



STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Thursday, May 18, 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://sfhsa.zoom.us/j/83085932124?pwd=TkJ4ZWt0YkhVUTVNZXlpbm56WEhKdz09>

Meeting ID: 830 8593 2124 **Meeting Password:** 673673 **Join by Phone at**
+1 16692192599,,83085932124#,,,,*673673#

(Public Comment Instructions available on page 7)

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 April 12, 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 Human Services Agency

Presenter: Fiona McBride

AB 525 (Ting): Foster youth: supervised independent living placement housing supplement

Recommended Position: Support

To reduce placement instability and homelessness for youth in extended foster care, AB 525 would establish a Supervised Independent Living Placement (SILP) Housing Supplement, modeled after the Housing Supplement established in 2020 for the Transitional Housing Placement for Non-Minor Dependents.

SB 307 (Ashby): Middle Class Scholarship Program: community colleges: current and former foster youth

Recommended Position: Support

SB 307, jointly authored by Senate Majority Leader McGuire, seeks to make debt free college a reality for foster youth in California. To do this, SB 307 expands the Middle Class Scholarship (MCS) program to allow for foster youth enrolled in an associate's degree, transfer pathway, or certificate program at a community college or a four-year program at a CSU or UC to have 100% of their unmet need covered, including for books, food, and lodging, after other aid is applied.

SB 600 (Menjivar): California CalFresh Minimum Benefit Adequacy Act of 2023

Recommended Position: Support

SB 600 (Menjivar) would authorize the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to supplement the CalFresh minimum benefit.

Department of Public Health & San Francisco Human Services Agency

**Presenter: Max Gara

AB 1644 (Bonta): Medi-Cal: medically supportive food and nutrition services

Recommended Position: Support

This bill aims to directly address racial and ethnic health disparities, combat chronic disease, and reduce rates of food and nutrition insecurity among Medi-Cal enrollees by making medically supportive food and nutrition interventions a covered benefit under the Medi-Cal program.

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Presenter: Scott Ammon

AB 965 (Carrillo): Local government: broadband permit applications

Recommended Position: Oppose

This bill would require approval of multiple permits for wireless broadband pole attachment project sites as a batch solely on the basis that they are "substantially similar" in "equipment and general design, but not location." The bill would also require automatic approval of batches of multiple permits (regardless of the amount) if a response is not received by the applicant within 60 days.

The SFPUC recommends an oppose position for AB 965.

AB 1373 (Garcia): Energy

Recommended Position: Oppose unless amended

This bill would implement the Governor's energy budget trailer bill language to impose capacity payments on load serving entities (LSEs) which have not met their Resource Adequacy (RA) capacity requirement when the State's Strategic Reliability Reserve (SRR) is used. The bill would also establish a central procurement entity (CPE), requiring either an investor-owned utility (IOU) or the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to procure the energy resources needed to meet California's increasing electric load. The bill would permit voluntary participation for CPE procurement among publicly-owned electric utilities (POUs). Finally, AB 1373 would expand the CPUC's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) jurisdiction over community choice aggregators (CCAs).

The SFPUC recommends an oppose unless amended position for AB 1373.

Environment Department

Presenter: Kyle Wehner

SB 795 (Stern): Energy: building energy efficiency: heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning equipment sale registry and compliance tracking system: electronic statewide compliance documentation data repository

Recommended Position: Support if amended

SB 795 would require the California Energy Commission (CEC) to establish online systems to track sales of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment and compliance documents for building energy efficiency standards. The Environment Department asks that this bill be amended to explicitly include a compliance and sales registry for water-heating equipment to support BAAQMD's adopted amendments to Rule 9-6.

AB 1267 (Ting): Zero-emission vehicle incentive programs: gasoline superusers

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1267 would require the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to provide a "superuser" incentive for certain individuals to purchase zero-emissions vehicles (ZEVs). The bill would require CARB to develop and implement a strategy to identify drivers of low or moderate income who are gasoline superusers and expedite the replacement of their vehicles. The bill would require CARB to submit a report to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2025, and every two years thereafter, regarding ZEV incentive programs administered and their impact.

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Presenter: Kyra Geithman

AB 84 (Ward): Property Tax Welfare Exemption

Recommended Position: Support

AB 84 makes changes to the property tax welfare exemption for rental housing offered to lower-income families, including expanding the exemption to include vacant land and buildings under construction. This would apply to San Francisco's Preservation and Seismic Safety (PASS) Program and the Housing Preservation Program (HPP).

AB 346 (Quirk-Silva): Increase the Efficiency of State Low-Income Housing Tax Credit

Recommended Position: Support

AB 346 would make a number of changes to the State's California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (CDLAC) and California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) that would streamline the allocation of Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) used to fund the development of affordable housing and allow for reallocation of certain tax credits that in the past have been restricted to federally subsidized projects to be used for projects that are financed without tax-exempt bonds. MOHCD recommends supporting this legislation.

AB 1053 (Gabriel): Income tax credits: low-income housing: California Debt Limit Allocation Committee rulemaking

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1053 would allow for loans from the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to be issued during construction instead of waiting until permanent conversion for funds to come in. This will save on construction loan interest and origination fees for affordable housing projects in San Francisco.

SB 469 (Allen & Wiener): Removing Barriers to State-Funded Affordable Housing

Recommended Position: Support

SB 469 removes a critical barrier to the financing and construction of affordable housing by clarifying that the use of state affordable housing dollars does not trigger a requirement for voter approval under Article 34 of the California Constitution.

Department on the Status of Women

Presenter: Nazneen Rydhan-Foster

AB 1740 (Sanchez): Human Trafficking: notice: pediatric care facilities

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would require facilities providing pediatric services to post a notice of human trafficking resources in a visible place near the public entrance. The definition of a pediatric facility is a medical facility that provides medical services by any licensed physician to persons from birth to 21 years of age, including attendance at labor and delivery.

