



STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 12, 2023
10:00am – 12:00pm
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.

[Click here to join meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 850 3448 6000 **Meeting Password:** 957207 **Join by Phone at**
+1 669 219 2599

(Public Comment Instructions available on page 11)

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 March 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 Animal Care and Control & Office of the City Administrator

Presenter: Angela Yip

AB 595 (Essayi): Animal shelters: 72-hour public notice: euthanasia: study

Recommended Position: Oppose

The March 21 revisions require 72-hour public notice before the euthanasia of any animal except in cases of irremediable suffering, newborns without maternal care, and dogs with a documented history of vicious/dangerous behavior. It imposes criminal penalties for violations. The bill would create new requirements on Animal Care and Control agencies, and it is an unfunded mandate.

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Presenter: Dylan Schneider

AB 441 (Haney): Earned Income Tax Credit: young child tax credit: foster youth tax credit: periodic payments

Recommended Position: Support

AB 441 would allow Californians to receive advance monthly payments of their CalEITC, Young Child Tax Credit, and Foster Youth Tax Credit, if the combined value of the credits is \$1,000 or greater.

SB 37 (Caballero): Older Adults and Adults with Disabilities Housing Stability Act

Recommended Position: Support

SB 37 would establish a multi-year Rent Stabilization Fund to provide a mix of shallow and deep subsidies to help older adults and people with disabilities afford fair market rate rent and transition to permanent housing assistance programs, including federally funded subsidies like the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program. SB 37 would also encourage the Department of Housing and Community Development to fund and work with a variety of community-based organizations who provide housing and services to older adults and people with disabilities.

SB 657 (Caballero): Homelessness services staff training

Recommended Position: Support

SB 657 would require the Interagency Council on Homelessness ("council") to coordinate with the California continuums of care and the area agencies on aging to partner in their shared regions to provide gerontological training for homelessness services staff, to ensure that homelessness service providers are well trained and well equipped to assist vulnerable older adults with accessing resources to gain a permanent housing solution.

Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 608 (Schiavo): Medi-Cal: Comprehensive Perinatal Services

Recommended Position: Support

AB 608 ensures more Californians have a healthy start to life by extending the Comprehensive Perinatal Services Program for Medi-Cal members to one year postpartum. The bill also allows perinatal health workers to provide preventive services outside of a clinic.

AB 1057 (Weber): California Home Visiting Program

Recommended Position: Support

The California Home Visiting Program (CHVP) is a voluntary program created by the State Department of Public Health to support pregnant people and parents with young children who live in communities that face greater risks and barriers to achieving positive maternal and child health outcomes. AB 1057 would boost the reach and impact of CHVP by giving additional flexibility to local health jurisdictions to administer Home Visiting Programs that address the unique needs of their communities and better provide support to families who need it most.

Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector

Presenter: Michelle Lau

SB 618 (Rubio): End Debt Trap Act

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would eliminate the collection and accrual of interest on child support debt owed to the government for public assistance repayment.

San Francisco Human Services Agency

Presenter: Rod Finetti

AB 366 (Petrie-Norris): County human services agencies: workforce development

Recommended Position: Support

AB 366 by Assembly Member Petrie-Norris would provide funding and resources, as well as reduce barriers, to address significant workforce shortages in county human services programs.

AB 386 (Nguyen): California Right to Financial Privacy Act

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would improve the capability of Adult Protective Services (APS) to fulfill its obligation to protect seniors and disabled adults from the growing threat of financial abuse.

AB 605 (Arambula): CalFresh Fruit and Vegetable Supplemental Benefits Expansion Program

Recommended Position: Support

AB 605 (Arambula) would expand the number and geographic diversity of retailers offering fruit and vegetable supplemental benefits to CalFresh.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter: Katie Angotti

AB 361 (Ward): Vehicles: video imaging of bicycle lane parking violations

Recommended Position: Support

This bill authorizes a local agency to use automated forward-facing parking control devices on city owned enforcement vehicles to cite vehicles parked in a bike lane.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency & Department on the Status of Women

Presenter: Katie Angotti

SB 434 (Min): Transit operators: street harassment survey

Recommended Position: Support

This bill requires the top ten public transit operators, including the SFMTA, upon appropriation of funds by the Legislature to collect and publish survey data and conduct outreach activities for the purpose of informing their efforts to improve the safety of riders and reduce street harassment on public transit. The bill requires transit operators, by December 31, 2024, to publish the survey data on their websites and inform the Governor and the Legislature.

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Presenter: Scott Ammon

SB 83 (Wiener): Public utilities: electrical distribution grid: interconnection

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would require electrical corporations to interconnect development projects to the electrical distribution grid within eight weeks of a project receiving a "Green Tag" from a governmental agency. Issuance of a Green Tag would confirm that all prerequisite work and approvals necessary for interconnection of a development project to the grid have been completed and received by the project applicant. The bill would require electrical corporations to compensate project applicants in the event that the electrical corporation fails to interconnect the project to the grid within the eight week timeline.

The bill would also require electrical corporations to provide an annual report to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on the number of interconnection applications received within the previous 12 months and the time period for interconnecting these projects to the grid. The SFPUC recommends a support position for SB 83.

Presenter: Rebecca Peacock

SB 778 (Ochoa Bogh): Excavations: subsurface installations

Recommended Position: Oppose unless amended

This bill would remove the exemption for nonpressurized sewer lines and storm drains from California's Dig Safe Law. It also makes other changes, such as revising requirements around notification of operators, use of vacuum equipment, and processes regarding discrepancies in excavation area delineation.

Environment Department

Presenter: Kyle Wehner

AB 496 (Friedman): Cosmetic safety

Recommended Position: Support

This bill prohibits the sale in California of cosmetic products containing any one of 26 carcinogens, reproductive toxins, and endocrine disruptors beginning January 1, 2025.

AB 1290 (Rivas): Eliminating Problematic Plastics Act

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would prohibit in California the manufacture, sale, or distribution of opaque or pigmented polyethylene terephthalate bottles, and plastic packaging containing certain chemicals, pigments, or additives beginning January 1, 2026.

SB 253 (Wiener): Corporate Climate Data Accountability Act

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would require large companies doing business in California to publicly disclose their Scope 1, 2, and 3 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. This bill will hold businesses accountable for the entire lifecycle of their operational impacts and contributions to climate change.

SB 261 (Stern): Climate-Related Risk Disclosure Act

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would require large companies doing business in California to publicly report their climate-related financial risk. This bill would ensure that financial institutions and businesses are taking the necessary steps to mitigate and adapt to global climate impacts.

SB 511 (Blakespear): Greenhouse gas emissions inventories

Recommended Position: Support

The bill would instruct the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to publish greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory data for municipalities on a publicly accessible database to help simplify climate action planning for municipalities in California. This legislation would help shift municipal resources away from time-consuming GHG accounting activities and toward impactful, consistent, and standardized implementation of climate programs.

SB 707 (Newman): Responsible Textile Recovery Act of 2023

Recommended Position: Support

SB 707 creates a statewide textile repair and recycling extended producer responsibility program to reduce the increasing volume of unusable textiles in landfills.

Department of Early Childhood

Presenter: Graham Dobson

AB 244 (Wilson): Specialized Inclusivity Training for Child Care Staff Grant Program

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would establish the Specialized Inclusivity Training for Child Care Staff Grant Program to fund staff training on including children with disabilities and improve access to child care for children with disabilities in California.

AB 596 (Reyes): Child Care Rate Reform and Suspension of Family Fees

Recommended Position: Support

AB 596 will help early learning and childcare providers and families by transitioning providers to a single cost based reimbursement rate, suspending family fees until an equitable sliding scale for family fees is established, and funding providers using an enrollment based contract earning mechanism. This is a companion bill to SB 380 (Reyes).

SB 380 (Limon): Child care: statewide pilot policies: individualized county childcare subsidy plans.

Recommended Position: Support

SB 380 will help early learning and childcare providers and families by transitioning providers to a single cost based reimbursement rate, suspending family fees until an equitable sliding scale for family fees is established, and funding providers using an enrollment based contract earning mechanism. This is a companion bill to AB 596 (Limon).

SB 635 (Menjivar): Early Education and Child care: developmental screenings

Recommended Position: Support

SB 635 would provide tens of thousands of children with access to early childhood developmental screening and other appropriate developmental screenings. It would also ensure that children ages 0-5 who need additional services after screening are referred for further assessment and intervention at no cost to the parent.

Department of Children Youth and Their Families

Presenter: Jasmine Dawson

SB 274 (Skinner): Suspensions and Expulsions: Willful Defiance

Recommended Position: Support

Senate Bill 274 would remove disrupting school activities and willful defiance from being on the list of acts for which a pupil, regardless of their grade enrollment, may be suspended or recommended for expulsion. Additionally, this bill will remove the ability to suspend or expel pupils who are truant, tardy, or otherwise absent from school activities. DCYF would support this bill fully based on the research confirming students of color, homeless, with disabilities, in foster care, and/or LGBTQIA+ are more likely to be suspended for behavior deemed to be willfully defiant.

SB 287 (Skinner): Features that harm child users: civil penalty

Recommended Position: Support

Senate Bill 287 would prohibit social media platforms from using a design, algorithm, or feature that the platform knows, or with the exercise of reasonable care should have known causes child users increased risk of harm, including addiction to the social media platform. DCYF would fully support this bill fully because we recognize that these algorithms can cause harm and increase risk in a number of ways, for example by promoting eating disorders or offering information on how to die by suicide. We also support that this bill lifts up the California Age-Appropriate Design Code Act which states that a business that provides an online service, product, or feature likely to be accessed by children to comply with specified requirements, including a requirement to configure all default privacy settings offered by the online service, product, or feature to the settings that offer a high level of privacy, as prescribed, and is required of a business. This requires new online services, products, or features that are offered to the public, complete a Data Protection Impact Assessment for any online service, product, or feature likely to be accessed by children and maintain documentation of this assessment if the online service, product, or feature is likely to be accessed by children.

SB 333 (Cortese): Homeless Pupils: California Success, Opportunity, and Academic Resilience (SOAR) Guaranteed Income Program

Recommended Position: Support

Senate Bill 333 would require the State Department of Social Services to establish the California Success, Opportunity, and Academic Resilience (SOAR) Guaranteed Income Program. This program would award public school pupils who are in the 12th grade and are homeless children or youths, a guaranteed income of \$1,000 each month for 5 months from April 1, 2025, to August 1, 2025. DCYF would support this bill fully based on the needs of who we would consider a priority population with greater needs, homeless youth, and because youth will receive a guaranteed based income of \$1,000 for five months and funds would not be considered income for public social service programs or other purposes and would not negatively impact the award recipient's eligibility for future public social service programs.

Department on the Status of Women

Presenter: Alea Brown-Hoffmeister

AB 254 (Bauer-Kahan): Confidentiality of Medical Information Act: reproductive or sexual health application information

Recommended Position: Support

Assemblymember Bauer-Kahan introduced AB 254, which ensures the privacy and security of individuals' information when they opt to use apps and websites that provide reproductive and sexual health services.

AB 576 (Weber): Medi-Cal: reimbursement for abortion

Recommended Position: Support

AB 576 ensures that patients that rely on Medi-Cal can access medication abortion in line with up-to-date clinical guidelines and peer-reviewed scientific evidence.

AB 598 (Wicks): Sexual health education and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) prevention education: school climate and safety: California Healthy Kids Survey

Recommended Position: Support

AB 598, introduced by Assemblymember Wicks requires school districts, including those in the City and County of San Francisco, to participate in the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) and include a module on sexual and reproductive health care as one of the core survey modules.

AB 710 (Schiavo): State Department of Public Health: pregnancy care and abortion services awareness campaign

Recommended Position: Support

This bill will launch a public information campaign to provide women with accurate information regarding access to abortion care at crisis pregnancy centers.

AB 1194 (Carrillo): California Privacy Rights Act Of 2020: Exemptions: Abortion Services

Recommended Position: Support

This bill will ensure that businesses can not use exemptions under the Consumer Privacy Rights Act to share information about a consumer accessing, procuring, or searching for services regarding contraception, pregnancy care, and perinatal care, including abortion services.

SB 36 (Skinner): Out-of-state criminal charges: prosecution related to abortion, contraception, reproductive care, and gender-affirming care

Recommended Position: Support

The new legislation by Senator Skinner builds on those landmark laws by barring California judges from directing bounty hunters or bail agents and making it illegal for bounty hunters and bail agents, to apprehend people who fled criminal prosecution or imprisonment for providing, receiving or supporting an abortion or gender-affirming care. Bounty hunters and bail agents who violate the new statute would be guilty of a misdemeanor and face up to a year in jail and forfeiture of their license to operate in California.

SB 345 (Skinner): Health care services: legally protected health care activities

Recommended Position: Support

SB 345 expands legal protections for health care professionals providing reproductive health services as well as gender-affirming care, contraception, and abortions for out-of-state patients. Specifically, this bill will protect health care providers from suspension, license revocation, and other related disciplinary actions by a California medical licensing board, due to their performance of legally protected health care services regardless of where these services were performed. Additionally, health care providers will be further protected from civil suits or criminal prosecution by non-California jurisdictions due to their performance of health care services, including abortions.

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://sfhsa.zoom.us/j/85034486000?pwd=b0FCS2U5MWw3OC94ZkkyL0c3ZjBVUT09>

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: +1 669 219 2599 **Access code:** 957207

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 *9 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." At this time, you should press *6 to unmute yourself.
- 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, 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 (Substitute for first 30 minutes—Luis Zamora)
Controller's Office -- Calvin Quock
Treasurer's Office -- Eric Manke

AGENDA

Meeting commenced at 11:04am.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Sarah Owens, Preston Kilgore, Kelly Groth, Holly Lung, Luis Zamora, Calvin Quock, Eric Manke

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on February 15, 2023.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Approve: Kelly Groth
Seconded by: Holly Lung
Approved: 7-0

III. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item). The City's

state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

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

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 and seek amendment

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support and Seek Amendments to ACA 1: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Preston Kilgore

Approved: 7-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support AB 1221: Eric Manke

Seconded by: Luis Zamora

Approved: 7-0

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).

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Sponsor AB 663: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Holly Lung
Approved: 7-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 339: Eric Manke
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore
Approved: 7-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 660: Holly Lung
Seconded by: Kelly Groth
Approved: 7-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support AB 1352: Kelly Groth

Seconded by: Preston Kilgore

Approved: 7-0

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector

Presenter: Michelle Lau

SB 474 (Becker): The Basic, Affordable Supplies for Incarcerated Californians (BASICs) 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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support SB 474: Eric Manke

Seconded by: Kelly Groth

Approved: 7-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Table AB 881: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore
Approved: 7-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 343: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Eric Manke
Approved: 7-0

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

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 1186: Eric Manke
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore
Approved: 7-0

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).

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 408: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Holly Lung
Approved: 7-0

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.

No Public Comment.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 12:11pm.



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 28, 2023
Submitting Department	SF Animal Care and Control/City Admin
Contact Name	Sophie Hayward
Contact Email and Phone Number	Sophie.hayward@sfgov.org , angela.yip@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Angela Yip
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 595

Asm. Essayi, District 63, Republican

Animal shelters: 72-hour public notice: euthanasia: study

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB595, "Bowie's Law" Summary: The March 21 revisions require 72-hour public notice before the euthanasia of any animal except in cases of irremediable suffering, newborns without maternal care, and dogs with a documented history of vicious/dangerous behavior. It imposes criminal penalties for violations. The bill would create new requirements on Animal Care and Control agencies, and it is an unfunded mandate.

Background/Analysis

Existing law declares that it is the policy of the state that no adoptable animal should be euthanized if it can be adopted into a suitable home. Existing law also declares that it is the policy of the state that no treatable animal should be euthanized. As described above, this bill would impose a 72-hour notice requirement before euthanasia except in very specific circumstances, and would add requirements – including reporting requirements – to existing Animal Care and Control agencies. No funds for staff or programming are identified as part of this bill.

