide only about 20 percent of youth restitution ordered since 2010 has been collected, and much of the outstanding debt is years old and unlikely to ever be paid.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The REPAIR Act would ensure the harmed person receives timely payment from the California Victim Compensation Board (CalVCB) while holding young people accountable in youth-appropriate ways that do not involve them paying money they and their families do not have. Instead, they would participate in restorative justice conferences, perform community service, or be connected to job opportunities.

The REPAIR Act builds off of reforms in San Francisco to address our broken system of restitution through the AFTER Pilot Program (Aims to Foster Transformation and Ensure Restitution), which was developed in collaboration between the District Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office, Juvenile Probation, Bar Association, Huckleberry Youth Programs, and The Financial Justice Project in the Treasurer's Office. In the AFTER Program, young people make amends by participating in restorative justice conferences, performing community service, or being connected to job opportunities, and are held accountable for their actions. The person harmed is paid restitution from a fund administered by the District Attorney's Office and can participate in other services to support them.

Departments Impacted & Why

No impact to City and County of San Francisco departments.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impact to the City and County of San Francisco. Estimated impact of \$12 million to the State to create a publicly funded restitution fund for crime survivors.

Support / Opposition

Support

ACLU of Southern California (co-sponsor)
ACLU of Northern California (co-sponsor)
All of Us or None (co-sponsor)
Californians for Safety and Justice (co-sponsor)
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ) (co-sponsor)
Freedom 4 Youth (co-sponsor)
Initiate Justice (co-sponsor)
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children (co-sponsor)
Root & Rebound (co-sponsor)
RYSE Center (co-sponsor)
San Francisco Public Defender's Office (co-sponsor)
The Maven Collective (co-sponsor)
United CORE Alliance (co-sponsor)
Western Center on Law and Poverty (co-sponsor)
Young Women's Freedom Center (co-sponsor)

No opposition on record.



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	3/6/2023
Submitting Department	Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
Contact Name	Eric Manke
Contact Email and Phone Number	eric.manke@sfgov.org ; 415-554-4509
SLC Meeting Presenter	Michelle Lau
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

SB 343
Sen. Skinner, District 9, Democrat
Child Support Federal Rule Conformity Bill

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

The bill would require the Department of Child Support Services and Judicial Council to conform with federal rule changes, resulting in improved capacity for non-custodial parents to pay their child support orders and maximize assistance to custodial parents and their children.

Background/Analysis

In 2016, the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) issued the "Flexibility, Efficiency, and Modernization in Child Support Enforcement Programs," commonly referred to as the "Final Rule." The Final Rule reorients the child support system to work better for low-income families by requiring states to set more realistic orders based on evidence of each person's financial circumstances, screen for ability to pay before incarcerating parents for failure to pay, ensure incarcerated parents are able to adjust their orders based on their income, and reduce the accumulation of unpaid and uncollectible child support arrearages. The Final Rule also increases public participation and transparency in state guidelines review processes to ensure state rules are in line with community needs, among other requirements and guidelines.

Research finds that setting child support orders based on the noncustodial parent's ability to pay improves compliance with orders, increases child support payments, and improves relationships among families. This bill would improve California's child support program and improve families' lives.

Challenge

Currently, California's uniform standards and guidelines for establishing child support orders create orders that are too high for many parents to afford. The median child support order for a low-income parent in California is \$318 per month, higher than other states that offer adjustments for lower-income parents. Approximately 34 percent of cases in California's child support program qualify for a low-income adjustment. This bill will mean more parents will qualify as low and middle-income when calculating their child support amount, and more parents will receive a low-income adjustment that reserves enough income for the parent to live on. Non-

custodial parents will be more likely to pay their child support in a timely manner, improving their relationship with their children and their co-parents.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 343 will bring California into conformity with the federal guidelines on child support orders under the 2016 “Flexibility, Efficiency, and Modernization in Child Support Enforcement Programs,” otherwise known as the “Final Rule.” Coming into compliance with the Final Rule would make California child support orders based on non-custodial parents’ ability to pay, using income and/or specific circumstances non-custodial parents are facing. Most states have either passed or developing legislation to bring them into compliance with the Final Rule.