The bill has also been ordered to the consent calendar because there has been no opposition from both the Judiciary and Appropriate Committee parties. Items part of the consent calendar are generally non-controversial items that do not require much discussion.

Reentry Council

Presenter: Victoria Westbrook

AB 745 (Bonta & Bryan): Reentry Housing and Workforce Development Program

Recommended Position: Support

Assembly Bill 745 would provide competitive grants to counties, homeless Continuums of Care, and community-based nonprofits to fund housing and

reentry services and workforce development for people recently released from incarceration who are experiencing or at risk of falling into homelessness. Funding for this program will come from the General Fund and will be sustained by an additional budget request.

Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector

Presenter: Michelle Lau

AB 1266 (Kalra): End Debtor’s Prison Act

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would amend the penal and vehicle code to end bench warrants for minor infractions.

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/83085932124?pwd=TKJ4ZWt0YkhVUTVNZlplbm56WEhKdz09>

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: +1 669 900 6833 **Webinar ID:** 830 8593 2124
Passcode: 673673

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, 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 (Substitute: Tina Novero)
City Attorney's Office – Rebekah Krell
Controller's Office -- Calvin Quock
Treasurer's Office -- Eric Manke

AGENDA

Meeting commenced at 10:05 am.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Sarah Owens, Tina Novero, Kelly Groth, Rebekah Krell, Calvin Quock
Absent: Preston Kilgore (Absent at Roll Call. Joined Meeting during Item III. State Lobbyist Overview and Update.)

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

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Approve: Kelly Groth
Seconded by: Sarah Owens
Approved: 5-0

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

Presenter: Paul Yoder, 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 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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support AB 595: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Kelly Groth

Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support AB 441: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Rebekah Krell

Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support 37: Kelly Groth
Seconded by: Sarah Owens
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 657: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Calvin Quock
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 608: Kelly Groth
Seconded by: Rebekah Krell
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support AB 1057: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Tina Novero
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 618: Preston Kilgore
Seconded by: Tina Novero
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 366: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Tina Novero
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 386: Kelly Groth
Seconded by: Rebekah Krell
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 605: Preston Kilgore
Seconded by: Sarah Owens

Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support AB 361: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Calvin Quock

Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support SB 434: Preston Kilgore

Seconded by: Kelly Groth

Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 83: Kelly Groth
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Table SB 778: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 496: Preston Kilgore
Seconded by: Kelly Groth
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 1290: Kelly Groth
Seconded by: Sarah Owens
Approved: 6-0

Chair Sarah Owens called SB 253 and SB 261 together.

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support SB 253: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Kelly Groth

Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support SB 253: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Kelly Groth

Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support SB 511: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Tina Novero

Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support SB 707: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Tina Novero

Approved: 6-0

Department of Early Childhood

Presenter: Graham Dobson (Substitute: Jenny Lam)

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support AB 244: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Kelly Groth

Approved: 6-0

Chair Sarah Owens called AB 596 and SB 380 together.

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).

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support AB 596: Kelly Groth

Seconded by: Tina Novero

Approved: 6-0

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).

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support SB 380: Kelly Groth

Seconded by: Tina Novero

Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 635: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Tina Novero
Approved: 6-0

Department of Children Youth and Their Families

Presenter: Jasmine Dawson (Substitute: Sydney Nobles)

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 274: Preston Kilgore
Seconded by: Sarah Owens
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Table SB 287: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Kelly Groth
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 333: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore
Approved: 6-0

Chair Sarah Owens called AB 254, AB 576, AB 598, AB 710, AB 1194, SB 36, and SB 345 together.

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 254: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Kelly Groth
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 576: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Kelly Groth
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 598: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Kelly Groth
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 710: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Kelly Groth
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support AB 1194: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Kelly Groth
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment
Motion to Support SB 36: Sarah Owens
Seconded by: Kelly Groth
Approved: 6-0

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.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Motion to Support SB 345: Sarah Owens

Seconded by: Kelly Groth

Approved: 6-0

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 11:51 am.



State Legislation Proposal Form

Date Submitted	May 8, 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 525
Asm. Ting, District 19, Democrat
Foster youth: supervised independent living placement
housing supplement

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

To reduce placement instability and homelessness for youth in extended foster care, AB 525 would establish a Supervised Independent Living Placement (SILP) Housing Supplement, modeled after the Housing Supplement established in 2020 for the Transitional Housing Placement for Non-Minor Dependents.

Challenge

California is facing an affordability crisis, disproportionately impacting low-income Californians looking to secure housing. This is especially true for foster youth in extended foster care who participate in Supervised Independent Living Placements (SILP). Though foster youth in SILPs receive a monthly aid meant to cover living costs, the cost of housing has increased substantially since the SILP was established, and the basic rate provided to youth in these placements has not kept pace, leaving them vulnerable to housing instability.

Background/Analysis

When California extended foster care in 2010, it created the Supervised Independent Living Placement (SILP), designed for youth ages 18- 21. Unlike other foster care placements, youth in SILPs are responsible for identifying and securing their own housing, which can include apartments rented alone or with roommates. As of July 1, 2022, the SILP was the single-most utilized placement in California, with a total of 3,361 (41%) non-minor dependents.

Regardless of which county they reside in, everyone in SILPs receives a monthly rate of \$1,129, meant to cover living costs like rent, food, and supplies. However, since the program’s establishment, the basic rate has only increased by 41 percent, while over that same period, the cost of housing has increased by up to 113 percent in high-cost counties. For many youth, this inadequate monthly payment has left them unable to compete with other low-income Californians looking to secure housing and has impeded their ability to cover costs outside of rent. According to the CalYOUTH Study’s 2015 data, 40 percent of youth residing in SILPs reported their monthly budget was insufficient to cover rent and expenses such as utilities,

transportation, and food. Without adequate funding, the end result for many youth is a cycle of homelessness and falling deeper into poverty.