Challenge

- San Francisco is an extremely successful shelter, sustaining a live release rate of more than 90% for dogs and cats since 2017. We take in roughly 10,000 animals annually.
- We assess the behavior and medical condition of every animal we receive to determine if it can be successfully adopted from our shelter.
- If our assessment shows that the animal needs more support than we can provide, we reach out to our network of more than 125 adoption partners.
- We receive animals who are dangerous and cannot safely be released to the public but there is no documented history of this behavior.
- In San Francisco, the average length of stay for dogs is approximately 10 days. For cats it's closer to 17 days. Adding a 72-hour hold period would further block a perilously full pipeline and exacerbate our overcrowding problem.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

We recommend opposing this bill. There are no amendments that would improve the outcome for San Francisco.

Departments Impacted & Why

San Francisco Animal Care & Control

Fiscal Impact

- In San Francisco at the SFACC, the average length of stay for dogs is approximately 10 days. For cats it's closer to 17 days. Adding a 72-hour hold period would further block a perilously full pipeline and exacerbate our overcrowding problem.

Support / Opposition

Teamsters and CalAnimals both opposed.



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 23, 2023
Submitting Department	SHS
Contact Name	Emily Cohen
Contact Email and Phone Number	Emily.cohen@sfgov.org , 415-307-3584
SLC Meeting Presenter	Dylan Schneider
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 441

Asm. Haney, District 17, Democrat

Earned Income Tax Credit: young child tax credit: foster youth tax credit: periodic payments

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 441 would allow Californians to receive advance monthly payments of their CalEITC, Young Child Tax Credit, and Foster Youth Tax Credit, if the combined value of the credits is \$1,000 or greater.

Background/Analysis

California has been a national leader in providing life-changing cash assistance for hard-working families through smart and targeted tax-credit programs. California’s refundable tax credits, including CalEITC, Young Child Tax Credit, and Former Foster Youth Tax Credit increase economic well-being by putting more than \$1 billion back into the pockets of millions of low-income Californians each year. They are also powerful tools for increasing racial equity in the state: 3 in 4 eligible Californians are people of color. The impact of these programs would be deepened by paying out tax credits monthly, as they’re earned, instead of only once a year.

In 2021, the federal government temporarily expanded the Child Tax Credit (CTC) and provided half of the credit as advance monthly payments over six months. Nearly 62 million children in 38 million families across the United States received financial relief, which was overwhelmingly used to pay for food, rent, child care, and other necessities for their children. Monthly CTC payments helped families pay bills, including to prevent utility shutoffs and evictions or foreclosures. They also reduced food insufficiency among families with kids by 24% and improvements were significant among Black and Latinx families, who experience the highest rates of food hardships.

While the expansion of the federal CTC in 2021 drove an unprecedented 46% drop in child poverty, research from Columbia University shows monthly payments cut poverty by 30% more each month than the same amount made annually, because of their income stabilizing effects.

Challenge

In California, 30% of households experience income volatility, and one in three Bay Area residents consistently run out of money before the end of each month, which makes it harder for families to pay bills, afford basics like groceries, or stay in their homes. Nationwide, income volatility disproportionately affects Black, Latinx, and families with low incomes, compounding the effects of institutional and systemic racism and furthering threatening the economic well-being of Californians of color.

Income volatility threatens housing security. California faces a severe affordability crisis: over 75% of extremely low-income households are paying more than half of their income on rent each month. Unexpected financial crises (like a medical bill or job loss) are among the most common causes of homelessness, and recent research has even pinpointed the sharp dips in earnings and increased payday loan inquiries that precede evictions.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 441 would increase income stability by providing tax credits as advance payments on a monthly basis instead of as an annual lump sum, helping families more easily meet their needs as they come up throughout the year. AB 441 maximizes the impact of California's existing tax credit programs, which provide millions of dollars to low-income working people across the state every year.

Homelessness prevention programs show that a cushion of even just a few hundred dollars a month can make the difference between staying housed or being evicted. That reliable monthly income can help households avoid evictions and their harmful effects, including less earnings and higher debt for years afterward.

Monthly payments reduce income shocks and increase economic security.

- *Monthly payments help families keep up with regular expenses, like food, housing and bills.*
- *Monthly payments reduce vulnerability to risky financial products like payday loans.*
- *Monthly payments help tax credits cut monthly poverty more than if paid in a lump sum.*

AB 441 would authorize the Franchise Tax Board to provide monthly payments to tax filers who are eligible for \$1,000 or greater in combined tax credits from the CalEITC, young Child Tax Credit, and Foster Youth Tax Credit. This bill will

- Protect taxpayers and the state from overpayments
 - Advance monthly payments will be equal to 80% of the estimated total credit amount; the other 20% of the credits will be available upon tax filing.
- Streamline the process for taxpayers
 - Payments will be paid by direct deposit where possible, or by check or debit card if not.
 - Recipients will have the ability to opt out of payments and make any changes affecting their eligibility for the credits on myFTB at any time.
- Protect taxpayers federal and state benefits
 - Advanced monthly payments will not be implemented until federal law is clear that monthly payments will not impact eligibility for federal benefits.
 - Franchise Tax Board will request any federal agency waivers that are necessary to protect taxpayers' federal means-tested benefits.

- o Monthly payment of tax credits will not be counted as regular income for the purpose of determining any means-tested state benefits.

Departments Impacted & Why

Human Services Agency as likely many ELI households eligible for this program are receiving other public benefits through HSA.

Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing – monthly distributions would support keeping families stably housed in supportive housing or in exiting homes, reducing the inflow into homelessness or high-risk of homelessness.

Fiscal Impact

- No anticipated fiscal impact on local jurisdictions.

Support / Opposition

Sponsors:

- Assembly Member Haney (D) - San Francisco
- All Home
- End Poverty in California
- Economic Security Project Action

City and County of San Francisco support:

- HSH
- HSA
- TTX



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 23, 2023
Submitting Department	HSH
Contact Name	Emily Cohen
Contact Email and Phone Number	Emily.cohen@sfgov.org , 415-307-3584
SLC Meeting Presenter	Dylan Schneider
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 37

Sen. Caballero, District 14, Democrat

Older Adults and Adults with Disabilities Housing Stability Act

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 37 would establish a multi-year Rent Stabilization Fund to provide a mix of shallow and deep subsidies to help older adults and people with disabilities afford fair market rate rent and transition to permanent housing assistance programs, including federally funded subsidies like the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program. SB 37 would also encourage the Department of Housing and Community Development to fund and work with a variety of community-based organizations who provide housing and services to older adults and people with disabilities.

Background/Analysis

Governor Newsom released California’s Master Plan for Aging (MPA) in January 2021, calling on California to develop housing solutions to prevent and end homelessness among older adults and other at-risk populations. Two years later, the need for bold intervention to stop the surge of older adult homelessness is more urgent than ever. By investing state funds into a rental assistance program targeted to severely rent-burdened and other precariously housed older adults and persons with disabilities, we can keep people in the housing they already have, and get people into housing that meets their needs. A targeted rent stabilization program is the top housing recommendation of the MPA Impact Committee, DACLAC and was endorsed by more than 70 organizations that supported AB 2547 in the last legislative session.

Challenge

The rent affordability crisis is hitting older and disabled adults living on fixed incomes especially hard because they can’t just work to make ends meet. Older Californians are facing severe housing cost burdens, with roughly 8 out of 10 extremely low-income older renters paying more than half of their income for rent. Caught in the vice between inadequate income and rapidly rising rents, older adults have become the fastest growing age group experiencing homelessness in California, with 45% of California’s homeless individuals now age 50 and older, many of whom have become unhoused for the first time after age 50. Over 56,000 Californians age 55 and older accessed homeless services in 2021. People with disabilities, who are far more likely to live in poverty, make up about 43% of those experiencing homelessness. This risk of homelessness particularly impacts

African American/Black households, who are over five times more likely to become homeless than Californians as a whole.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Create a targeted housing stabilization program that will prevent and solve homelessness for many of thousands of older adult and people living with disabilities through the following unique approach:

- Through a competitive grant process administered by the Housing and Community Development Department, fund housing subsidies that meet the specific needs of eligible households.
- Targeting prevention resources to those most at risk of homelessness using evidence-informed predictive factors.
- Ensuring that people receiving subsidies through this program will eventually transition to longer-term federally-funded subsidies through preference in federal turn-over vouchers.
- Leverage funding strategies that have worked locally, such as partnering with landlords, public housing authorities, local aging and disability providers, and area agencies on aging.
- Ensuring that the allocation of funds represents geographic diversity and promotes equity.

Departments Impacted & Why

Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing that provides housing interventions to prevent and end homelessness and additional resources are needed for this population.

Department of Disability and Aging Services that provides support services to the population who would be served by this grant program.

San Francisco Housing Authority that administers federal permanent housing subsidies like Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers.

Fiscal Impact

- Provide a new source of funding for much needed rental subsidies for this population.
- Would likely require the City to fund the support serves needed to ensure program participants can be successful in the rental subsidies.
- Administrative and implementation costs to HSH and/or DAS.

Support / Opposition

Sponsors:

- *Elected Officials*
 - *Senator Smallwood-Cuevas (co-author)*
 - *Assembly Member Wicks (co-author)*
- *Corporation for Supportive housing (CSH) - (co-sponsor)*
- *Justice in Aging (co-sponsor)*
- *State Council on Developmental Disabilities (co-sponsor)*
- *United Way of Greater Los Angeles (co-sponsor)*
- *AARP*
- [Full list of supporters here](#)

City supporters:

- *MOHCD*



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	HSH
Contact Name	Emily Cohen
Contact Email and Phone Number	Emily.cohen@sfgov.org , 415-307-3584
SLC Meeting Presenter	Dylan Schneider
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 657
Sen. Caballero, District 14, Democrat
Homelessness services staff training

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 657 would require the Interagency Council on Homelessness (“council”) to coordinate with the California continuums of care and the area agencies on aging to partner in their shared regions to provide gerontological training for homelessness services staff, to ensure that homelessness service providers are well trained and well equipped to assist vulnerable older adults with accessing resources to gain a permanent housing solution.

Background/Analysis

Governor Newsom released California’s Master Plan for Aging (MPA) in January 2021, calling on California to develop housing solutions to prevent and end homelessness among older adults and other at-risk populations. SB-657 is one of the 11 bills that Justice in Aging has identified as furthering the Master Plan for Agency’s goal this legislative session.

This bill add language to Section 8257.25 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, relating to homelessness, that currently establishes:

- The California Department of Aging in the California Health and Human Services agency and requires the Department to designate and work with area agencies on aging to work for the interest of older Californians;
- Establishes that federally defined continuums of care are eligible for specified State grants and programs;
- Required the creation of the Interagency Council on Homelessness for specific purposes, including to create partnerships among various entities.

Challenge

Caught in the vice between inadequate income and rapidly rising rents, older adults have become the fastest growing age group experiencing homelessness in California, with 45% of

California's homeless individuals now age 50 and older, many of whom have become unhoused for the first time after age 50. Over 56,000 Californians age 55 and older accessed homeless services in 2021. This risk of homelessness particularly impacts African American/Black households, who are over five times more likely to become homeless than Californians as a whole.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Homeless services staff, especially those working in shelter and prevention services are an important component in addressing California's homelessness crisis, yet the majority of the supportive staff are not trained in the issues and concerns of older adults. Staff training on older adult issues, how to access an individual's independence to manage daily living activities, and knowledge of regional services and resources is needed to better assist a more vulnerable population experiencing homelessness.

By requiring the Interagency Council on Homelessness and regional Continuums of Care (CoC's) to create and provide geriatric training to homeless service staff, staff will be better prepared to support the unique needs of older adults experiencing homelessness.

Departments Impacted & Why

Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing funds homeless services in San Francisco and has the Local Homelessness Coordinating Board (LHCB), San Francisco's Continuum of Care as an advising body.

Department of Disability and Aging Services in the Human Services Agency has partnerships with HSH to support older adults experiencing homelessness and works closely with area agencies on aging.

Fiscal Impact

The bill would be implemented contingent on an appropriation for those purposes in the budget act.

- If funding was identified and approved, San Francisco's Continuum of Care, the Local Homelessness Coordinating Board (LHCB) staffed by HSH, and DAS (or other eligible aging agencies) would likely be eligible for state funds to support this training

Support / Opposition

Sponsors:

- *Justice in Aging*

City Support:

- *HSH*
- *HSA*



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	SF Department of Public Health
Contact Name	Max Gara
Contact Email and Phone	Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org ; 415-554-2621
SLC 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 608
Asm. Schiavo, District 40, Democrat
Medi-Cal: Comprehensive Perinatal Services

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 608 ensures more Californians have a healthy start to life by extending the Comprehensive Perinatal Services Program for Medi-Cal members to one year postpartum. 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 Medi-Cal that provides a wide range of culturally competent services to pregnant people, from conception to 60 days after delivery. 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 in 2021, 1,500 births were covered under Medi-Cal.

Challenge

Comprehensive health and social services, especially when provided by CPHWs, are important for promoting primary prevention of adverse childhood experiences (ACEs). 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. Perinatal health

workers such as CPHWs help screen for behavioral and physical health issues, promote preventive healthcare, and support stronger parent-child bonds.

While current law provides full-scope Medi-Cal benefits for pregnant individuals for a full calendar year after birth, it does not include perinatal services, which are covered only 60-days post pregnancy. A 2020 Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) 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 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 meet individuals where they reside and feel most comfortable receiving care. These factors can collectively work to prevent pregnant and post-partum persons from receiving important health and social services.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 608 would expand the Comprehensive Perinatal Services Program by:

- Requiring Medi-Cal to cover Comprehensive Perinatal Services for the full calendar year following pregnancy.
- Requiring 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 and covered under Medi-Cal, 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 the 365 days post pregnancy. Further, allowing CPSP services to be provided in-home 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 referral assessments to programs before issues in home escalate.

Departments Impacted & Why

DPH will have to: (1) 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 bill 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: Maternal and Child Health Access; The Children's Partnership

Opposition: None known at this time



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	3/3/2023
Submitting Department	SF 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 1057
Asm. Weber, District 79, Democrat
California Home Visiting Program

Recommended Position

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

Summary

The California Home Visiting Program (CHVP) is a voluntary program created by the State Department of Public Health to support pregnant people and parents with young children who live in communities that face greater risks and barriers to achieving positive maternal and child health outcomes. AB 1057 would boost the reach and impact of CHVP by giving additional flexibility to local health jurisdictions to administer Home Visiting Programs that address the unique needs of their communities and better provide support to families who need it most.

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 birthing people were significantly more likely to report prenatal depression (22%) than white birthing people (9%).

The California Home Visiting Program (CHVP) aims to address these disparities by supporting pregnant people and parents with young children who live in communities that face greater risks and barriers to achieving positive maternal and child health outcomes. CHVP is designed to support preventative interventions by focusing on positive parenting and child development for families who are at risk for adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) such as neglect, abuse, child maltreatment, mental health related issues, or other potentially traumatic experiences.

San Francisco Department of Public Health’s Maternal Child Adolescent Health Division oversees one of the county’s local CHVP programs, the Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP) Program. The NFP program is for women who are pregnant with their first child who enroll in their first or second trimester (less than 28 weeks). The program provides nursing care in client homes and in the community, through the child’s second birthday. Additionally, San Francisco, in collaboration with Napa and Sonoma Counties, has launched a new program funded by a CHVP grant, Trauma Informed Approach in Public Health Nursing (TIA-PHN). TIA-PHN is based on ACEs

research and trauma informed principles, and aims to incorporate a trauma-informed approach into traditional maternal and child home visiting programs for clients who do not have access to or do not meet NFP criteria. This program launched in 2021, and funding has been extended through FY 2026

Public health nurses (PHNs) in these programs build therapeutic relationships with clients who have experienced trauma and/or have underlying physical and mental health challenges. These programs provide physical assessment, linkages to medical, dental, behavioral health, and community resources, education regarding childbirth, parenting, safety in the home and community, nutrition, maternal role development, child development, and more. Because the home visitors are nurses, they are uniquely able to support clients with complex needs and provide both physical assessment as well as referrals, linkages and emotional support.