In a San Francisco, The Financial Justice Project in the Treasurer’s Office partnered with the Department of Child Support Services to conduct a unique pilot program. We used philanthropic dollars to pay down the child support debt these parents owed to the government, so that the parents were able to focus their efforts on providing support and making payments to their families. The pilot program was evaluated by the Urban Institute. The researchers found that parents’ relationships with children and co-parents improved. People’s credit scores, employment, and housing status all improved as well. Furthermore, noncustodial parents’ payments increased in size in regularity, getting more resources to families. Reforming and improving child support orders is critical for supporting children and families.

Departments Impacted & Why

No impact to City and County of San Francisco departments.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impact to the City and County of San Francisco.

Support / Opposition

Support

Truth and Justice in Child Support Coalition (co-sponsor)

No opposition on record.



State Legislation Committee 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 Sarah Owens at Sarah.Owens@sfgov.org and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	March 7, 2023
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

SB 408
Sen. Ashby, District 7, Democrat
Foster youth with complex needs

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 408 would establish programs and services to support foster youth and youth at risk of foster care with significant trauma and complex needs. This investment is needed to ensure no youth are left behind in California's continuing effort to implement Continuum of Care Reform (CCR).

Background/Analysis

San Francisco has embraced the goals of the State's Continuum of Care Reform (CCR), implemented through AB 403 (Stone, Ch. 773, Statutes of 2015), to reduce the use of congregate care and improve permanency and other outcomes for foster youth. CCR has resulted in profound shifts in child welfare practice and has helped to improve outcomes for many – but not all - children, youth and families. Improvements in practices include the use of child and family teaming to ensure youth and family voice in case management and placement decisions, statewide use of the Resource Family Approval process to align and streamline licensing and approval for families, increases in foster care rates, and use of a universal child strengths and needs assessment tool. CCR resulted in significant reductions in the use of congregate care and a greater focus on supporting children and youth in family-based settings.

Challenge

However, CCR was not designed to serve some of our foster youth who have experienced severe trauma and/or have complex physical, behavioral and other needs. The complexity of the needs of these youth challenge even our most sophisticated cross-system providers, resulting in multiple placements, longer lengths of stay in shelters and/or stays in unlicensed settings. In fact, on multiple occasions, the City has covered the cost for foster youth to reside in unlicensed locations like hotels or Airbnbs because no placements were available (in spite of a statewide search). As a result, and like many other counties, our county continues to struggle in achieving the full vision

of CCR: to minimize use of congregate care and to improve child safety, permanency and well-being outcomes through family-based care.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 408 establishes an enhanced Short-Term Residential Therapeutic Program (STRTP) model providing intensive, on-site services to stabilize, assess, and provide therapeutic supports to the subset of foster youth with particularly significant needs, and deliver 6 months of after care to both youth and their caregivers. This ensures continuity of services and supported transitions to family-based care or into other residential care settings that we hope will prevent future disruptions and undesired outcomes, such as hospitalizations.

Additionally, SB 408 would establish up to ten regional health teams across the state to improve assessments and timely access to needed services (physical, mental health, substance use, etc.), perform comprehensive case management in coordination with other child-serving systems, and ensure appropriate follow-up to prevent placement disruptions with families and care coordination for youth stepping down from hospitals or other settings. This approach is critical to preserving families, preventing disruptions in family-based foster care, and identifying and supporting families as early as possible to reduce trauma.

Finally, this bill and the accompanying budget proposal would convert one-time funds provided to counties into an on-going appropriation of funding from the State Department of Social Services to build and sustain complex care programs and practices.

Departments Impacted & Why

SFHSA & JPD

Fiscal Impact

- \$63.1M State GF One Time Funding over 5 years to establish the Children’s Crisis Continuum Pilot Project
- \$43.3M State GF One Time over 5 years to develop local sustainable services
- \$18.1M State GF ongoing available to counties, upon request to the California Department of Social Services to help stabilize youth and meet their immediate and longer-term needs

Support / Opposition

The County Welfare Directors Association of California (CWDA) and Chief Probation Offices of California (CPOC) are co-sponsors. Child advocacy groups like Children NOW and Children’s Defense Fund are likely to support.