In 2020, California recognized the need to augment the monthly rate paid to foster youth in extended foster care by approving the establishment of a housing supplement for youth in Transitional Housing Placements for Non-Minor Dependents (AB 79, 2020). AB 525 would build on that work and extend that benefit for youth in SILPs 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.¹

Solution/Recommended Proposal

To reduce placement instability and homelessness for youth in extended foster care, AB 525 would establish a SILP Housing Supplement, modeled after the Housing Supplement established in 2020 for the Transitional Housing Placement for Non-Minor Dependents. The housing supplement would augment the Basic Rate paid for SILPs based on Fair Market Rent, which is the system developed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to determine the allowable rent level for individuals who participate in their Housing Choice Voucher program. The housing supplement would be calculated annually and would vary based on the cost of housing in each county

Departments Impacted & Why

HSH is not directly impacted but has been made aware of this bill and supports it.

Fiscal Impact

AB 525 is accompanied by a budget proposal of \$16.5 million (GF) in FY 2023-24 and ongoing to improve housing affordability and reduce homelessness among the more than 3,300 youth in extended foster care placed in Supervised Independent Living Placements (SILPs). This investment, which would establish a "SILP Housing Supplement," would draw down \$10.8 million in federal matching funds

Support

John Burton Advocates for Youth (Sponsor)	African American Wellness Center for Children & Families
California Alliance of Caregivers	Alameda County Office of Education
Children Now	Alliance for Children's Rights
Children's Law Center of California	Allies for Every Child Beyond Emancipation
County Of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors	California Alliance of Caregivers
County Welfare Directors Association of California (CWDA)	California Youth Connection (CYC)
First Place for Youth Grace Institute	Children Now
End Child Poverty in Ca	Children's Law Center of California
National Association of Social Workers California Chapter	Communities United For Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)
Think Of Us	Corporation for Supportive Housing

¹ 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.

Covenant House
California Creative Alternatives
Transitional Housing Program
Doing Good Works
Encompass Community Services
Transition Age Youth Services (TAY)
First Place for Youth
Foster Care Counts
Heritage Group Homes Inc.
Law Foundation of Silicon Valley
Scholarship Prep Charter School

MILPA (Motivating Individual Leadership for
Public Advancement)

Monterey County Office of Education
Foster Youth Services
National Association of Social Workers
California Chapter National Organization for
Women
Hollywood Chapter On The Move
Public Counsel
TAY Reedley College
Safe Place for Youth
San Diego Community College
District Santa Cruz
Barrios Unidos Inc.



State Legislation Proposal Form

Date Submitted	May 8, 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

SB 307

Sen. Ashby, District 8, Democrat

Middle Class Scholarship Program: community colleges: current and former foster youth

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 307, jointly authored by Senate Majority Leader McGuire, seeks to make debt free college a reality for foster youth in California. To do this, SB 307 expands the Middle Class Scholarship (MCS) program to allow for foster youth enrolled in an associate’s degree, transfer pathway, or certificate program at a community college or a four-year program at a CSU or UC to have 100% of their unmet need covered, including for books, food, and lodging, after other aid is applied.

Challenge

The MCS, while a major step towards addressing equity gaps in college access, falls short on serving the needs of foster youth. The MCS requires students to contribute towards the cost of attendance through work or savings. For many foster youth, who have neither an emotional or financial safety net in place, successfully balancing a full-time course load and part time work is not possible.

While the vision of the MCS is to one day enable all Californians to access debt-free higher education by covering student’s unmet need, the shortfalls of the program leave foster youth with an additional funding gap that continues to make higher education extremely inaccessible to these youth.

Background/Analysis

Children and youth enter foster care due to serious abuse and neglect. This trauma is often compounded by the instability they experience while in foster care, through placement and school changes. Together, these lead to poor educational outcomes, most notably low rates of college completion: in California, 93% of foster youth say they want to attend college, but only 4% of former foster youth will obtain their bachelor’s degree by 26, compared to 50% of the same age, non-foster youth.

California has been making strides to improve access to financial aid for foster youth, but more can be done. Currently, California offers the Chafee Grant Program, which provides up to \$5,000 annually to eligible foster youth, as well as a \$6,000 Cal Grant award for non-tuition costs. However,

even with these investments, the state's financial aid program has not kept pace with significant increases to the cost of living for students, and foster youth are among those hit hardest by this disparity.

Recognizing the college affordability crisis that impacts college students more broadly, the state revamped the Middle Class Scholarship (MCS) in 2021 to become the first state financial aid program for which award amounts are linked to students unmet need, including non-tuition costs such as housing, food, and transportation.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Building upon the Governor's vision for debt-free college for all students, SB 307 would establish the Fostering Futures program within the existing MCS program to do the following for foster youth:

- Expand eligibility to foster youth enrolled in an associate's degree, transfer pathway, or certificate program at a community college
- Remove the student contribution requirement towards the cost of attendance
- Cover 100% of remaining unmet need after other federal, state, and institutional aid
- Allow students to participate regardless of high school performance

4,317 students are anticipated to be eligible for the Fostering Futures program across the CSU, UC and CCC systems.

Completion of a four-year degree, while a major milestone, does not mark the end of a foster youth scholar's journey, but rather a new beginning. SB 307 serves to both increase the likelihood that foster youth can reach their educational goals and also better prepare them to enter the next stage of their lives, whether that involves pursuing an advanced degree or entering directly into their chosen career path, by providing the opportunity to begin their next chapter debt-free from higher education

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

To fully fund the Fostering Futures program would cost **\$21.8 million** annually. The cost of this bill is a factor of the number of students who are expected to qualify for the program and the average amount of funding each student will receive. SB 307 proposes to utilize existing funding allocated for the Middle Class Scholarship (MCS) by first fully funding foster youth and then disbursing the remaining funding to non-foster youth students.