Challenge

Maternal mental health disorders (MMHDs) are the most common complication during the perinatal period, which often goes both undetected and untreated. MMHDs are even more prevalent for birthing people of color with rates that are often as high as 20 percent for African American and Latino women. These high rates are often attributed to a lack of awareness and stigma of mental health issues within their respective communities, higher levels of stress, and other socio-economic factors. Currently, mental health support can be difficult to access for our clients, and our programs have record long waitlists with PHNs unable to serve all the need. Further, state rules limit the types of home visiting models counties can implement to address these needs.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1057 would require the California Department of Public Health to allow local health departments (LHDs) additional flexibility in administering the California Home Visiting Program (CHVP). Specifically this bill would:

- Allow local health departments the flexibility to use any other federally approved home visiting model.
- Permit local health departments the opportunity to supplement home visiting with mental health supports and training.
- Allow local health jurisdictions to submit an alternative public health nursing model that prioritizes the unique needs of individuals in that jurisdiction (e.g., Trauma Informed Approach in PHN).

Mental health needs are high for our clients, those who care for them, and our PHN staff. This bill would allow our PHN home visiting programs to embed mental health clinicians to provide direct therapy via home visits to clients who are unable to obtain or access other community resources. These same clinicians would also carry a caseload of PHNs for whom they would provide mental health support given the secondary trauma impacts they experience. SFDPH has piloted the provision of mental health consultation for PHNs for the last 5 years which has increased staff resilience and team morale, has improved the ability of our PHNs to provide therapeutic support for clients, and has decreased burnout.

Further, this bill would allow the current pilot program to continue after the initial three-year grant, by expanding the allowable public health nursing models that local jurisdictions can implement on a non-pilot basis.

Departments Impacted & Why

No other departments would be impacted.

Fiscal Impact

California uses federal and general fund to operate the CHVP. This bill requires CDPH to maximize federal funds for CHVP's expansion. While the bill will likely have an impact on the State GF, no analysis has been conducted to date. This bill would provide funding for SF's local home visiting programs to hire mental health clinician.

Support / Opposition

CHEAC sponsoring



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	3/28/2023
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 618
Sen. Rubio, District 22, Democrat
End the Debt Trap Act

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would eliminate the collection and accrual of interest on child support debt owed to the government for public assistance repayment.

Background/Analysis

For over 40 years, California has required parents who receive public assistance to repay the state by intercepting their child support payments. When parents cannot afford to pay, their debt to the state grows rapidly because of California’s high interest rates on child support debt to the government. California’s 10% interest rate is one of the highest in the country, with only seven other states joining California in charging 10% or more. Meanwhile, sixteen states—including Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Utah—charge no interest at all.

California’s interest rate – higher than in Mississippi and Texas – quickly inflates debt to levels that are nearly impossible to repay. In California, a parent with \$15,000 in debt, the average amount owed, could pay \$50 every two weeks for 30 years and they’d actually owe more than when they started, since the interest owed exceeds their annual payments. Someone making the same payments in 1 of the 16 states that charge no interest would have nearly paid off their debt in 12 years.

As a result, today low-income parents owe over \$6.5 billion in unpaid child support debt to the state. While Governor Newsom and the Legislature have committed to ending the state interception of child support to repay public benefits by 2025, parents who are already in debt, and who have accrued substantial interest on this debt, require debt relief due to this unjust and inequitable public assistance repayment practice, which is fueled by this extreme interest rate.

Challenge

California’s 10% interest on government-owed debt traps low-income parents in insurmountable debt. The State’s own research shows that 95% percent of child support debt owed to the government is uncollectible since it is owed by very low-income parents who simply cannot pay

it. Many of these parents are elderly or disabled, living only on Social Security. Eliminating the interest rate is also a crucial racial and economic equity issue we must address because child support debt disproportionately impacts families of color. By imposing 10% interest on government owed debt, California undermines the economic stability of low-income families, increases the debt to unsustainable levels, and exacerbates racial inequity and the racial wealth gap. It also furthers a legacy of extracting wealth from Black families, which is why the state's reparations task force recommends eliminating the annual interest rate charged for past due child support.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Eliminating the collection and accrual of interest rate on child support debt owed to the government will build on groundbreaking reforms brought by Governor Newsom and the California Legislature. Because federal law does not require that interest be charged on government-owned child support debt, California can end the collection and accrual of interest without federal action. This action will free up low-income parents' ability to support themselves and their children. This bill would not impact the child support debt or interest rate that is owed to the custodial parent.

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	April 3, 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?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

AB 366
Asm. Petrie-Norris, District 73, Democrat
County human services agencies: workforce development

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 366 by Assembly Member Petrie-Norris would provide funding and resources, as well as reduce barriers, to address significant workforce shortages in county human services programs.

Background/Analysis

County human service agencies are facing critical staffing shortages across all program areas. Competition for staff is fierce both within the county (across programs and services as well as the private sector) and across county lines. Rapid turnover of county staff undermines the quality of services provided to consumers of county programs, impedes progress for improving county practices, and potentially can result in fiscal sanctions in some situations (i.e. federal Child and Family Service Reviews in CWS). Last year, after strong advocacy by CWDA and our co-sponsor NASW, the State Budget provided \$30 million General Fund to expand slots in schools of social work to increase the pool of Master’s level social workers. While this is a necessary first step, there will be several years before the new MSW’s enter the workforce, and this aspect of staffing needs only accounts for part of the county-level staffing shortages.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

- For counties that use the state-administered Merit System for job applicants (not SF), require that Merit use alternate minimum qualifications for any county that has a 20% or greater vacancy rate.
- Establish a “Building Diversity in Human Service Workforce Program” as an opt-in grant program administered by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). This would be a two-year program and priority would be given to counties that demonstrate a commitment to building diversity in their programs by recruiting and supporting persons from underserved and/or over-represented communities. The grant program will help

fund county programs for three potential tracks: o High school to career track o College to career track to Community to career track. Estimated costs: \$30 million

- Require CDSS to work with counties and the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), to establish a Title IV-E stipend program in rural counties for community college students who have an interest in public child welfare work. This will allow the state and counties to leverage the 75 percent federal match for training leading to state or local agency employment, which is not limited to pursuit of a bachelor's or master's level education. Estimated costs: \$5 million.

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

\$35M

Support / Opposition

Support: County Welfare Directors Association (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	April 3, 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

AB 386
Asm. Nguyen, District 10, Democrat
California Right to Financial Privacy Act

Recommended Position

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

Summary

This bill would improve the capability of Adult Protective Services (APS) to fulfill its obligation to protect seniors and disabled adults from the growing threat of financial abuse.

Background/Analysis

County APS Departments are responsible for investigating alleged incidences of abuse of older and dependent adults, including financial abuse. This role is expanding with the population that APS serves, which has grown and changed significantly since the program’s inception. 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 be disabled, cognitively impaired, or facing housing instability. County APS programs struggle to address an evolving landscape of abuse and neglect, including an increase of financial abuse and scams targeting this growing population. As of 2021, California ranks first nationally in total monetary losses, and third in per-capita monetary losses, experienced by victims of elder financial abuse.¹

County APS investigators are granted access to certain financial records of an alleged victim under current law. However, a law enforcement agency, district attorney or special agent of the Department of Justice must first certify that a crime report has been filed before APS can access the information of a potential victim of abuse. This typically requires APS, once notified of alleged financial abuse from a mandated reporter, to file a police report prior to submitting a request to a bank or financial institution for access to an individual’s financial records

Challenge

The requirement to file a police report to access records that are necessary to substantiate reports of financial abuse is a barrier to APS in conducting an effective investigation. Even when

¹ 2021 DOJ Elder Fraud Report: <https://www.justice.gov/file/1523276/download>

APS has reasonable suspicion of abuse, a police report must first be filed to proceed further with the investigation. This requirement makes it more difficult to protect older and dependent adults in a timely manner. No comparable requirement exists for the other types of abuse APS is tasked with investigating.

County APS investigators experience further restrictions that impede their ability to protect victims. Once an APS investigator has been granted access, they are restricted to only financial records dating from a period of 30 days before and after the date of any alleged illegal activity (60 days total). Limiting access to such a narrow window of time makes it significantly harder for APS to identify normal spending habits of the alleged victim, which is necessary to identify abnormal and potentially illegal activity.

Additionally, APS is severely limited in the types of financial information that they can access. APS is excluded from accessing information that counties have identified as potentially critical to uncovering financial abuse and scams. This includes information related to newly issued cards, changes of addresses and information regarding trusts or Power of Attorney.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 386 is intended to address the challenges posed by these tight restrictions. This bill will assist APS in effectively investigating allegations of abuse by: 1) amending the law to allow an APS report of abuse to suffice as a certification that a crime report has been filed that involves financial abuse; 2) extending the period for which APS can request records to 90 days prior and 90 days following the alleged illegal act, and; 3) expanding the types of items APS can request from a bank or financial institution to include information regarding newly issued cards, changes of addresses and information regarding trusts or Power of Attorney.

The changes included in this bill will better ensure that APS is able to meet the needs of the growing population of older and dependent adults and uncover incidences of financial abuse. In better protecting victims from identity theft and abuse, this bill ultimately improves victims' privacy from those who would do them harm.

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

Support: County Welfare Directors Association (Sponsor) AARP California Alliance for Retired Americans California Elder Justice Coalition (CEJC) County of Riverside CSAC RCRC Sacramento; County of Urban Counties of California (UCC)

Opposition: California Credit Union League



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	April 3, 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

AB 605
Asm. Arambula, District 31, Democrat
CalFresh Fruit and Vegetable Supplemental Benefits Expansion
Program

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 605 (Arambula) would expand the number and geographic diversity of retailers offering fruit and vegetable supplemental benefits to CalFresh.

Background/Analysis

This February, the California Department of Social Services went live with the CalFresh Fruit and Vegetable EBT Pilot Program¹, which provides CalFresh households with up to \$60/month in additional food assistance when they buy California-grown fresh fruits and vegetables with their EBT cards. Because this program is integrated into the state’s EBT system, it is poised to scale at more retail locations and reach many more people quickly.

This comes at an important time: more than five million CalFresh participants are facing a hunger cliff – due to both high food inflation and a drop in their benefits because of the end of federal “emergency allotments.” Since March 2020, all CalFresh recipients have received the maximum CalFresh benefit available for their household size, regardless of other income (e.g. earnings, SSI, etc.). The policy also set a minimum monthly benefit amount of \$95 per month. Beginning in this month, individuals and families on CalFresh are no longer receiving this extra monthly payment; in addition, the minimum benefit level will return to \$23 per month.

As we shared in a memo to the Board, HSA estimates that approximately 70,000 CalFresh households — more than 96,000 San Franciscans — will lose a total \$11.5M per month. The average decrease in CalFresh will be \$160/month; San Francisco individuals and families on CalFresh will lose between \$95

¹ <https://www.cdss.ca.gov/Portals/13/Press%20Releases/2023/CDSS-News-release-California-Fruit-Veg-EBT-Pilot-Project.pdf>

and \$517 per month. The neighborhoods with the largest share of CalFresh recipients are the Tenderloin, Excelsior, Bayview Hunters Point, and Visitacion Valley.

This February, the California Department of Social Services went live with the CalFresh Fruit and Vegetable EBT Pilot Program², which provides CalFresh households with up to \$60/month in additional food assistance when they buy California-grown fresh fruits and vegetables with their EBT cards. Because this program is integrated into the state's EBT system, it is poised to scale at more retail locations and reach many more people quickly – and could help blunt some of the pain of the benefits cliff. However, the pilot is slated to end and run out of funds this December, without legislative and budgetary action.

In addition to helping reduce hunger, Fruit and Vegetable Supplemental Benefits also benefit California farmers who grow the vast majority of produce sold in grocery stores (and all the produce sold at certified California farmers' markets).

Challenge

Even before the pandemic and soaring food costs, one in four San Franciscans were at risk of hunger. The inflationary pressures and the ongoing fallout of the recession particularly among the lowest income residents has only exacerbated this crisis.

San Francisco residents are not alone. Californians with low income across the state can't make ends meet.

- As of early 2022, one of every ten adults in California reported that they struggled to consistently put enough food on their table.³ This very high rate of food insecurity exists even with the CalFresh program providing food assistance to between 4-5 million Californians.⁴
- According to a [recent statewide survey](#), three in four Californians with low or moderate income worried about running out of food in the past year. And three in five actually did run out of food.⁵
- Research demonstrates that current CalFresh benefits alone do not provide enough money for families to meet the USDA's nutrition and dietary guidelines for fruits and vegetables.⁶
- Federal SNAP emergency allotments have provided, in total, \$500 million dollars in food assistance each month to Californians. That translates into an average drop in CalFresh benefits of roughly \$200/month per household⁷.
- CalFresh households' purchasing patterns often don't reflect the foods they need, want, or find culturally appropriate. Shopping decisions are shaped mostly by high prices and limited access, which restricts their choices.⁸

² <https://www.cdss.ca.gov/Portals/13/Press%20Releases/2023/CDSS-News-release-California-Fruit-Veg-EBT-Pilot-Project.pdf>

³ US Census Bureau, Household Pulse Survey, "Food Scarcity - Week 41 (December 29, 2021 – January 10, 2022)": https://www.census.gov/data-tools/demo/hhp/#/?measures=FOODSCARCE&periodSelector=41&s_state=00006

⁴ CalFresh Data Dashboard, CalFresh Persons - Monthly Participation (as of Nov 2021): <https://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/data-portal/research-and-data/calfresh-data-dashboard>

⁵ Nourish California and Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3), 2021, available at <https://nourishca.org/event/food-hardship-hope-for-change/>

⁶ Mulik, Kranti et al., "The Affordability of MyPlate: An Analysis of SNAP Benefits and the Actual Cost of Eating According to the Dietary Guidelines", *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, Vol. 49, Issue 8 (September 2017), 623 – 631.

⁷ Kuang, Jeanne. "'No Light at the Other End': Impending Loss of Pandemic CalFresh Boosts Could Trigger Hunger Spike." *CalMatters*, February 9, 2023. <https://calmatters.org/california-divide/2023/02/calfresh-emergency-allotments-ending/>.

⁸ Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, "More Adequate SNAP Benefits Would Help Millions of Participants Better Afford Food," July 2021: <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/more-adequate-snap-benefits-would-help-millions-of-participants-better>

- Among Californians with low income, 29 percent report that they can only sometimes find affordable fruits and vegetables in their neighborhood and 3 percent report they never can.⁹

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

Expanding CalFresh Fruit and Vegetable Supplemental Benefits to be available to hundreds of thousands of households across the state will, in the short-term, help families afford the foods they need to stay healthy and help alleviate some of the economic strain they are facing with SNAP emergency allotments ending. In the long-term, it will position the program to become permanently available to CalFresh families throughout California. Research shows that existing, similar programs – including Double Up Food Bucks, Más Fresco, Market Match, and others – reduce hunger, improve health, and increase revenue for agricultural communities.¹⁰ It is a “win-win-win” that reduces hunger, improves public health, and boosts California’s agricultural economy.

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

There is an accompanying budget proposal to request a one-time allocation of \$93.75 million to be spent over 2 years. The funds would be used by the state to:

1. Expand the program to 1-2 large grocery chains with broad geographic reach in California.
2. Expand the program to additional smaller independently owned and operated grocery stores and chains.
3. Expand the program to additional farmers’ markets and other farm-direct sites.
4. Contract with one or more firms to develop at least two technology solutions to make it easier for farmers markets and corner stores to offer supplemental benefits.

96% of the funds requested in this proposal will go directly into the pockets of CalFresh participants to buy food.

Support / Opposition

Nourish California and SPUR (sponsoring); child advocacy groups like Children NOW and Children’s Defense Fund are likely to support.

⁹ UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, 2015 California Health Interview Survey:

<http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/Pages/default.aspx>. Low-income defined as households up to 200% of the federal poverty level.

¹⁰ SPUR, *The Case for Expanding Fruit and Vegetable Supplemental Benefits*, 2022:

<https://www.spur.org/sites/default/files/Policy%20brief%20fruit%20veg%20supplemental%20benefits%202-13-22.pdf>



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	SFMTA
Contact Name	Katie Angotti
Contact Email and Phone Number	Kathryn.angotti@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Katie Angotti
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 361
Asm. Ward, District 78, Democrat
Vehicles: video imaging of bicycle lane parking violations

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill authorizes a local agency to use automated forward-facing parking control devices on city owned enforcement vehicles to cite vehicles parked in a bike lane.

Background/Analysis

From 2017 through 2021 there have been approximately 2,000 bicycle collisions involving vehicles in San Francisco and between 1 and 3 lives lost each year over that same period.

SFMTA’s vision is to make bicycling a part of everyday life and underpinning this vision are four key goals:

1. Improve the safety and connectivity of San Francisco’s Bike Network
2. Make bicycling a more convenient transportation option through amenities like better bike parking and an expanded bike sharing system
3. Use outreach and education to increase bicycle ridership, especially in underserved populations
4. Plan and deliver projects that make bicycling, and other non-private auto modes, the preferred way of getting around

Bike lanes provide a dedicated space for cyclists that make cyclists feel safe. As of May 2022, San Francisco installed 463.7 miles of bike lanes and 121 protected miles. While counted bike volumes dropped substantially in 2020 and 2021 due to COVID, counted bike volumes in 2022 are the highest since 2019.

SFMTA invests significant resources to plan and implement bike lanes in order to increase cyclist safety. When a motorist parks in the bike lane, it undermines this work and creates a dangerous environment for cyclists, causing them to swerve into the traffic lane.

Challenge

Currently, the only tool cities have to discourage drivers from stopping in bike lanes are tickets issued by our parking control officers. In order for parking control officers to issue a ticket, they must witness the

offense, approach the vehicle in violation to record the vehicle's VIN number and affix the citation onto the vehicle.

There are many instances of parking in bike lanes in San Francisco on any given day and the SFMTA has a limited number of parking control officers. Issuing this kind of ticket takes time due the requirement for the ticket to include the violating vehicle's VIN and to attach it to the vehicle. This limits the parking control officer's ability to issue more citations. Further, the driver of the vehicle in violation may be waiting in the parked car and drive away if they see a parking control officer's vehicle. Finally, there are instances of parking control officers being assaulted while issuing a ticket.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill would authorize cities to use existing technology to make it easier and safer to enforce parking in bike lane violations. Similar to the forward-facing cameras that SFMTA uses to enforce violations of stopping in a transit only lane, this bill would allow cities to install forward-facing cameras onto city owned enforcement vehicles to capture violations of parking in bike lanes. This bill would allow cities to review those images and send a violation in the mail.

By removing the requirement to affix the ticket on the vehicle and record the vehicle VIN number, SFMTA parking control officers would be able to issue more tickets for parking in a bike lane which would disincentivize this dangerous driving behavior. In addition, SFMTA's parking control officers would be less exposed to potential assaults since they can remain in their vehicle when recording a violation.

The bill authorizes a pilot program until Jan 1, 2030. The devices would only capture parking violations and not capture images of other streets users. The bill requires the local agency to include in their program options to reduce or waive the payment of a parking penalty for indigent persons. Only warning notices can be issued for the first 60 days of the program and the agency must make a public announcement and provide the public with information about the program before it begins. A designated employee of the local agency must review the video images to determine whether a parking violation occurred. Tickets are civil penalties and the bill provides for a process to contest the ticket. For privacy purposes, the bill limits the public's right of access to the images captured by an automated parking control device installed on city-owned or district-owned parking enforcement vehicles.

Local agencies that implement such a program must provide to the transportation, privacy, and judiciary committees of the Legislature an evaluation report of the enforcement system's effectiveness, impact on privacy, impact on traffic outcomes, cost to implement, change in citations issued, and generation of revenue, no later than December 31, 2029.

Departments Impacted & Why

SFMTA would be the only department impacted.

Fiscal Impact

This bill does not require local agencies to do anything. However, if passed and SFMTA chooses to install cameras for bike lane enforcement, the SFMTA would pay for the camera equipment and processing fees.

Support / Opposition

No registered support or opposition



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	SFMTA & Dept. on the Status of Women
Contact Name	Katie Angotti
Contact Email and Phone Number	Kathryn.angotti@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Katie Angotti
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 434
Sen. Min, District 37, Democrat
Transit operators: street harassment survey

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill requires the top ten public transit operators, including the SFMTA, upon appropriation of funds by the Legislature to collect and publish survey data and conduct outreach activities for the purpose of informing their efforts to improve the safety of riders and reduce street harassment on public transit. The bill requires transit operators, by December 31, 2024, to publish the survey data on their websites and inform the Governor and the Legislature.

Background/Analysis

Last year, the Legislature approved SB 1161 (Min, Chapter 318, Statutes of 2022), which requires the Mineta Transportation Institute (MTI) to develop a standard survey for transit operators to use to gather data related to street harassment. The survey includes specific demographic information and information regarding a riders' experiences with safety while waiting at transit stops and riding the transit system. SB 434 takes the next step by requiring the top 10 transit operators in the state, by December 31, 2024, to gather and publish data about riders and their experiences with street harassment on their systems.

As part of the survey process, operators would be required to conduct outreach activities with specific subpopulations of riders who are traditionally underrepresented, such as women, non-English speakers, LGBTQ+, and people with disabilities.

Transit operators would be able to utilize the survey developed by MTI, add additional questions or use their own survey. This bill is very much in line with work that is currently underway by the SFMTA's Safety Equity Initiative. The aim of the Safety Equity Initiative is to reduce and eventually eliminate gender-based harassment and violence on SFMTA's Muni lines. As part of the initiative, the SFMTA has expanded the ways in which people can report gender-based harassment incidents to help us understand the scope of the problem better, identify possible improvements and track progress.

Additionally, if a transit operator has collected the data or conducted the outreach activities required by the bill in the last five years, they are deemed to have met the requirements of the bill. This takes into account the work of systems like SFMTA. Finally, transit operators would be required to publish on their website all survey data collected, except any personally identifiable data. They must also inform the Governor and the Legislature when the data is published.

Challenge

California's public transit systems provide a crucial service to local communities. Unfortunately, studies show that many women (trans and cisgender) and other vulnerable communities experience harassment while using these services. Women and other vulnerable communities are often unable to access public transit safely due to street harassment, which can include unwanted sexual and racialized comments and slurs, whistling, leering, and other intimidating actions. According to a 2019 statewide study by the University of California San Diego Center on Gender Equity and Health, 77 percent of women experience sexual harassment in a public space, including 29 percent on mass transit.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 434 seeks to increase safety for public transit riders by requiring the 10 largest transit providers to collect and publish survey data on demographic information and information regarding a riders' experiences with safety while waiting at transit stops and riding the transit system, and conduct outreach activities with subpopulations of riders who are underrepresented in surveys and impacted by street harassment. The bill requires transit operators, by December 31, 2024, to publish the survey data on their websites and inform the Governor and the Legislature.

Departments Impacted & Why

SFMTA would be the only department impacted.

Fiscal Impact

Minimal impact as this work is already underway at the SFMTA.

Support / Opposition

NO OPPOSITION

SUPPORT

Stop AAPI Hate (Sponsor)
AAPI Equity Alliance
ACLU California Action
African Advocacy Network
Alliance for Girls
Apex Express
API Council of San Francisco
API Forward Movement
Asian American Pacific Islander Coalition of The North Bay
Asian Americans in Action
Asian Law Alliance
Asian Pacific American Dispute Resolution Center (APADRC)
Asian Pacific American Women Lawyers Alliance (APAWLA)
Asian Pacific Community Fund
Asian Youth Center

Aypal: Building API Community Power
CAIR California
California Association of Human Relations Organizations
California Commission on Asian and Pacific Islander American Affairs
Cambodia Town INC.
Center for Asian Americans in Action
Center for Asian Americans United for Self Empowerment (CAUSE)
Center for Leadership, Equity, and Research (CLEAR)
Chinese Culture Center of San Francisco
Chinese for Affirmative Action
Chinese Progressive Association
City & County of San Francisco Office of Sexual Harassment and Assault, Response and Prevention

Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety
Contigo Communications
Educating Marissa, LLC
Equal Justice Society
Ethnic Media Services
Food Empowerment Project
Food for People
Heart of Los Angeles (HOLA)
Hmong Innovating Politics
Inland Empire Immigrant Youth Collective
Japantown Task Force, INC. (San Francisco)
Justice in Aging
Korean American Center
Korean American Coalition - Los Angeles
Korean American Federation of Los Angeles
Korean Community Center of The East Bay
Korean Community Services
LA Raza Community Resource Center
Los Angeles County Metropolitan
Transportation Authority
Macla/movimiento De Arte Y Cultura Latino
Americana
Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing
Project
National Pacific Islander Education Network
Nicos Chinese Health Coalition
North East Medical Services (NEMS)
Oakland Lacrosse Club
Oca - Sacramento Chapter
Orange County Asian and Pacific Islander
Community Alliance, INC. (OCAPICA)
Pacific Asian Counseling Services
People Organizing to Demand
Environmental & Economic Rights
San Francisco Senior and Disability Action
San Francisco Transit Riders
Self-help for The Elderly
Silicon Valley Asian Pacific American
Democratic Club
Soma Pilipinas - Sf Filipino Cultural Heritage
District
South Asian Network
Southeast Asian Community Center
Southeast Asian Development Center
Streets for All
Thai Community Development Center
The Betti Ono Foundation
The Unity Council
The Women's Building
Tranzito
University of California Student Association

Women's Foundation of California
Wu Yee Children's Services
Youth Against Hate
YWCA Berkeley/Oakland



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	4/3/2023
Submitting Department	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Contact Name	Scott Ammon
Contact Email and Phone Number	sammon@sfgwater.org ; 415-407-5208
SLC Meeting Presenter	Scott Ammon
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 83

Sen. Wiener, District 11, Democrat

Public utilities: electrical distribution grid: interconnection

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would require electrical corporations to interconnect development projects to the electrical distribution grid within eight weeks of a project receiving a "Green Tag" from a governmental agency. Issuance of a Green Tag would confirm that all prerequisite work and approvals necessary for interconnection of a development project to the grid have been completed and received by the project applicant. The bill would require electrical corporations to compensate project applicants in the event that the electrical corporation fails to interconnect the project to the grid within the eight week timeline.

The bill would also require electrical corporations to provide an annual report to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on the number of interconnection applications received within the previous 12 months and the time period for interconnecting these projects to the grid.

The SFPUC recommends a support position for SB 83.

Background/Analysis

The investor-owned utilities' (IOUs) conduct distribution grid planning with considerations for customer load interconnections in the context of general rate cases, where distribution investments for traditional maintenance, service area expansion, reliability, resiliency, and safety are proposed by the IOUs and authorized by the CPUC. The IOUs' distribution grid planning to support distributed energy resource expansion occurs in the High Distributed Energy Resources (DER) Future Grid proceeding, R.21-06-017.

The existing policy concerning electric grid upgrades due to increased new and permanent customer load is set forth in two Electric Tariff Rules – Rule 15 (Distribution Line Extensions) and Rule 16 (Service Line Extensions). Tariff Rule 15 generally pertains to grid equipment used by multiple customers (e.g. a transformer serving multiple homes). Rule 16 generally pertains to network equipment used by only one customer. Currently, there is no public interconnection queue for applications under the Wholesale Access Distribution Tariff (WDT), Rule 15, and Rule 16, nor are the IOUs held to any timelines to interconnect these customers.

Challenge

Retail and wholesale customers have experienced long service extension interconnection delays, arbitrary requests for additional and/or unnecessary information, and/or increased project costs due to equipment upgrades dictated by IOUs. Load interconnection delays continue to have significant repercussions for California residents and businesses. For example, affordable housing, medical facilities, and public projects have been especially vulnerable to load interconnection delays.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The SFPUC recommends a support position for SB 83.

Departments Impacted & Why

This bill would help mitigate delays experienced by City projects attempting to interconnect to PG&E's electrical distribution grid in San Francisco. The SFPUC operates San Francisco's publicly-owned utility for electric service, Hetch Hetchy Power. Wholesale customers with applications to receive electric service from Hetch Hetchy Power must rely on PG&E's wholesale transmission and distribution services per PG&E's tariffs, which are regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Since FERC has no set requirements for its regulated entities to make interconnection queues public, the SFPUC has little visibility as to where its new customers' applications stand in PG&E's interconnection queue. PG&E also lacks set timelines for key portions of the interconnection process which can lead to significant or indefinite delays. Since October 2018, the SFPUC has provided quarterly reports to the Board of Supervisors which have identified 136 projects, including a combined 519 units of affordable housing, that have experienced delays.

Fiscal Impact

The total cost impact (i.e. additional project costs and loss of revenue to the City of San Francisco) of the interconnection delays reported to the Board of Supervisors since October 2018 is over \$28 million.¹

Support / Opposition

N/A- Bill analysis is currently pending.

¹ San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's Quarterly Report to the Board of Supervisors on the Status of Applications to PG&E for Electric Service. January 13, 2023. p.3.
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5db7630b5aa4a623608e05fa/t/63c6fc576e9ca8090e0e089c/1673985112955/Jan+2023+Quarterly+Report.pdf>



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 29, 2023
Submitting Department	SFPUC
Contact Name	Rebecca Peacock
Contact Email and Phone Number	rpeacock@sfwater.org / 415-757-8365
SLC Meeting Presenter	Rebecca Peacock
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 778

Sen. Ochoa Bogh, District 23, Republican Excavations: subsurface installations

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OPPOSE unless AMENDED

Summary

This bill would remove the exemption for nonpressurized sewer lines and storm drains from California’s Dig Safe Law. It also makes other changes, such as revising requirements around notification of operators, use of vacuum equipment, and processes regarding discrepancies in excavation area delineation.

The SFPUC recommends an oppose unless amended position for SB 778.

Background/Analysis

The Dig Safe Law of 2016 regulates excavations around underground infrastructure, including pipelines, conduits, ducts, wires, and other structures (except nonpressurized sewer lines and storm drains). Under this law, excavators must comply with requirements to properly mark the area to be excavated (delineation) and notify appropriate regional notification centers and operators of subsurface installations.

The SFPUC’s Wastewater Enterprise currently complies with this law by marking its pressurized sewage pipelines, structures, electrical conduits and ductbanks, and chemical and hydraulic lines related to the sewer systems.

Challenge

Our primary concern with the bill is the removal of the exemption for nonpressurized lines and storm drains. The current practice of not marking nonpressurized lines has not caused any significant issues for the SFPUC or public safety. These lines are often buried much deeper than other utilities and therefore are less likely to be struck. San Francisco has approximately 2,000 miles of sewer mains and laterals, and the potential benefit of marking these lines does not outweigh the additional cost this would impose on our ratepayers due to the need to hire multiple new staff to perform this marking.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The SFPUC recommends an oppose position unless the exemption for nonpressurized sewer lines and storm drains in Government Code Section 4216(s) is reinstated.