Support

John Burton Advocates for Youth (Sponsor); 3rd Street Youth Center & Clinic A Better Way, INC.; Alameda County Office of Education; Aspiranet; Associated Students of Pasadena; City College Barstow Community College; Berkeley; Hope Scholars; Beyond Emancipation; Butte College; Inspiring Scholars; California Alliance of Caregivers; California Chamber of Commerce; California Charter Schools Association (CCSA); California Court Appointed Special Advocate; Association California Professional Firefighters; California State University; Dominguez Hills - Toro Guardian Scholars Program; California Teachers Association; Casa Pacifica Centers for Children and Families; Cerritos College; Children Now - Child Welfare Children Youth & Family Collaborative; Children's Advocacy Institute; Children's Institute; Children's Legal Services of San Diego; Cuesta

College - Financial Aid Doing Good Works; Family Services; East Bay Leadership Council; Network of Northern California; California Alliance; First Place for Youth Foster Care Counts; Foster Youth Services; At College of The Desert Haven of Hope; Jovenes, INC.; Mary Graham Children's Foundation; Merced County Independent Living Program; Monterey County Office of Education - Foster Youth Services; Mt. San Antonio College; Reach Guardian Scholars; National Association of Social Workers; California Chapter Natomas; Unified School District; Health & Human Services San Diego City College; California Sonoma County - Family Youth & Children's Services; Students Rising Above; Sycamores Child & Family Services; Transition Age Youth Housing; Together We Rise—among others.



State Legislation Proposal Form

Date Submitted	April 28, 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

SB 600

Sen. Menjivar, District 20, Democrat

California CalFresh Minimum Benefit Adequacy Act of 2023

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 600 (Menjivar) would authorize the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to supplement the CalFresh minimum benefit.

Background/Analysis

More than five million CalFresh participants are facing a hunger cliff – due to both high food inflation (9.5% between February 2022 and 2023) 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. As a result of these policies and expansion of other safety net programs during the pandemic, the rate of residents living in poverty went down in fall 2021.

As of April 2023, 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, far from adequate to cover the average \$415 a family of two needs for a month’s groceries.

In San Francisco, approximately 70,000 CalFresh households — more than 96,000 residents — 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 and \$517 per month. The neighborhoods with the largest share of CalFresh recipients are the low-income southeastern portions of the City, which also have higher populations of people of color.

Challenge

Even before the pandemic, one in four San Franciscans were at risk of hunger. Inflationary pressures and ongoing economic fallout, particularly among the lowest income residents, have only exacerbated this crisis. San Francisco residents are not alone. Californians with low income across the state cannot make ends meet, and the state’s high cost of living is not taken into consideration when the federal minimum benefit is determined:

- Research demonstrates that current CalFresh benefits do not provide enough money for families to meet the USDA’s nutrition and dietary guidelines.¹
- 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 household.²
- As of early 2022, one of every ten adults in California reported that they struggled to consistently put enough food on their table.³
- 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.⁴
- Fifty percent of children in California receive CalFresh by the time they are six.⁵ Young children are at risk of hunger and poverty as a result of the decrease in benefits.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Increasing the minimum benefit from \$23 to \$50 will partially offset the loss in benefits from the end of emergency allotments, and ensure the program better reflects the state’s high cost of living. This policy solution aligns with the recommendation from the White House Conference on Hunger, Nutrition, and Health to address food insecurity brought on by the loss of emergency allotments. It also follows the policy lead of other states like New Jersey and Massachusetts that are working to support CalFresh clients after the end of emergency allotments. It will be a helpful support especially for older adults and those on fixed incomes, who are hardest hit by inflation. Increasing the minimum allotment is crucial to ensure individuals and families avoid hunger.

Departments Impacted & Why

CDSS would need to establish the CalFresh Minimum Nutrition Benefit (MNB) Program by January 1, 2025. The department must provide the MNB of \$50 to all eligible households once an appropriation is received for this purpose.

Fiscal Impact

TBD pending analysis by the fiscal committee.

Support / Opposition

California Association of Food Banks, GRACE/End Child Poverty, Hunger Action LA, and Nourish California are sponsors. Anti-hunger organizations and county agencies are likely to support the bill.

¹ 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.

² 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/>.

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

⁵ Danielson, Caroline and Tess Thorman. “The Role of CalFresh in Stabilizing Family Incomes.” (September 2022) Public Policy Institute of California, 3. <https://www.ppic.org/?show-pdf=true&docaptor=true&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ppic.org%2Fpublication%2Fthe-role-of-calfresh-in-stabilizing-family-incomes%2F>.



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	May 5, 2023
Submitting Department	Department of Public Health & SFHSA
Contact Name	Max Gara; 415-554-2621
Contact Email and Phone Number	Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org Susie.smith@sfgov.org
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 1644

Asm. Bonta; District 18, Democrat

Medically Supportive Food and Nutrition Services

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill aims to directly address racial and ethnic health disparities, combat chronic disease, and reduce rates of food and nutrition insecurity among Medi-Cal enrollees by making medically supportive food and nutrition interventions a covered benefit under the Medi-Cal program.

Background/Analysis

In 2017, an estimated 115,190 San Franciscans, or 13.3 percent of the City’s population, were identified as food insecure. The COVID-19 pandemic has only exacerbated racial health disparities, and the rates of food and nutrition insecurity have hit crisis levels. Too many San Franciscans, particularly San Franciscans of color, are living with largely preventable chronic conditions. Adequate food and nutrition are a fundamental part of preventing and treating chronic conditions and can significantly improve a patient’s quality of life and health status while also reducing healthcare costs.