Departments Impacted & Why

The SFPUC's Wastewater Enterprise will be significantly impacted by the requirement to mark nonpressurized sewer lines, laterals, and storm drain lines.

Any other City agencies that are utility owners or representatives that marks subsurface installations will be affected by other changes to this legislation. This may include the Department of Public Works and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. We have consulted both of these departments and they do not have concerns with this proposed Oppose Unless Amended position.

Fiscal Impact

If SB 778 becomes law, the SFPUC will need to hire more full-time employees (FTE) to fulfill this work. At least five FTEs would need to be created, based on the number of FTEs who do this work for our Water Enterprise. If the bill is interpreted in a way that requires us to mark lateral sewers (which are owned by the property owner), we would likely need at least double this amount for 10 FTEs total.

Support / Opposition

Support

- None on record yet.

Opposition

- None on record yet.



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	Environment Department
Contact Name	Pauli Ojea
Contact Email and Phone Number	Pauli.Ojea@sfgov.org ; (415) 355-5005
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 X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 496
Asm. Friedman, District 44, Democrat
Cosmetic safety

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill prohibits the sale in California of cosmetic products containing any one of 26 carcinogens, reproductive toxins, and endocrine disruptors beginning January 1, 2025.

Background/Analysis

Cosmetics sold in California and the United States are largely unregulated. Notwithstanding California’s recent prohibition of 13 chemicals, few ingredients are restricted from use in cosmetics, and regulators have limited authority to guarantee products’ safety.

While the Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938 bans the sale of harmful cosmetics, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) does not conduct safety testing or review products to ensure that cosmetics are safe before going out to market. Instead, federal law relies on manufactures to verify their products’ safety and allows the FDA to recall products found to pose serious health risks to consumers. Congress recently granted the FDA the authority to review company safety records under limited circumstances but did not direct the FDA to review chemicals of concern.

Under California law, the Sherman Act classifies cosmetics containing poisonous or toxic substances as misbranded, prohibiting them from sale in our state. The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) oversees the Sherman Act’s misbranded cosmetics ban but has not developed regulation to enforce it.

The Safe Cosmetics Program, which is also run by CDPH, requires cosmetics manufacturers to report the presence of any Prop. 65-listed chemical – known to cause cancer, birth defects or reproductive harm – in a cosmetic product sold in California. Based on these reports, 613 cosmetics companies in California have sold over 75,000 beauty and personal care products containing chemicals linked to cancers, birth defects, or reproductive harm since 2009 alone. Because cosmetics are regularly washed off after use, their environmental risks are particularly alarming.

More than 80 nations have banned or restricted the use of hundreds of cosmetic ingredients. The European Union and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations have prohibited or greatly

restricted the use of almost 1,400 chemicals in cosmetics. Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, and Japan have similarly banned or restricted numerous chemicals that remain common in American cosmetics. Major retailers such as Credo Beauty, CVS, Rite Aid, and Target have developed their own lists of chemicals prohibited in their cosmetic products.

Challenge

Due to lack of regulation and strong government oversight, consumers in California cannot easily discern whether their cosmetics and personal care products are free of toxic ingredients. Workers in hair and nail salons are particularly vulnerable because they interact with these chemicals throughout their workday. San Franciscans deserve greater protections against exposure to harmful chemicals in the products they rely on every day.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 496 prohibits the sale in California of cosmetic products containing any one of 26 highly toxic chemicals, all of which the European Union has banned from use in cosmetics sold in its member nations.

Departments Impacted & Why

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) has a strong interest in protecting water quality. Personal care products are washed off and wind up in wastewater. The Environment Department has informed SFPUC of its intent to support this bill.

Fiscal Impact

This bill is not expected to have a fiscal impact on the City.

Support/Opposition

Supported by:

- California Health Coalition Advocacy CALPIRG
- California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative
- California Nurses for Environmental Health and Justice
- California Product Stewardship Council
- Environmental Working Group
- Friends of the Earth
- Green Science Policy Institute
- Grove Collaborative
- Keep a Breast Foundation
- Long Beach Environmental Alliance
- Moms Across America
- National Association of Environmental Medicine (NAEM)
- National Stewardship Action Council Non-toxic Neighborhoods

- Osea Skincare
- Olita
- Poison Free Malibu
- Prima
- Queers for Climate
- Rooted in Resistance
- San Francisco Bay Keeper
- Save our Shores
- Seventh Generation
- SoCal 350 Climate Action
- Sonoma Safe Agriculture Safe Schools
- Women's Voices for the Earth

Opposed by:

- Fragrance Creators Association
- Fragrance Science & Advocacy Council



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	Environment Department
Contact Name	Pauli Ojea; Jack Macy
Contact Email and Phone Number	Pauli.Ojea@sfgov.org ; (415) 355-5005 Jack.Macy@sfgov.org ; (415) 355-3751
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 X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 1290
Asm. Rivas, District 43, Democrat
Eliminating Problematic Plastics Act

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would prohibit in California the manufacture, sale, or distribution of opaque or pigmented polyethylene terephthalate bottles, and plastic packaging containing certain chemicals, pigments, or additives beginning January 1, 2026.

Background/Analysis

Certain plastic packaging materials and additives can make plastic difficult to recycle and pose risks to human and environmental health. These materials and additives include per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), polyvinyl chloride (PVC), polyvinylidene chloride (PVDC), oxo-degradable/oxo-biodegradable additives, polyethylene terephthalate glycol (PETG), and certain pigments.

The Plastic Pollution Prevention and Packaging Producer Responsibility Act, which affects single-use packaging and plastic food service ware, requires producers to reduce their amount covered plastic material. The law also requires producers to ensure that covered material offered for sale or distribution in California is recyclable or compostable by 2032. Existing California law prohibits the use of PFAS in food packaging and requires manufacturers to use the least toxic alternative when replacing regulated PFAS in food packaging.

Challenge

San Francisco aims to reduce waste generation by 15% and disposal to landfill by 50% by 2030 (from a 2015 baseline). San Francisco has long implemented leading programs to collect and recycle as much plastics as possible. However, plastics that are difficult or impossible to recycle continue to proliferate. In recent years, recycling markets have become increasingly restrictive with respect to plastics containing certain chemicals and additives, many of which are harmful to human health throughout their lifecycle.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill would phase out the use of select chemicals, pigments, and additives in plastic beginning in 2026.

Departments Impacted & Why

SF Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) has a strong interest in protecting water quality from pollutants such as PFAS and microplastics. The Environment Department has informed SFPUC its intent to support AB 1290.

Fiscal Impact

This bill is not expected to have a fiscal impact on the city.

Support/Opposition

Supported by:

- 5 Gyres Institute
- Azul
- Bay Area Youth Lobbying Initiative
- Breast Cancer Prevention Partners (Sponsor)
- California Environmental Voters
- California Product Stewardship Council
- Californians Against Waste (Sponsor)
- Clean Water Action (Sponsor)
- Dr. Bronner's
- Environmental Working Group
- FracTracker Alliance
- Friends of the Earth
- Greenpeace US
- Green Science Policy Institute
- Grove Collaborative
- The Last Plastic Straw
- Natural Resources Defense Council (Sponsor)
- Pacific Environment
- Plastic Free Future
- Plastic Pollution Coalition
- Save Our Shores
- Surfrider Foundation



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	Environment Department
Contact Name	Sylvan Ludewigt
Contact Email and Phone Number	Sylvan.ludewigt@sfgov.org ; (415) 355-3775
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 X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 253
Sen. Wiener, District 11, Democrat
Corporate Climate Data Accountability Act

Recommended Position

SPONSOR X SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would require large companies doing business in California to publicly disclose their Scope 1, 2, and 3 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. This bill will hold businesses accountable for the entire lifecycle of their operational impacts and contributions to climate change.

Background/Analysis

SB 253 would require covered companies to submit annual GHG emissions inventory reports to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), which the 2006 California Global Warming Solutions Act tasks with the regulation, verification, and monitoring of statewide greenhouse gas emissions. CARB will publish the information online and work with the University of California to analyze and compare that information to the state’s climate and emissions reduction goals.

Covered companies include American privately held or publicly traded corporations, limited liability companies, and partnerships doing business in California with annual revenues of \$1 billion dollars or more. An estimated 5,000 companies would be required report their annual scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions. Reporting requirements would not begin until 2026, which would allow covered companies time to develop internal capacity, staffing, and data collection practices needed to meet these requirements. Reporting standards would closely follow the [GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard](#) and [the GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain Standard](#).

SB 253 was introduced as one of three bills that making up the Climate Accountability Package, which also includes SB 252 (the Fossil Fuel Divestment Act) and SB 261 (the Climate-Related Financial Risk Act). (The San Francisco Board of Supervisors previously adopted a resolution supporting SB 252 in February).

Challenge

While there has been some success in voluntary emissions reporting by Fortune 500 companies, one area of the proposed framework has been largely unreported: Also known as downstream emissions, Scope 3 emissions do not derive from a company’s owned or controlled assets, but rather from their supply and value chains. According to analyses from UC Berkeley’s Cool Climate Network and similar groups, Scope 3 emissions comprise the single largest category of a company’s emissions. When

identified, they can provide valuable insight into a company or industry's climate impacts. Without this information, it is impossible to accurately discern a company's total carbon footprint. This bill addresses this gap by requiring reporting on Scope 3 emissions in addition to Scope 1 (direct operational emissions) and Scope 2 (emissions from energy purchases).

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The Climate Corporate Data Accountability Act would strengthen and expand the state's emissions reduction targets developed in the 2006 California Global Warming Solutions Act by integrating large businesses and corporations directly into the state's GHG emissions inventory and planning efforts. Additionally, this bill aligns with upcoming SEC reporting requirements for publicly traded companies by expanding reporting requirements to privately held companies, effectively tripling the number of covered companies.

Departments Impacted & Why

This legislation is not expected to impact other City departments.

Fiscal Impact

This legislation is not expected to have a fiscal impact on the City.

Support/Opposition

Supported by:

- Asian Pacific Environmental Network
- Avocado Green Brands
- BC3
- California Environmental Voters (Sponsor)
- Carbon Accountable (Sponsor)
- CERES (Sponsor)
- The Climate Center
- Dignity Health
- Earthjustice
- Environmental Defense Fund
- Environmental Working Group
- Everlane
- Greenlining Institute (Sponsor)
- Grove Collaborative
- IKEA USA
- Natural Resources Defense Council
- Patagonia
- Sierra Nevada Brewing
- Sunrise Movement (Sponsor)

Opposed by:

- Local California chambers of commerce
- Major business and trade associations
- Fossil fuel trade associations



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	Environment Department
Contact Name	Sylvan Ludewigt
Contact Email and Phone Number	Sylvan.ludewigt@sfgov.org ; (415) 355-3775
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 X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 261
Sen. Stern, District 27, Democrat
Climate-Related Risk Disclosure Act

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would require large companies doing business in California to publicly report their climate-related financial risk. This bill would ensure that financial institutions and businesses are taking the necessary steps to mitigate and adapt to global climate impacts.

Background/Analysis

This bill would cover American corporations, limited liability companies, and partnerships doing business in California, including privately held or publicly traded corporations, with annual revenues greater than \$500 million. This bill would require companies to report on their climate-related financial risk. Companies in the insurance industry would be exempted from this law. The reporting framework would follow widely used and accepted standards developed by the International Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). In addition, these companies would also be required to develop and implement measures to reduce, mitigate, or adapt to the risks identified through the reporting process.

All covered companies would be required to publish their climate-related risk disclosures online and submit a copy to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), which the 2006 California Global Warming Solutions Act tasks with the regulation, verification, and monitoring of statewide greenhouse gas emissions. An advisory group will be formed to analyze the reported information and study the issues financial institutions and businesses face in adapting to climate change. The first of these reports would be due by December 31, 2024.

SB 261 was introduced as one of three bills making up the Climate Accountability Package, which also includes SB 252 (the Fossil Fuel Divestment Act) and SB 253 (the Climate Corporate Accountability Act). (The San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution supporting SB 252 in February.)

Challenge

Climate change presents serious risks to the economic health of the entire state, including companies from all industry sectors. These risks include supply chain disruptions, negative impacts on employee health and safety, damage and loss of capital and financial investments, and reduced consumer demand. Because of these threats, California requires a system that promotes risk preparedness and supports

accountability, measurement, and action. Standardized, reliable, and mandatory climate risk disclosures will promote stability and economic resilience.

San Francisco is a prominent business and financial hub with a long history of attracting business headquarters and regional offices. Under this bill, numerous companies with offices in San Francisco will be required to disclose their financial risk. This information will alert local leaders and the public to the challenges that climate change presents and inform locally tailored solutions to attract more business and sustain a robust economy.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The Climate Corporate Data Accountability Act would build upon the 2006 California Global Warming Solutions Act by addressing risks specific to businesses and the economy at large. Additionally, this bill aligns with upcoming SEC reporting requirements for publicly traded companies by expanding reporting requirements to privately held companies, which comprise nearly 80% of the businesses covered by this bill. SB 261 will help companies, lawmakers, and the public understand, prepare for, and take action to protect the economy from short- and long-term climate risks.

Departments Impacted & Why

This legislation is not expected to impact other City departments.

Fiscal Impact

This legislation is not expected to have a fiscal impact on the City.

Support/Opposition

Supported by:

- Alter Eco
- Avocado Green Brands
- CalPIRG
- CERES (Sponsor)
- DSM North America
- Environmental Defense Fund
- Grove Collaborative
- Sierra Nevada Brewing.
- Natural Resources Defense Council
- Sierra Club California
- Third ACT

Opposed by:

- Local California chambers of commerce, major business and trade associations, and fossil fuel trade associations.



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	Environment Department
Contact Name	Sylvan Ludewigt
Contact Email and Phone Number	Sylvan.ludewigt@sfgov.org ; (415) 355-3775
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 X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 511 Sen. Blakespear, District 38, Democrat Greenhouse gas emissions inventories

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

The bill would instruct the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to publish greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory data for municipalities on a publicly accessible database to help simplify climate action planning for municipalities in California. This legislation would help shift municipal resources away from time-consuming GHG accounting activities and toward impactful, consistent, and standardized implementation of climate programs.

Background/Analysis

GHG inventories are important and informative analyses that quantify emissions from a given entity, in this case local governments. These inventories help communities develop GHG emissions benchmarks, monitor progress, and allow analysis of emissions trends over time. In 2006, California passed the landmark Global Warming Solutions Act, which mandated a statewide GHG emissions reduction of 15% by 2020. In 2016 the legislature passed SB 32, which mandated a target of 40% GHG emissions reductions by 2030 (from a 1990 baseline).

Challenge

San Francisco has been at the forefront of climate action planning and GHG emissions reporting for almost 20 years. San Francisco adopted its first Climate Action Plan in 2004, followed by significant updates in 2012 and 2021, and calculated its first major, communitywide GHG inventory in 2012. In addition, San Francisco has tracked department-level GHG inventories since 2008. However, many municipalities in California lack the resources to adopt climate actions or GHG inventories.

Staffing shortages, high turnover, and the lack of adequate and necessary data can thwart municipalities' attempts to develop such systems. Data accessibility is particularly critical to the success of climate programs in drafting and implementing strong and reliable GHG emissions inventories.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 511 would require CARB to develop and share GHG inventories and data with municipalities beginning in 2025. This bill would benefit the state and the climate movement because it eases the burden of preparing GHG inventories for municipalities. It would create a standardized and centralized repository, including emissions data, calculation tools, and other best practices. SB 511 is a critical tool for

policymakers and the public to understand the state’s progress in meeting its climate commitments. It also decreases the outsized burden that small communities face when developing climate action plans.

Departments Impacted & Why

San Francisco Environment Department is responsible for preparing the communitywide GHG inventory for the City and County of San Francisco. Many other departments, including SFPUC, SFMTA, SFCTA, contribute data to this effort. The methodology proposed by SB 511 mirrors the methodology currently used to conduct San Francisco’s annual communitywide GHG inventory ([ICLEI U.S. Community Protocol for Accounting and Reporting of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Version 1.2](#)).

Fiscal Impact

SB 511 is expected to save San Francisco Environment Department funding that could be reallocated toward other goals, including decarbonization in environmental justice communities and other programs developed under the 2021 Climate Action Plan.

Support/Opposition

Supported by:

- Civic Well (Sponsor)
- Contra Costa County (Sponsor)

Opposed by:

- None known at this time.



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	Environment Department
Contact Name	Freddy Coronado
Contact Email and Phone Number	freddy.coronado@sfgov.org ; (415) 355-5017
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 X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 707
Sen. Newman, District 29, Democrat
Responsible Textile Recovery Act of 2023

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 707 creates a statewide textile repair and recycling extended producer responsibility program to reduce the increasing volume of unusable textiles in landfills.

Background/Analysis

SB 707 would require producers of textiles and textile articles to design and fund an extended producer responsibility program to collect, repair, and recycle these items. The program would use California’s network of thrift and secondhand businesses to collect unwanted textiles for sorting and recycling, with textiles that can be reused or repaired being sorted for those purposes. The bill would have strong oversight by state regulators and a robust education and outreach requirement to ensure that consumers know how to access the program.

Reducing textile waste is important to San Francisco, which has two zero waste climate action commitments to reduce disposal to landfill by 50% by 2023 and two to reduce waste generation by 15% by 2030. Household-generated textile waste is among the fastest-growing material waste streams in our city and in California. San Francisco alone sends nearly 20,000 tons of textiles to landfill annually. To meet our zero waste climate commitments, we must recover textiles from our landfill stream.

Challenge

Despite our attempts to identify recycling markets since 2017, there are still no widespread and viable textile recycling markets available for California jurisdictions. In addition, our donation centers are overflowing with unusable textiles as residents struggle to find ways to properly dispose of clothing, fabrics, and bedding. In one year alone, we received over 40 inquiries from community members regarding how to donate, recycle, repair, or dispose of textiles.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This policy would reduce the number of textiles San Francisco sends to landfill, expand access to textile recycling and repair markets, and alleviate costs for donation centers as the public’s main way of ridding of their textiles.

Departments Impacted & Why

No departments are affected by this mandate. The Environment Department may need to report to CalRecycle if legislation passes.

Fiscal Impact

The fiscal impact of this bill in San Francisco is unknown. However, this bill would reduce the number of textiles going to landfill, therefore reducing disposal costs.

Support/Opposition

Supported by:

- 5 Gyres Institute
- Ambercycle
- Aquafil Carpet Recycling
- California Environmental Voters
- California Product Stewardship Council
- California Resource Recovery Association
- Californians Against Waste
- CALPIRG, California Public Interest Research Group
- Castro Valley Sanitary District
- Cbu Productions
- Changing Markets Foundation
- Circ, Inc.
- Cirtex
- City of Roseville
- City of San Jose
- Coare
- County of Santa Clara
- Environmental Working Group
- Fashion Revolution USA
- Fibershed
- Friends Committee on Legislation of California
- Heal the Bay
- Materevolve
- National Stewardship Action Council
- Northern California Recycling Association
- Plastic Pollution Coalition
- Product Stewardship Institute
- R3 Consulting Group, Inc.
- Ravel
- Repeat Reuse, Inc.
- Republic Services, Inc.
- Santa Clara County Recycling and Waste Reduction Commission
- Scullyspark
- Sea Hugger
- Sierra Club
- Sortile
- South Bayside Waste Management Authority (SBWMA)/Rethinkwaste
- Sustainable Works
- Upcycle It Now
- Zero Waste Company
- Zero Waste Sonoma



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	4/3/23
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 244

Asm. Wilson, District 11, Democrat

Specialized Inclusivity Training for Child Care Staff Grant Program

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would establish the Specialized Inclusivity Training for Child Care Staff Grant Program to fund staff training on including children with disabilities and improve access to child care for children with disabilities in California.

Background/Analysis

Decades of research have established that inclusive child care programs that serve children with and without exceptional needs are higher quality and have better outcomes for all children. The quality of practices in inclusive classrooms is highly dependent on professional development. Training on inclusion has a large impact on the overall program and has shown positive outcomes. Staff with training are more comfortable and confident providing accommodations and have more positive thoughts about inclusion. When early educators are trained to include children with and without exceptional needs, organizations are more likely to openly welcome children with varying abilities. Inclusion-specific education is the biggest factor in predicting whether programs are inclusive. If the director, provider, or teacher has some exceptional needs/inclusion related training, the program is more likely to have children with exceptional needs enrolled.

Challenge

According to the most recent data from the National Survey on Children’s Health, 1 in 5 children have a mental, emotional, developmental, or behavioral disorder. Existing law requires the State Department of Social Services to ensure that eligible children with exceptional needs are given equal access to child care and development programs. A child with exceptional needs must never be turned away from an early education/preschool center or Family Child Care program based on assumptions about the severity of the needs or how much assistance and/or accommodations they may need. Despite legal obligations, parents of children with exceptional needs are more likely to have difficulty with child care arrangements. Early education programs are often hesitant to include children with exceptional needs because they feel inadequate to meet the child’s needs. Special needs knowledge, awareness, and skills should be components of ongoing professional development provided within child care and

development programs. The reality is that adults working with children are often not given the information or tools to implement inclusion effectively. The pandemic has added to the struggle, with staffing shortages placing additional stress on an already overwhelmed system.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Establishing the Specialized Inclusivity Training for Child Care Staff Grant Program to fund staff training on including children with disabilities and improve access to child care for children with disabilities in California.

Departments Impacted & Why

Department of Early Childhood (DEC): DEC has heard from San Francisco providers about the need for more training, professional development and support regarding including children with exceptional needs in their centers and FCC homes. DEC's city-supported Early Learning SF (ELS) network prioritizes serving DEC priority populations, including children with exceptional needs. As DEC leverages state funding and policies, state impacts to these agencies can influence DEC funding and policy decisions.

Fiscal Impact

There is potential fiscal impact to funding from DEC as a result of changes to state supported early educator programs. DEC currently supports access to early educator training and professional development, including inclusivity and best practices for serving children with exceptional needs. Additional state support could enhance/replace this local funding and enable DEC to divert support for other essential resources for the early educator workforce.

Support / Opposition

Support:

Kids Included Together (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	4/3/23
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 596

Asm. Reyes, District 47, Democrat

Child Care Rate Reform and Suspension of Family Fees

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 596 will help early learning and childcare providers and families by transitioning providers to a single cost based reimbursement rate, suspending family fees until an equitable sliding scale for family fees is established, and funding providers using an enrollment based contract earning mechanism. This is a companion bill to SB 380 (Limon).

Background/Analysis

Without affordable and available child care, parents cannot work. Throughout the state, and in San Francisco, there are empty early childhood classrooms because providers cannot hire teachers to staff them. In California, Family Child Care (FCC) homes have been forced to close due to a lack of sufficient funding. These are funded child care spaces that will not be utilized because of the antiquated state cost model, despite a huge need for child care. Families, particularly the most marginalized, are left to make increasingly difficult choices. California has been subsidizing the true cost of child care by paying the early learning and child care workforce low wages and expecting families to pay high family fees for subsidized child care programs. Early educators are some of the lowest paid workers across the country and many have left the profession to find better paying careers. While San Francisco is implementing initiatives to combat these issues, such as our ECE Workforce Compensation Initiative and providing funding to enhance inadequate state reimbursement rates, it is essential that California stabilize the child care sector and reduce costs to low-income families.

Challenge

Currently, California uses two methodologies for determining reimbursement rates for early learning and care services – the Regional Market Rate (RMR) and the Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR). The RMR is based on regional cost surveys for licensed providers, including voucher-based programs, and the SRR is based in statute for Title 5 providers for programs with direct state contracts. The SRR does not account for geographic costs and neither rate structure accounts for the actual cost of providing care to children. Efforts to move to one single reimbursement rate structure have not been realized. AB 131 required the State and Child Care Providers United (CCPU) to establish a committee to develop recommendations for a single reimbursement rate structure by November 2022. AB 131 also required the California Department of Social Services

(CDSS) and the California Department of Education (CDE) to establish a working group to assess the existing quality standards for child care and development and preschool programs and the methodology for establishing reimbursement rates for those programs. In addition to recommending implementation of a single rate structure for publicly-funded childcare in California, the Rate and Quality Workgroup also recommended increasing affordability by making adjustments to family fee requirements and to the method in which subsidized contractors earn their contract. In 2022, the State waived family fees for another year. However, the waiver is set to expire in June 2023 and families will begin receiving a monthly bill of up to \$595 at the start of July 2023 unless family fees are suspended for state and federally-funded programs. With limited disposable income, working families struggle to pay high fees and are forced to make difficult decisions about their basic needs.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 596 will require CDSS to apply to the federal Health and Human Services Agency to amend the State's current Child Care and Development Fund State Plan to change reimbursement rates by using an alternative methodology to include a cost-based model consistent with the recommendations of the CDSS-led Rate and Quality Workgroup report and the CCPU committee. It also considers the true cost of providing care by considering current statutory and regulatory requirements, staff salaries, training, supplies, ratios, enrollment levels, facilities, and family engagement. The bill will require that this methodology be updated regularly to account for rising costs in care. Additionally, it will require CDE and CDSS to suspend family fees until an equitable sliding scale for the payment of family fees is established. Finally, AB 596 requires that providers are paid based on the number of children enrolled in their programs instead of attendance.

Departments Impacted & Why

Department of Early Childhood (DEC): The majority of the Family Child Care and center-based programs that are part of DEC's city-supported Early Learning SF (ELS) network also provide state subsidized spaces through the state programs impacted by this bill. 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

There is potential fiscal impact to funding from DEC as a result of changes to state reimbursement rates. DEC currently provides funding to enhance state reimbursement rates in order to make them equal to the local reimbursement rate provided through Early Learning San Francisco (ELS) vouchers. Additional state support could enhance/replace this local funding and enable DEC to divert support for other essential resources for young children and their families.

Support / Opposition

Support:

Parent Voices (co-sponsor)
California Child Care Resource and Referral
Network (co-sponsor)
EveryChild California (co-sponsor)
Child Care Resource Center (co-sponsor)
Children Now (co-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	4/3/23
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

SB 380

Sen. Limon, District 19, Democrat

Child care: statewide pilot policies: individualized county childcare subsidy plans.

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 380 will help early learning and childcare providers and families by transitioning providers to a single cost based reimbursement rate, suspending family fees until an equitable sliding scale for family fees is established, and funding providers using an enrollment based contract earning mechanism. This is a companion bill to AB 596 (Limon).

Background/Analysis

Existing law requires CDSS and CDE, on or before June 30, 2022, to review the existing individualized Without affordable and available child care, parents cannot work. Throughout the state, and in San Francisco, there are empty early childhood classrooms because providers cannot hire teachers to staff them. In California, Family Child Care (FCC) homes have been forced to close due to a lack of sufficient funding. These are funded child care spaces that will not be utilized because of the antiquated state cost model, despite a huge need for child care. Families, particularly the most marginalized, are left to make increasingly difficult choices. California has been subsidizing the true cost of child care by paying the early learning and child care workforce low wages and expecting families to pay high family fees for subsidized child care programs. Early educators are some of the lowest paid workers across the country and many have left the profession to find better paying careers. While San Francisco is implementing initiatives to combat these issues, such as our ECE Workforce Compensation Initiative and providing funding to enhance inadequate state reimbursement rates, it is essential that California stabilize the child care sector and reduce costs to low-income families.

Challenge

Currently, California uses two methodologies for determining reimbursement rates for early learning and care services – the Regional Market Rate (RMR) and the Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR). The RMR is based on regional cost surveys for licensed providers, including voucher-based programs, and the SRR is based in statute for Title 5 providers for programs with direct state contracts. The SRR does not account for geographic costs and neither rate structure accounts for the actual cost of providing care to children. Efforts to move to one single reimbursement rate

structure have not been realized. AB 131 required the State and Child Care Providers United (CCPU) to establish a committee to develop recommendations for a single reimbursement rate structure by November 2022. AB 131 also required the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and the California Department of Education (CDE) to establish a working group to assess the existing quality standards for child care and development and preschool programs and the methodology for establishing reimbursement rates for those programs. In addition to recommending implementation of a single rate structure for publicly-funded childcare in California, the Rate and Quality Workgroup also recommended increasing affordability by making adjustments to family fee requirements and to the method in which subsidized contractors earn their contract. In 2022, the State waived family fees for another year. However, the waiver is set to expire in June 2023 and families will begin receiving a monthly bill of up to \$595 at the start of July 2023 unless family fees are suspended for state and federally-funded programs. With limited disposable income, working families struggle to pay high fees and are forced to make difficult decisions about their basic needs.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 380 will require CDSS to apply to the federal Health and Human Services Agency to amend the State's current Child Care and Development Fund State Plan to change reimbursement rates by using an alternative methodology to include a cost-based model consistent with the recommendations of the CDSS-led Rate and Quality Workgroup report and the CCPU committee. It also considers the true cost of providing care by considering current statutory and regulatory requirements, staff salaries, training, supplies, ratios, enrollment levels, facilities, and family engagement. The bill will require that this methodology be updated regularly to account for rising costs in care. Additionally, it will require CDE and CDSS to suspend family fees until an equitable sliding scale for the payment of family fees is established. Finally, SB 360 requires that providers are paid based on the number of children enrolled in their programs instead of attendance.

Departments Impacted & Why

Department of Early Childhood (DEC): The majority of the Family Child Care and center-based programs that are part of DEC's city-supported Early Learning SF (ELS) network also provide state subsidized spaces through the state programs impacted by this bill. 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

There is potential fiscal impact to funding from DEC as a result of changes to state reimbursement rates. DEC currently provides funding to enhance state reimbursement rates in order to make them equal to the local reimbursement rate provided through Early Learning San Francisco (ELS) vouchers. Additional state support could enhance/replace this local funding and enable DEC to divert support for other essential resources for young children and their families.

Support / Opposition

Support:

Parent Voices (co-sponsor)
California Child Care Resource and Referral
Network (co-sponsor)
EveryChild California (co-sponsor)

Child Care Resource Center (co-sponsor)
Children Now (co-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	4/3/23
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 635

Sen. Menjivar, District 20, Democrat

Early Education and Child care: developmental screenings

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 635 would provide tens of thousands of children with access to early childhood developmental screening and other appropriate developmental screenings. It would also ensure that children ages 0-5 who need additional services after screening are referred for further assessment and intervention at no cost to the parent.

Background/Analysis

The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) oversees the services and support to over 400,000 individuals with developmental disabilities and their families. The Early Start Program provides for the delivery of these services to infants and toddlers at risk of having developmental disabilities. Eligibility for these services and support are determined by the Regional Center (RC) system which coordinate community-based services through service coordinators. Child care and home visits are existing services received by tens of thousands of children and families throughout California. State-subsidized programs such as Alternative Payment, General Child Care, CalWORKS, Family Child Care Home Education Network (FCCHEN), and California State Preschool are provided in local communities and have established relationships with the children and families they serve. They are in a unique position to support families in accessing early screening services for their children and make referrals to developmental and trauma services. These services assist families in supporting the growth and development of their children through early identification and referral services. These services are critical in helping children reach their full potential to thrive in school and life. There is a need for a clear pathway for eligible families to access services through existing services and relationships in their home language, accessible locations, and during convenient hours.