Focusing on preventative care may help Medi-Cal beneficiaries avoid chronic conditions before they start. At San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH), addressing food security and diet related conditions is a high priority issue. SFDPH currently offers food pharmacies at five of its adult primary care clinics, and partners with nonprofit organizations to connect patients to other programs such as produce prescriptions and medically tailored meals. Through the food pharmacy program, clinic staff refer patients to “fill” prescriptions for healthy groceries weekly, paired with interactive nutrition education, cooking demonstrations, cooking toolkits, on-site hypertension management by clinicians, health coaching, and effective referrals to local food resources. Evaluations from similar programs show improved health and reduced avoidable healthcare spending.

Under the California Advancing and Innovating Medi-Cal (CalAIM) initiative, Medi-Cal managed care plans can elect to cover Community Supports such as medically supportive food and nutrition (MSF&N) services. Both of San Francisco’s Medi-Cal managed care plans, SF

Health Plan and Anthem, will be providing coverage of MSF&N services for Medi-Cal beneficiaries.

Challenge

Under Medi-Cal rules, Community Supports, like MSF&N, must be medically appropriate and cost-effective (i.e., a cost-benefit calculation is imposed on the provision of services), which can limit the scope of what is covered and who is eligible. Making MSF&N services a benefit under Medi-Cal, versus a Community Support, would result in broader eligibility for the service and ensure the benefit continues after the Community Support services expire at the end of 2026.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Under AB 1644, medically supportive food and nutrition (MSF&N) interventions would be added as a covered benefit under the Medi-Cal program, upon issuance of final guidance by the Department of Health Care Services, on or before July 1, 2026.

The bill would require:

- Require the spectrum of medically supportive food and nutrition interventions to include medically tailored meals, medically supportive meals, food pharmacies, medically tailored groceries, medically supportive groceries, produce prescriptions and nutrition supports when paired with food provision.
- Require interventions be covered when determined to be medically necessary by a health care provider or health plan, for a minimum of 12 weeks. The bill would also establish the Medically Supportive Food and Nutrition Benefit Committee to assist the department in developing final guidance.

San Francisco already has a robust network of medically supportive food and nutrition providers who offer these interventions, often funded via philanthropic dollars. Coverage of these interventions by health insurers offers a pathway to permanent funding and the promise of better integration of food-based interventions into healthcare delivery, both of which are critical to the potential of these interventions to improve health and advance health equity.

This bill will ensure the medically supportive food and nutrition services provided via CalAIM through San Francisco Health Plan and Anthem (the city's two managed care plans) will continue and potentially be expanded to reach more patients once it expires on January 1, 2027. Medi-Cal coverage of these interventions leverages state and federal dollars and ensures greater sustainability of programs already improving the health of many low-income San Franciscans.

Departments Impacted & Why

SFHN healthcare providers under DPH, and potentially staff at other relevant city departments such as HSA and HSH, will have the opportunity to refer Medi-Cal beneficiaries to medically supportive food and nutrition interventions, providing a critical opportunity to address health disparities and food insecurity.

Fiscal Impact

This bill would not impose a direct cost to San Francisco. There will be a state budget request for FY 25/26 for DHCS to establish the Benefit Committee and develop guidance. In FY 26/27 there would be a budget request for the state's share of the cost of the benefit.

Support / Opposition

Food As Medicine Collaborative (cosponsor)
SPUR (cosponsor) and 50+ other organizations.

No public 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	5/4/2023
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

AB 965
Asm. Carrillo, District 39, Democrat
Local government: broadband permit applications.

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would require approval of multiple permits for wireless broadband pole attachment project sites as a batch solely on the basis that they are “substantially similar” in “equipment and general design, but not location.” The bill would also require automatic approval of batches of multiple permits (regardless of the amount) if a response is not received by the applicant within 60 days.

The SFPUC recommends an oppose position for AB 965.

Background/Analysis

Existing state and federal law establishes shot clocks for approval of broadband project site permits. AB 1027 (2011) requires public utilities to provide a response within 45 days of receiving a permit request and 60 days for batches of 300 or more poles. Similarly, the 2018 Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Small Cell Order reduced the shot clock for approving or denying applications for installation of small wireless facilities on existing infrastructure from 90 to 60 days.

In recent years, the SFPUC and the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) have opposed numerous bills supported by the telecommunications industry that would have advanced industry interests at the expense of the public. In 2022, CCSF adopted an Oppose Unless Amended position for SB 717 (Dodd), which required the California Department of Technology to develop a report identifying the barriers to and opportunities for broadband deployment in underserved communities. CCSF and the SFPUC expressed concerns that the study’s narrow focus on regulatory barriers presumed that local permitting costs and approval timeframes are the primary challenges to investment in rural and disadvantaged communities. CCSF and the SFPUC recommended amendments to broaden the study’s scope to consider the impact of industry decisions including the perception of carriers that investment in such communities would not yield sufficient revenue to justify deployment. In September 2022, the bill was signed into law by the Governor without the City’s amendments.

In 2021, the SFPUC coordinated with the Mayor's Office to lobby against SB 556 (Dodd) which aimed to align state law with the 2018 FCC Order interpreting federal law to limit the amount of license fees that state and local governments can impose on carriers for use of their vertical infrastructure (e.g. utility poles) and would have required local governments to (1) make streetlight and traffic poles available to carriers for placing "small cell" facilities, (2) limit the amount that local governments can charge carriers for using these assets, and (3) place time limits on local governments for processing applications. The bill was vetoed by the Governor in October 2021.

In 2017, the SFPUC opposed SB 649 (Hueso) which would have eliminated local governments' authority to regulate the size, appearance, location, and quantity of cellular infrastructure sited on public property while capping licensing fees at \$250 per utility pole per year (a significant reduction from the then annual fee of \$4,000 per pole). CCSF also adopted an oppose position as did many other local governments. SB 649 was vetoed by the Governor in October 2017.