Challenge

Many children with developmental delays or behavior concerns are not identified as early as possible, delaying their access to help in social and educational settings. According to the Center for Disease Control (CDC), in the United States, about 1 in 6 children aged 3 to 17 have one or more developmental or behavioral disabilities such as autism, a learning disorder, or

attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. However, many children with developmental disabilities are not identified until they are in school, by which time significant delays might have occurred and opportunities for treatment may have been missed. A 2023 Report by the Early Childhood Technical Center found that racial and economic disparities also occur in access to early intervention, screening, identification, and referral. In the past year 36% of families above low income reported that their child had received a screening in comparison to 27.2% of low income families. Black and African American families have the lowest screening and response rate due to affordability and insurance issues. Research shows that early intervention treatment services can greatly improve a child's development. Services can include a variety of options based on a child's need, but many parents aren't aware of where to access support or figure out what steps to take to support their child's development.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

California has the opportunity to reach tens of thousands of children, who are currently being served in either subsidized child care programs and through home visiting support services by providing each child in these programs the opportunity to be screened for development and trauma concerns. SB 635 would direct all state subsidized child care programs (Alternative Payment, General Child Care, CalWORKS, and FCCHEN, California State Preschool) and home visiting programs to screen all children, following family consent, with an Ages and Stages screening (for children 0-5) and other appropriate developmental screenings; direct the California Departments of Education (CDE) and Social Services (CDSS) to set up a centralized billing point to draw down Federal Funding to pay the subsidized child care programs for providing the screening; and direct CDE and CDSS to work with the Department of Health Care Services, the Department of Developmental Services, and the Office of the Surgeon General to establish processes to ensure identified children are receiving needed intervention services in a timely manner and in their home language.

Departments Impacted & Why

Department of Early Childhood (DEC): The majority of the Family Child Care and center-based programs that are part of DEC's city-supported Early Learning SF (ELS) network also provide state subsidized spaces through the state programs impacted by this bill. 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

There is potential fiscal impact to funding from DEC as a result of changes to state subsidized child care. DEC currently supports access to Ages and Stages developmental screenings for ELS programs. Additional state support could enhance/replace this local funding and enable DEC to divert support for other essential resources for young children and their families.

Support / Opposition

Support:

Child Care Resource Center (Co-Sponsor)

EveryChild California (Co-Sponsor)

First 5 California (Co-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	03/17/2023
Submitting Department	Department of Children Youth and Their Families
Contact Name	Jasmine Dawson
Contact Email and Phone Number	Jasmine.dawson@dcyf.org ; 628-652-7124
SLC Meeting Presenter	Jasmine Dawson
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 274
Sen. Skinner, District 9, Democrat
Suspensions and Expulsions: Willful Defiance

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Senate Bill 274 would remove disrupting school activities and willful defiance from being on the list of acts for which a pupil, regardless of their grade enrollment, may be suspended or recommended for expulsion. Additionally, this bill will remove the ability to suspend or expel pupils who are truant, tardy, or otherwise absent from school activities. DCYF would support this bill fully based on the research confirming students of color, homeless, with disabilities, in foster care, and/or LGBTQIA+ are more likely to be suspended for behavior deemed to be willfully defiant.

Background/Analysis

Under the existing law, pupils cannot be suspended or recommended for expulsion, unless the superintendent of the school district or the principal of the school determines that the pupil has committed a specific act, which includes disrupting school activities or being willfully defiant. Additionally, under the existing law, until July 1, 2025, pupil's grades 6 to 8 cannot be suspended for disrupting school activities or willful defiance. This includes charter schools. Finally, under existing law, the intent of the legislature is that alternatives to suspension or expulsion may be imposed against a pupil who is truant, tardy, or otherwise absent from school activities. However, it does mean that under current law, suspension or expulsion for pupils who are truant or tardy is still an option.

Challenge

With the current law of allowing schools to suspend or expel pupils based on disrupting school activities or being willfully defiant, there is an opening for more students of color, homeless, with disabilities, in foster care, and/or LGBTQIA+ to be suspended or expelled based on subjective behavior deemed to be willfully defiant or disruptive. Additionally, with the current law, while alternatives to suspension and expulsion is the intent of the Legislature for truant or tardy students, alternative efforts may not always be taken. This problem impacts the children of San Francisco because students of color, homeless, with disabilities, in foster care, and/or LGBTQIA+ in San Francisco can be impacted by the subjectivity of how staff respond to students disrupting school activities, being willfully defiant, and being tardy or truant.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The solution that this bill is proposing is to remove disrupting school activities and willful defiance from the list of acts for which a student, regardless of their grade, may be suspended or expelled. This bill would also extend the prohibition of suspension that expires on July 1, 2025, based on those acts within charter schools to be indefinite for all grades. Finally, this bill will prohibit a suspension or expulsion from being imposed on students that are tardy or truant. This solution will positively impact the children of San Francisco as it will remove subjectivity for how school staff can respond to students disrupting school activities, being willfully defiant, and being tardy or truant.

Departments Impacted & Why

San Francisco Unified School District's policy is already consistent with the main intent of this bill. There is already a policy in place that prohibits suspension or expulsion based solely on the basis of disruptive or willfully defiant behavior. SB 274 would codify the policy that SFUSD already has in place. The impact would require SFUSD to review the current policy and ensure that it is in compliance with the language in SB 274.

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

None listed.



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	03/17/2023
Submitting Department	Department of Children Youth and Their Families
Contact Name	Jasmine Dawson
Contact Email and Phone Number	Jasmine.dawson@dcyf.org ; 628-652-7124
SLC Meeting Presenter	Jasmine Dawson
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 XN/A

SB 287

Sen. Skinner, District 9, Democrat

Features that harm child users: civil penalty

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Senate Bill 287 would prohibit social media platforms from using a design, algorithm, or feature that the platform knows, or with the exercise of reasonable care should have known causes child users increased risk of harm, including addiction to the social media platform. DCYF would fully support this bill fully because we recognize that these algorithms can cause harm and increase risk in a number of ways, for example by promoting eating disorders or offering information on how to die by suicide. We also support that this bill lifts up the California Age-Appropriate Design Code Act which states that a business that provides an online service, product, or feature likely to be accessed by children to comply with specified requirements, including a requirement to configure all default privacy settings offered by the online service, product, or feature to the settings that offer a high level of privacy, as prescribed, and is required of a business. This requires new online services, products, or features that are offered to the public, complete a Data Protection Impact Assessment for any online service, product, or feature likely to be accessed by children and maintain documentation of this assessment if the online service, product, or feature is likely to be accessed by children.

Background/Analysis

Under the California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018, businesses cannot sell personal information of a consumer if the business knows the consumer is under 16 years of age and/or does not have parental consent. Under the California Age-Appropriate Design Code Act, beginning July 1, 2024, businesses that have online services and products likely to be accessed by children will need to have default settings offering a high level of privacy. Social media platforms, which have a lot of children using the platform, currently have an algorithm that can collect data off users which can lead to addiction of the social media platform or cause an increased risk of harm for the user. This bill prohibits social media platforms from using a design or algorithm which can cause children to have an increased risk of harm and addiction.

Challenge

The problem that this bill is trying to solve is preventing social media platforms from using a design, algorithm, or features that the platform knows, or should reasonably know, causes an increased risk of harm to child users, such as content that facilitates the purchase of fentanyl, developing an eating disorder, causing an addiction to the social media platform, and other forms of increased risk of harm. Many children in San Francisco use social media platforms, which means that based on the platform's design, algorithm, or features children in San Francisco might be exposed to various content which can increase their risk to harm or addiction. This bill will help prevent that increase risk for San Francisco children.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The solution that this bill is proposing is to have the social media platforms institute and maintain a program of quarterly audits of its design, algorithms and features to detect designs, algorithms, and features that have the potential to cause and contribute to the increased risk of harm for children. Social media platforms have 30 days after completion of the audit to apply corrections to the design, algorithm, or feature that poses an increased risk of harm to children. This bill would subject a social media platform that knowingly and willfully violates the provisions with a fine not exceeding \$250,000 per violation. Through the regular audits that this bill is proposing, it will help San Francisco children avoid seeing content that increases their risk of harm.

Departments Impacted & Why

City IT has confirmed that there would be no impact and they do not have any concerns.

Fiscal Impact

Unknown.

Support / Opposition

None listed.



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	03/17/2023
Submitting Department	Department of Children Youth and Their Families
Contact Name	Jasmine Dawson
Contact Email and Phone Number	Jasmine.dawson@dcyf.org ; 628-652-7124
SLC Meeting Presenter	Jasmine Dawson
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 333

Sen. Cortese, District 15, Democrat

Homeless Pupils: California Success, Opportunity, and Academic Resilience (SOAR) Guaranteed Income Program

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Senate Bill 333 would require the State Department of Social Services to establish the California Success, Opportunity, and Academic Resilience (SOAR) Guaranteed Income Program. This program would award public school pupils who are in the 12th grade and are homeless children or youths, a guaranteed income of \$1,000 each month for 5 months from April 1, 2025, to August 1, 2025. DCYF would support this bill fully based on the needs of who we would consider a priority population with greater needs, homeless youth, and because youth will receive a guaranteed based income of \$1,000 for five months and funds would not be considered income for public social service programs or other purposes and would not negatively impact the award recipient's eligibility for future public social service programs.

Background/Analysis

There are existing laws that establish various public social services programs to provide eligible recipients with certain benefits, such as the CalWORKs program, CalFresh program, and Medi-Cal. These programs can provide additional services to eligible recipients. The existing law also allows for the establishment of various programs to aid homeless youth, including, homeless youth emergency service pilot projects and the Runaway Youth and Families in Crisis Projects. These laws show that there is a necessity and pathway for adding additional support, specifically for homeless children and youth.

Challenge

The problem that this bill is trying to solve is to provide additional financial support for homeless children and youth who are in 12th grade at a public high school for 5 months between April 1, 2025 to August 1, 2025. This would impact the children and youth of San Francisco as there is a houseless population of children and youth in the city. San Francisco children and youth feel the impact of this problem due to how expensive housing is in the area. There potentially are some 12th grade public school homeless children and youth who would benefit from this problem being addressed by this bill.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The solution that this bill is proposing is to have the California State Department of Social Services to establish the California Success, Opportunity, and Academic Resilience (SOAR) Guaranteed Income Program which will provide homeless 12th graders who attend public schools a guaranteed income of \$1,000 a month for 5 months. Having this added financial support for 5 months, offered along with other established public social service programs, can help homeless 12th grades in San Francisco. Additionally, this bill would ensure that for tax year starting on January 1, 2025, the income received from this program would not be included in gross income for personal income taxes which means that the homeless 12th graders in San Francisco would not have an additional tax burden due to this program.

Departments Impacted & Why

San Francisco Unified School District would be impacted because they would have to form or work with a local educational agency liaison to identify eligible participants for the purposes of assisting the State Department of Social Services in distributing entitled awards. Department of Children, Youth, and their Families would be impacted because they might be the department that would have to take on the additional duties of a local educational agency liaison or have a state-mandated local program.

Fiscal Impact

The California Constitution requires the states to reimburse local agencies and school districts for costs mandated by the state. This bill will provide reimbursement if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state.

Support / Opposition

None listed.



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	4/3/22
Submitting Department	Department on the Status of Women
Contact Name	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
Contact Email and Phone Number	alea.brown@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
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 254

Asm. Bauer-Kahan, District 16, Democrat

Confidentiality of Medical Information Act: reproductive or sexual health application information

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Assemblymember Bauer-Kahan introduced AB 254, which ensures the privacy and security of individuals' information when they opt to use apps and websites that provide reproductive and sexual health services.

Background/Analysis

Reproductive and sexual health information is particularly sensitive given the criminalization of almost any form of ending a pregnancy since the overturn of *Roe v. Wade*. Apps and websites that explicitly market themselves as providing menstrual and pregnancy tracking are creating an expectation of healthcare and the associated privacy of information.

The HIPAA Privacy Rule provides consumers with important privacy rights and protections with respect to their health information, including important controls over how their health information is used and disclosed by health plans and health care providers. Ensuring strong privacy protections is critical to maintaining individuals' trust in their health care providers and willingness to obtain needed health care services, and these protections are especially important where very sensitive information is concerned, such as mental health and reproductive health information.

Challenge

The current lack of protection for sensitive information collected by menstrual tracking apps and other digital services leaves individuals vulnerable to criminalization and predatory advertising based on their reproductive health choices. This legislation is critically needed as some states have already moved to criminalize abortion and gender-affirming healthcare, putting millions of people at risk. In addition to the legal risks, the information sharing can result in users being tracked across the internet with ads about this sensitive information. This predatory advertising can be incredibly stigmatizing and dissuades people from getting care.

AB 254 extends the privacy safeguards of the CA Confidential Medical Information Act (CMIA) to digital services that offer sexual and reproductive healthcare, offering a vital layer of protection for this sensitive information. The consequences of this vulnerable data falling into the wrong hands

are dire, and AB 254 prevents this from happening by creating a secure and continuous data protection across all health platforms.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 254 revises the Confidentiality of Medical Information Act (CMIA) to include reproductive or sexual health application information into the definition of medical information. It also deems a business that offers a reproductive or sexual health digital service to a consumer for the purpose of allowing the individual to manage the individual's information, or for the individual's diagnosis, treatment, or management of a medical condition, to be a provider of health care, as specified.

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

Support:

Oakland Privacy

Opposition:

None on file



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	DOSW
Contact Name	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
Contact Email and Phone Number	alea.brown@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
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 576
Asm. Weber, District 79, Democrat
Medi-Cal: reimbursement for abortion

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 576 ensures patients that rely on Medi-Cal can access medication abortion in line with up-to-date clinical guidelines and peer-reviewed scientific evidence.

Background/Analysis

Existing law:

- Establishes the Medi-Cal program, which is administered by the State Department of Health Care Services, under which qualified low-income individuals receive health care services. The Medi-Cal program is, in part, governed and funded by federal Medicaid program provisions;
- Provides that abortion is a covered benefit under Medi-Cal; and
- Authorizes reimbursement for specified medications used to terminate a pregnancy through the 70th day from the first day of the recipient's last menstrual period.

Challenge

Medication abortion is widely used and proven to be safe and effective, but with more and more states criminalizing reproductive health care providers and patients, access to this FDA-approved treatment and other services is being further restricted every day. In fact, a major national pharmacy chain recently said it would end the distribution of abortion medication not only in states where it is now illegal, but also in some states where it remains lawful, following a pressure campaign by anti-abortion attorneys general in those states.

AB 576, will ensure that access to medication abortion is protected, and that the type of medication abortion a woman is prescribed is not determined by income but science.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill would require the department to fully reimburse providers for the provision of medication to terminate a pregnancy that aligns with clinical guidelines, evidence-based research, and the discretion of the provider. This bill would require the department, by March 1, 2024, to review and update Medi-Cal coverage policies for medication abortion to align with current evidence-based clinical guidelines. After the initial review, the bill would require the department to update its Medi-Cal coverage policies for medication abortion as needed to align with evidence-based clinical guidelines. The bill would require the department to allow flexibility for providers to exercise their clinical judgment when services are performed in a manner that aligns with one or more evidence-based clinical guidelines.

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

Support:

California Future of Abortion Council
ACCESS REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE
Black Women for Wellness Action Project
California Coalition for Reproductive Freedom
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice (CLRJ)
Essential Access Health
NARAL Pro-Choice California
National Health Law Program
Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California
TEACH (Training in Early Abortion for Comprehensive Healthcare)

Opposition:

Right to Life League



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	4/3/22
Submitting Department	Department on the Status of Women
Contact Name	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
Contact Email and Phone Number	alea.brown@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
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 598

Asm. Wicks, Assembly District 14, Democrat

Sexual health education and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) prevention education: school climate and safety: California Healthy Kids Survey

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 598, introduced by Assemblymember Wicks requires school districts, including those in the City and County of San Francisco, to participate in the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) and include a module on sexual and reproductive health care as one of the core survey modules.

Background/Analysis

Existing law, the California Healthy Youth Act, requires school districts to ensure that all pupils in grades 7 to 12, inclusive, receive comprehensive sexual health education and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) prevention education, as specified. Under the act, this instruction includes, among other things, information about local resources related to sexual and reproductive health, pregnancy prevention and care, and assistance with sexual assault and intimate partner violence, and information about pregnancy, including parenting, adoption, and abortion, as provided.

This bill would revise the information included in this instruction related to local resources and abortion, as specified, and would require that pupils receive a physical or digital resource detailing certain local resources upon completion of the applicable instruction. By imposing additional duties on local educational agencies, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

Challenge

Following the Dobbs decision in 2022, it is critical that students in California, including in the City and County of San Francisco, are taught about reproductive and sexual health care. Assemblymember Wicks' bill expands California's sexual reproductive education requirements to ensure young people have knowledge, and know where to, and how to receive abortion care along with contraception care and all the other care that our young people deserve to know about it.

The bill also ensures that California school districts are required to administer the California Healthy Survey test that includes a test around reproductive care and contraceptive care in that healthy survey so that policymakers and educators can have data around what our young people are experiencing and how they understand these issues, and how they can create the appropriate curriculum for students moving forward.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Existing law authorizes anonymous, voluntary, and confidential research and evaluation tools to measure pupils' health behaviors and risks, including tests, questionnaires, and surveys containing age-appropriate questions about the pupil's attitudes concerning or practices relating to sex, to be administered to any pupil in grades 7 to 12, inclusive. The California Healthy Kids Survey is an anonymous, confidential survey of school climate and safety, student wellness, and youth resiliency.

This bill would require the State Department of Education to ensure the California Healthy Kids Survey includes questions about sexual and reproductive health care as a core survey module for pupils in grades 7, 9, and 11. The bill would require each school district serving pupils in any of grades 5, 7, 9, or 11 to administer the California Healthy Kids Survey to pupils in the applicable grades, as provided. By imposing new requirements on local educational agencies, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

None on File



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	DOSW
Contact Name	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
Contact Email and Phone Number	Alea.brown@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	
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 710

Asm. Schiavo, District 40, Democrat

State Department of Public Health: pregnancy care and abortion services awareness campaign

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill will launch a public information campaign to provide women with accurate information regarding access to abortion care at crisis pregnancy centers.

Background/Analysis

Existing law:

- Provides for the licensure and regulation of clinics and health facilities, including, but not limited to, primary care and specialty clinics, by the State Department of Public Health (DPH). DPH is also responsible for the statewide administration of various programs and policies relating to personal health, including maternal, child, and adolescent health.
- Requires DPH to develop a coordinated state strategy for addressing the health-related needs of women, including implementation of goals and objectives for women's health, as specified.

Challenge

Crisis pregnancy centers (CPC) engage in purposefully manipulative and deceptive practices that spread misinformation on sexual health and abortion. CPCs have also been shown to delay access to medically legitimate prenatal and abortion care, which negatively impacts maternal health. This bill will ensure that women seeking reproductive health care receive accurate information and the misinformation of these CPC's is actively combated.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation relating to crisis pregnancy centers. DPH would be required to conduct an awareness campaign to communicate with local health departments, health care providers, and the public regarding facilities that provide health care services, including, but not limited to, primary care and specialty clinics. The awareness campaign would include information about the services the facilities offer, and the activities of the department, relating to pregnancy care and abortion.

Additionally, the awareness campaign would provide outreach to, among others, health care professional associations and societies and health care employers.

DPH would be authorized to award grants or enter into contracts to perform the functions required to conduct the awareness campaign, as specified.

The bill would repeal these provisions on January 1, 2025.

Departments Impacted & Why

Department of Public Health, as provided in the bill, they would be responsible for launching the public information campaign either directly, or through the administration of grants.

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

Support:

California Future of Abortion Council
ACCESS REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE
Black Women for Wellness Action Project (BWWAP)
California Coalition for Reproductive Freedom
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice (CLRJ)
Essential Access Health
NARAL Pro-Choice California
National Health Law Program
Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California
TEACH (Training in Early Abortion for Comprehensive Healthcare)

Opposition:

Right to Life League



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	April 3, 2023
Submitting Department	DOSW
Contact Name	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
Contact Email and Phone Number	Alea.brown@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	
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 1194

Asm. Carrillo, District 52, Democrat

California Privacy Rights Act Of 2020: Exemptions: Abortion Services

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill will ensure that businesses can not use exemptions under the Consumer Privacy Rights Act to share information about a consumer accessing, procuring, or searching for services regarding contraception, pregnancy care, and perinatal care, including abortion services.

Background/Analysis

Under Existing law, the California Privacy Rights Act of 2020 (CPRA), grants a consumer various rights with respect to personal information that is collected or sold by a business, including the right to require the business to delete personal information about the consumer unless those obligations restrict a business's ability to, among other things, comply with federal, state, or local laws or comply with a court order or subpoena to provide information, or cooperate with a government agency request for emergency access to a consumer's personal information if a natural person is at risk or danger of death or serious physical injury, as provided.

Challenge

Following the fall of Roe, states across the country have enacted laws restricting access to reproductive health services, and in some instances, enacted complete bans on abortion services. Health care providers, patients, and/or third parties assisting in the procurement of an abortion, are increasingly at risk for incurring civil and/or criminal penalties. Unfortunately, it is becoming more and more apparent, that those in opposition to abortion access are able to employ new ways to penalize individuals seeking abortion and reproductive health services, regardless of whether they are located in a state that restricts access.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill will ensure that consumer information related to reproductive health and abortion services remains private by preventing businesses from maintaining and potentially sharing that information with third parties.

When a consumer's personal information contains information related to accessing, procuring, or searching for services regarding contraception, pregnancy care, and perinatal care, including,

but not limited to, abortion services, this bill would require businesses to comply with the obligations imposed by the CPRA.

Specifically, this bill would make it clear that a consumer accessing, procuring, or searching for abortion services does not constitute a natural person being at risk or danger of death or serious physical injury.

Departments Impacted & Why

[List any departments that may be impacted by the legislation and explain the impact. We recommend consulting with affected departments for their perspective before submitting this proposal form.]

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

Support:

California Future of Abortion Councils

- ACCESS REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE
- Black Women for Wellness Action Project
- California Coalition for Reproductive Freedom
- California Latinas for Reproductive Justice
- Essential Access Health
- NARAL Pro-Choice California
- National Health Law Program
- Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California TEACH (Training in Early Abortion for Comprehensive Healthcare)

Opposition:

Right to Life League



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	4/3/22
Submitting Department	Department on the Status of Women
Contact Name	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
Contact Email and Phone Number	alea.brown@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
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 36

Sen. Skinner, District 9, Democrat

Out-of-state criminal charges: prosecution related to abortion, contraception, reproductive care, and gender-affirming care

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

The new legislation by Senator Skinner builds on those landmark laws by barring California judges from directing bounty hunters or bail agents and making it illegal for bounty hunters and bail agents, to apprehend people who fled criminal prosecution or imprisonment for providing, receiving or supporting an abortion or gender-affirming care. Bounty hunters and bail agents who violate the new statute would be guilty of a misdemeanor and face up to a year in jail and forfeiture of their license to operate in California.

Background/Analysis

During the most recent legislative session, Gov. Newsom signed AB 1242 by Assemblymember Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, D-Orinda and SB 107 by Senator Scott Wiener, D-San Francisco, as well as other laws that made California a sanctuary state for abortion services and gender-affirming care. In addition, in the November election, California voters passed a constitutional amendment, guaranteeing the right to abortion and contraception.

SB 36 would strengthen California's "Safe Haven" laws by expanding protections for people who have come to California, including the City and County of San Francisco, to avoid criminal prosecution or imprisonment related to that state's criminalization of abortion or gender-affirming care. The bill would also ensure that benefits such as food and housing assistance would not be denied to individuals who left another state and traveled to California for purposes described above but would otherwise be eligible for such benefits.

Challenge

Since the anti-abortion majority of the U.S. Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade in June, at least 13 states now have laws on the books making it a felony to receive or perform an abortion, according to the Guttmacher Institute.

In addition, four states have enacted laws or regulations banning gender-affirming care, and 15 additional states are considering legislation to do so, according to a report by the Kaiser Family Foundation.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The purpose of this bill is to:

- 1) Prohibit a magistrate from issuing a warrant for the arrest of a bail fugitive whose alleged offense or conviction is for the violation of another state's laws that criminalize abortion, contraception, reproductive care, or gender-affirming care that is otherwise lawful under the laws of this state, regardless of the individual's location;
- 2) State that it is a misdemeanor for a bail fugitive recovery agent or bail bondsman to take into custody a bail fugitive whose alleged offense or conviction is for the violation of another state's laws that criminalize abortion, contraception, reproductive care, or genderaffirming care that is otherwise lawful under the laws of this state and makes them ineligible for a license to operate in California;
- 3) Prohibit a state or local law enforcement agency from providing information or assistance to specified entities regarding legally protected health care activity, which includes abortion, contraception, reproductive care, or gender-affirming care that is otherwise lawful under the laws of this state; and,
- 4) State that a person who is fleeing to avoid prosecution, or custody and confinement after conviction, for the above-described acts, is not ineligible for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program, regardless of the recipient's location.

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

Support: Access Reproductive Justice; American Atheists; California Attorneys for Criminal Justice; California Public Defenders Association; Ella Baker Center for Human Rights; John Burton Advocates for Youth; Oakland Privacy; Young Women's Freedom Center

Opposition: Concerned Women for America; Right to Life League



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	4/3/22
Submitting Department	Department on the Status of Women
Contact Name	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
Contact Email and Phone Number	alea.brown@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Alea Brown-Hoffmeister
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 345

Sen. Skinner, District 9, Democrat

Health care services: legally protected health care activities

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 345 expands legal protections for health care professionals providing reproductive health services as well as gender-affirming care, contraception, and abortions for out-of-state patients. Specifically, this bill will protect health care providers from suspension, license revocation, and other related disciplinary actions by a California medical licensing board, due to their performance of legally protected health care services regardless of where these services were performed. Additionally, health care providers will be further protected from civil suits or criminal prosecution by non-California jurisdictions due to their performance of health care services, including abortions.

Background/Analysis

As numerous states across the country continue to criminalize abortion services, and enact significant restrictions on other reproductive health services, California is moving to enact additional legislative safeguards to protect access to abortion services, as well as provide enhanced protections for health care providers, ensuring that both health care providers, and people seeking reproductive health services, including abortion, are provided with additional criminal and civil protections.

Existing Law:

(1) Provides for the licensure and regulation of various categories of medical professionals by boards within the Department of Consumer Affairs, including, among others, the Medical Board of California and the Dental Board of California. Existing law makes specified actions by licensed health care providers unprofessional conduct and, in certain cases, a criminal offense.

(2) Pursuant to the Confidentiality of Medical Information Act, a health care provider, health care service plan, contractor, or corporation are generally prohibited from sharing, selling, using for marketing, or otherwise using medical information for a purpose not necessary to provide health care services to the patient. Various obligations are imposed

on businesses with respect to protecting consumer privacy and information, including requiring certain disclosures to consumers regarding a consumer's rights under the act.

(3) Establishes that a law of another state that authorizes a person to bring a civil action against a person or entity that engages in certain activities relating to obtaining or performing an abortion is deemed contrary to CA public policy pursuant to the Reproductive Privacy Act. Application of an out-of-state law described above to a case or controversy in state court or enforcing or satisfying a civil judgment under the out-of-state law is prohibited.

(4) Judgment creditor is permitted to apply for the entry of a judgment based on a sister state judgment by filing an application with a superior court and requires the court clerk to enter a judgment based on the application. Courts are required to grant a stay enforcement of such a judgment under specified circumstances.

(5) Murder is defined as the unlawful killing of a human being, or a fetus, with malice aforethought. An exemption exists for a person who commits an act that results in the death of a fetus under specific circumstances, including if the act is solicited, aided, abetted, or consented to by the mother of the fetus.

(6) Governor must recognize a demand for extradition of a person if the demand meets specified requirements. A magistrate is required, upon the filing of a verified complaint, to issue a warrant directed to any peace officer commanding the officer to apprehend an individual in this state who is convicted, or has violated the terms of bail, probation, or parole, or who is charged with a crime, in another state and who is believed to be in this state.

(7) State or local law enforcement agency or officer is prohibited from knowingly arresting or knowingly participating in the arrest of any person for performing, supporting, or aiding in the performance of an abortion or for obtaining an abortion, if the abortion is lawful in this state. Existing law prohibits a state or local public agency from cooperating with or providing information to an individual or agency from another state or a federal law enforcement agency, as specified, regarding a lawful abortion.

(8) Terms like "unborn children" and "unborn persons" are used in various contexts, including, among others, defining low-risk pregnancy conditions for determining the scope of authorization of a certificate to practice nurse-midwifery, defining active labor for health facility licensing provisions, and defining spouse for California State Teachers' Retirement System benefits.

(9) The term "unborn persons" is used in various contexts, including naming unknown defendants in real property actions, allowing a court to appoint a guardian ad litem to advocate for inadequately represented interests in probate proceedings, allowing a guardian ad litem to give consent on behalf of a beneficiary who lacks legal capacity, and providing an exception for requiring a personal representative to file an account of the distributions of a decedent's estate.

Challenge

Since the fall of *Roe v. Wade*, patients are being forced to travel long distances — often over 500 miles — to access abortion care in a clinic. Offering medication abortion, which has been shown

to be safe and effective, would make it more convenient and accessible to more people. Additionally, by providing enhanced legal protections, this bill would allow California clinicians to help patients in other states who need medication abortion care.

While medication abortion is widely used and proven to be safe and effective, more and more states are criminalizing reproductive health care providers and patients, access to this FDA-approved treatment with other services being further restricted every day. Contraception and medication for gender-affirming care are also under attack.

Under SB345, someone who has traveled to or resides in Texas could contact a California medical provider and be prescribed abortion medication or contraception. Similarly, a California-based pharmacy would be able to ship the medication to Texas, and both the health care provider and the pharmacy would receive protections, as long as they are in California, from criminal and civil actions initiated in Texas. The same would be true in the case of a person in Florida who contacts a California health care provider for gender-affirming care and a California pharmacy ships the medication.

Other states, such as Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Maryland and Vermont are proposing or passing similar laws that expand the ability of medical providers to provide care to patients, regardless of the patient's location.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 345 will ensure that California health care practitioners are able to provide essential reproductive and gender-affirming care that is legal in California, regardless of their patient's geographic location, knowing that California is doing everything it can to protect them against the draconian laws of other states.

SB 345 will expand California's landmark protections in both reproductive health care and gender-affirming care by allowing California health care providers to:

- Prescribe and dispense medications for abortion and contraception that are safe to patients regardless of where the patient is located;
- Provide gender-affirming care and deliver that care regardless of where the patient is located; and
- Bring suit in California against anyone who interferes with the health care provider's right to provide care that is legal in California.

SB 345 would also prohibit any state or local official or contractor from co-operating with any out-of-state investigation into health care that is legally protected in California, including reproductive and gender-affirming care. It would also prevent the extradition of anyone who is in California for receiving or providing legally protected care if the care was initiated in California.

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

Support:

California Future of Abortion Council
ACCESS REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE
Black Women for Wellness Action Project (BWWAP)

California Coalition for Reproductive Freedom
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice (CLRJ)
Essential Access Health
NARAL Pro-Choice California
National Health Law Program
Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California
TEACH (Training in Early Abortion for Comprehensive Healthcare)
California Nurse-Midwives Association
Center for Reproductive Rights
Equality California
Essential Health Access, Los Angeles
Gender Spectrum
Planned Parenthood of California

Opposition:

Right to Life League