Challenge

The SFPUC is concerned with AB 965 for several reasons. First, the bill's requirement to approve multiple permits as a batch on the basis of vague and overarching language has the potential to undermine City departments' ability to effectively review safety issues specific to each application. This concern is exacerbated by the requirement to automatically approve application batches (regardless of size) after 60 days if a response is not received by the applicant.

Additionally, the imposition of a 60 day shot clock to approve batches of unquantified amounts may create an administrative review burden for departments. Moreover, departments such as the SFPUC, which allow wireless facilities on their poles, are responsible for inspecting existing conduits and electrical inputs to ensure they can handle additional load. The bill would circumvent this critical review. Finally, the bill would create confusion due to existing and overlapping permit processes established by AB 1027 (2011) and the 2018 FCC Order.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The SFPUC recommends an oppose position for AB 965.

Departments Impacted & Why

This bill would apply to both the SFPUC and MTA as both departments allow wireless facilities on their vertical infrastructure. The bill would also apply to DPW which issues permits for wireless facilities on PG&E's poles and excavation permits for underground facilities. AB 965 would also impact the Port which issues permits for infrastructure on its property.

Fiscal Impact

The fiscal impact on City departments of this bill is unknown. However, the bill's imposition of a shot clock and requirement to approve batches containing any volume of applications may result in additional costs related to staff time to meet these new requirements.

Support / Opposition

Support

Bay Area Council
Calbroadband
Calchamber
California Apartment Association
California Broadband & Video Association
California Building Industry Association
California Business Properties Association

California Chamber of Commerce
California Wireless Association
Consolidated Communications
Crown Castle
Crown Castle and Its Affiliates
CTIA
Frontier Communications Corporation
Pcia - the Wireless Infrastructure Association
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
San Mateo County Economic Development Association
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
United States Telecom Association DbA Ustelecom - the Broadband Association
Wireless Infrastructure Association

Oppose

California Municipal Utilities Association
California State Association of Counties
League of California Cities
Rural County Representatives of California



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	5/4/2023
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

AB 1373
Asm. Garcia, District 36, Democrat
Energy

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED OTHER
 & Describe

Summary

This bill would implement the Governor’s energy budget trailer bill language to impose capacity payments on load serving entities (LSEs) which have not met their Resource Adequacy (RA) capacity requirement when the State’s Strategic Reliability Reserve (SRR) is used. The bill would also establish a central procurement entity (CPE), requiring either an investor-owned utility (IOU) or the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to procure the energy resources needed to meet California’s increasing electric load. The bill would permit voluntary participation for CPE procurement among publicly-owned electric utilities (POUs). Finally, AB 1373 would expand the CPUC’s Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) jurisdiction over community choice aggregators (CCAs).

The SFPUC recommends an oppose unless amended position for AB 1373.

Background/Analysis

Existing law requires the CPUC and the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) to establish RA requirements for LSEs (Public Utilities Code § 380). The CPUC assesses penalties to LSEs who are deficient in meeting their RA capacity requirements. Existing law also requires LSEs to submit an IRP to the CPUC to help ensure each LSE is contributing to a diverse, clean, and reliable energy supply.

Challenge

The SFPUC is concerned with AB 1373 for several reasons. The bill’s proposed capacity payment penalty mechanism would penalize LSEs who are making good faith efforts to procure capacity despite a shortage of RA supply available in the market. The proposed penalty is incremental to penalties currently assessed by the CPUC and would further increase rates for ratepayers while failing to address the barriers to building and interconnecting new generating capacity in California. Relatedly, the proposed scope of the CPE may further exacerbate tight RA market conditions.

Additionally, AB 1373's proposal to grant the CPUC expanded IRP jurisdiction by making CCAs subject to the "same requirements... that apply to electrical corporations" would undermine CCAs' local control and procurement autonomy. This expanded jurisdiction will not help improve electric reliability or advance California's progress towards meeting its clean energy goals. Expanded CPUC-IRP jurisdiction will also interfere with CCAs' ability to keep rates low for their customers.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The SFPUC recommends an oppose unless amended position for AB 1373.

Departments Impacted & Why

This bill would impact the SFPUC. In particular, AB 1373 would affect San Francisco's CCA and POU, CleanPowerSF and Hetch Hetchy Power respectively, which are responsible for procuring power (including RA capacity) on behalf of their customers. The bill would undermine our ability to provide clean affordable power by subjecting CleanPowerSF and Hetch Hetchy Power to tighter RA market conditions, increased procurement costs, and expanded CPUC oversight.

Fiscal Impact

The fiscal impact on City departments of this bill is unknown. However, the bill's proposed capacity payment penalty mechanism and expansion of the CPUC's IRP jurisdiction may lead to increased procurement costs for LSEs, including the SFPUC's CCA and POU, CleanPowerSF and Hetch Hetchy Power. As a result, the bill would result in higher rates for San Francisco ratepayers.

Support / Opposition

Support

American Clean Power Association
California Wind Energy Association
Environment California
Offshore Wind California

Oppose Unless Amended

Alliance for Retail Energy Markets
California Community Choice Association
California Municipal Utilities Association
Clean Power Alliance
Marin Clean Energy (MCE)
National Parks Conservation Association
San Jose Clean Energy
Sonoma Clean Power



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	May 8, 2023
Submitting Department	Environment Department
Contact Name	Sylvan Ludewigt
Contact Email and Phone Number	Sylvan.ludrewigt@sfgov.org ; (415) 355-3775
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kyle Wehner
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 795

Sen. Stern, District 27, Democrat

Energy: building energy efficiency: heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning equipment sale registry and compliance tracking system: electronic statewide compliance documentation data repository

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 795 would require the California Energy Commission (CEC) to establish online systems to track sales of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment and compliance documents for building energy efficiency standards. The Environment Department asks that this bill be amended to explicitly include a compliance and sales registry for water-heating equipment to support BAAQMD’s adopted amendments to Rule 9-6.

Background/Analysis

Existing law establishes the CEC’s authority to adopt regulations for building energy and water efficiency standards as well as appliance efficiency standards. Existing building codes require completion of compliance documents and testing to demonstrate that installations are correctly installed and result in energy and water savings. Enforcement is carried out by local building officials.

Recent relevant laws include SB 49 (2019), which expanded the CEC’s authority to create efficiency standards to promote appliances with flexible demand capabilities; SB 1414 (2016), which required the CEC to create a plan to promote building code compliance for HVAC and heat pump installations; and AB 2021 (2006), which required the CEC to create a plan to improve HVAC energy efficiency and reduce air conditioners’ peak electricity demands.

Challenge

HVAC systems consume large quantities of energy and are responsible for a significant share of greenhouse gas emissions from buildings. There is currently no unifying strategy to address and reduce energy demands of HVAC systems in California.

In 2011, the CEC updated the California Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan to set a goal that “90% of HVAC systems are installed to code and optimally maintained for systems’ useful life.” At that time, the CEC

found that only 10% of HVAC installations met permitting requirements. Since then, the state has failed to meet this goal, with only 8-29% of installations satisfying permitting requirements as of 2017. This bill will help the CEC and CPUC collect and maintain more information about the efficiency of HVAC systems.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 795 will create an online tracking system that collects and stores compliance, installation, and acceptance test documentation data for California's building energy efficiency standards. Local building officials will now be able to review compliance, installation, and acceptance test documentation data for each construction and upgrade project in their jurisdiction and verify whether all requirements have been met. A statewide HVAC sales and installation compliance registry will ensure that compliant systems are installed during replacement projects and deter the sale of non-compliant equipment in California.

These registries will be an important tool in promoting compliance with local and regional requirements, including [BAAQMD's recently adopted amendments to Rule 9-4 and Rule 9-6](#). These standards require HVAC and water-heating equipment sold and installed in the Bay Area to meet zero NOx requirements and use a compliance date range (2027 to 2031) based on equipment type and capacity.

Departments Impacted & Why

The Department of Building Inspection would be the primary enforcement agency for these new registries.

Fiscal Impact

This bill will have no impact on the San Francisco General Fund. The CEC will be responsible for determining a funding source for the tracking systems. SB 795 also requires the CEC to make a good faith effort to secure funding for the systems, including eligible federal funding sources.

Support/Opposition

Supported by:

- 350 Sacramento and Humboldt
- AIM Associates
- American Institute of Architects California
- Building Electrification Institute
- California Building Industry Association
- California Building Officials
- California Environmental Voters
- California State Pipe Trades Council
- Carbon Zero Buildings, Inc.
- Earthjustice
- Indivisible Sacramento
- Natural Resources Defense Council (Sponsor)
- Rewiring America
- Rocky Mountain Institute
- San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility
- Sierra Club
- Western States Council of Sheet Metal Workers (Sponsor)
- Wooley Energy & Environment

Opposed by:

- None 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	May 8, 2023
Submitting Department	Environment Department
Contact Name	Henna Trewn
Contact Email and Phone Number	Henna.Trewn@sfgov.org (415) 355-5009
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 1267
Asm. Ting, District 19, Democrat
Zero-emission vehicle incentive programs: gasoline superusers

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 1267 would require the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to provide a “superuser” incentive for certain individuals to purchase zero-emissions vehicles (ZEVs). The bill would require CARB to develop and implement a strategy to identify drivers of low or moderate income who are gasoline superusers and expedite the replacement of their vehicles. The bill would require CARB to submit a report to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2025, and every two years thereafter, regarding ZEV incentive programs administered and their impact.

Background/Analysis

Existing law designates CARB as the state agency with the primary responsibility for controlling vehicular air pollution. Existing law establishes various incentive programs, which are administered or funded by CARB, to provide financial assistance for the purchase of ZEVs.

Challenge

While California offers a variety of ZEV incentive programs, ZEV adoption has been slow among the biggest gasoline users (“superusers”). Many superusers are below the median income and cannot afford to live near their workplaces and therefore spends a greater share of their income on fuel. In addition, rural areas of the state have twice as many superusers per capita as urban areas. According to Coltura, a sponsor of AB 1267, the average gasoline superuser uses 1,260 gallons per year compared to non-superusers, who use an average of 354 gallons per year.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

By offering financial incentives specific to lower-income gasoline superusers, AB 1267 will maximize investments to reduce gasoline consumption and greenhouse gas emissions efficiently and equitably. AB 1267 recommends that CARB limit the incentive to drivers who use an average of 700 gallons of gasoline per year.

Departments Impacted & Why

AB 1267 would create a new ZEV incentive program at CARB, which would be responsible for administering, tracking, and adjusting the incentive. The Environment Department will want to share

information on the incentive via its San Francisco Clean Cities Coalition program and other awareness-building campaigns, once available.

Fiscal Impact

AB 1267 will be implemented by CARB and will not have a fiscal impact on the City and County of San Francisco.

Support/Opposition

Supported by:

- California Interfaith Power & Light
- Coltura Elders Climate Action, NorCal and SoCal Chapters
- Fossil Free Mid-Peninsula
- Plug in America
- Rapid Substitution
- Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action
- Zev 2030

Opposed by:

- None 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	5/8/2023
Submitting Department	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
Contact Name	Kyra Geithman
Contact Email and Phone Number	kyra.geithman@sfgov.org (628) 652-5835
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kyra Geithman
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

AB 84
Asm. Ward, District 78, Democrat
Property Tax Welfare Exemption

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 84 makes changes to the property tax welfare exemption for rental housing offered to lower-income families, including expanding the exemption to include vacant land and buildings under construction. This would apply to San Francisco's Preservation and Seismic Safety (PASS) Program and the Housing Preservation Program (HPP).

Background/Analysis

Article XIII, Section 4(b) of the California Constitution authorizes the Legislature to exempt property used exclusively for religious, hospital, or charitable purposes, as specified, from taxation. The Legislature has implemented this "welfare exemption" in the Revenue and Tax Code, Section 214.

In 1988, the Legislature amended this section to specifically exempt low-income housing developments operated by non-profit organizations. Generally, to qualify for the welfare exemption, the law requires that the rental housing be financed with specified tax-exempt bonds, government loans, or grants, or that the property's owner receives federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) under Internal Revenue Code (IRC) Section 42. The welfare exemption extends to "units serving lower income households." It does not, however, immediately extend this exemption upon acquisition, whether it is undeveloped land that is deed-restricted for 100% affordable housing or the acquisition of a building to be preserved as 100% affordable housing, before construction has begun.

San Francisco's Housing Preservation Program known as the Small Sites Program (SSP), is an acquisition and rehabilitation subsidy loan program for existing, typically rent-controlled, buildings. The program was created to protect and establish long-term affordable housing in properties throughout San Francisco that are particularly vulnerable to market pressure resulting in property sales, increased evictions, and rising tenant rents. In the face of this increasing pressure on tenants, the City developed the program in 2014 to support non-profit and for-profit entities to successfully remove these sites from the market and restrict them for the long-term.

In 2015, 74% of San Francisco voters approved Proposition A, a \$310 million general obligation affordable housing bond. Then in 2016, 76% of voters approved Proposition C to repurpose \$260.7 million in unused bond capacity to fund the Preservation and Seismic Safety Program (PASS). The repurposed bond capacity originated from the Seismic Safety Loan Program (SSLP), which was passed by the voters in 1992 Proposition A. The SSLP provided low-cost financing for property owners to perform seismic retrofits after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. The 2016 approval to expand the eligible uses of the SSLP has resulted in the development of the PASS Program. The first PASS loan closed in May 2019.

To date, these acquisition and preservation programs have deployed over \$217 million in funding to preserve 50 projects with 39 commercial spaces, and 519 residential units for low and moderate-income households.

Since the introduction of the PASS program in 2019, nearly all new SSP projects have been financed with senior loans from PASS and subsidy loans from SSP. The PASS program complements and enhances MOHCD's ongoing anti-displacement and preservation work under the SSP Program by replacing more expensive conventional debt with low-cost, long-term PASS financing.

Challenge

Since the SSP's inception in 2014 and the PASS Program's in 2019, a core factor in the City issuing financing has been whether the requested financing amount does not exceed a maximum subsidy per unit amount. The program guidelines were formally updated in 2022 to establish maximum City subsidies per unit, although projects exceeding maximum base funding may be eligible subject to meeting minimum scoring criteria and or Director approval.

Since these properties are not immediately eligible for a welfare exemption upon purchasing a property to make it permanently affordable, project sponsors have to provide funding to pay property taxes while their application for an exemption is under review. This results in increased subsidy amounts from the City, and puts a potential PASS or SSP project at risk of exceeding the maximum subsidy per unit amount stipulated in program guidelines.

Additionally, when the City acquires undeveloped land and restricts it via deed to be developed for 100% affordable housing, the City must go through a public procurement process to identify a project developer that can design, construct, and operate the development. During this process, the City can incur costs due to the property taxes owed. This increased cost, in addition to the costs incurred to maintain security and safety at the site, can often deter the City from acquiring the land to begin with.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 84 facilitates greater access to the welfare exemption by reducing the cost of development of affordable housing and provides more certainty by making the eligibility criteria permanent. By ensuring that non-profit affordable rental housing organizations are immediately eligible for this welfare tax exemption, the reduced costs that would come from not having to subsidize for unnecessary tax payments prior to construction start date would benefit not just the developments but also the State and local jurisdictions, which currently fund the added costs.

Departments Impacted & Why

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) would see the greatest impact. MOHCD oversees the PASS and SSP programs and has provided financing for non-profit affordable rental housing organizations to pay unnecessary taxes while the organizations apply for the tax exemption. This would also reduce the administrative burden on MOHCD and its affordable housing partners by eliminating a tedious and unnecessary application process.

Fiscal Impact

In FY21-22, MOHCD made loans totaling approximately \$33.8 million to assist a nonprofit acquire and rehabilitate seven properties with four commercial spaces and 56 residential units under its acquisition and preservation programs, including the Small Sites Program and the Preservation and Seismic Safety Program. Through AB 84, costs would be reduced due to the lack of need to pay property taxes during the pre-construction phase; these reduced costs would allow for the City to be more nimble in working with property owners to permanently preserve their properties as affordable housing.

Support / Opposition

The California State Board of Equalization strongly supports AB 84. Other entities that support AB 84 include the Association of Bay Area Governments, of which San Francisco is a member, the California Housing Partnership Corporation, and the San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund. The only two organizations that have filed opposition are the League of California Cities and the Santa Clara County Assessor.



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	5/8/2023
Submitting Department	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
Contact Name	Kyra Geithman
Contact Email and Phone Number	kyra.geithman@sfgov.org (628) 652-5835
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kyra Geithman
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 346

Asm. Quirk-Silva, Asm. District 67, D

Increase the Efficiency of State Low-Income Housing Tax Credits

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 346 would make a number of changes to the State's California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (CDLAC) and California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) that would streamline the allocation of Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) used to fund the development of affordable housing and allow for reallocation of certain tax credits that in the past have been restricted to federally subsidized projects to be used for projects that are financed without tax-exempt bonds. MOHCD recommends supporting this legislation.

Background/Analysis

In San Francisco and throughout the state, almost all new affordable rental housing is financed with federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). The federal LIHTC program enables affordable housing developers to raise financing through the allocation of tax benefits to investors. The California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) administers the program and awards credits to qualified developers who can then sell those credits to private investors who use the credits to reduce their federal tax liability. The developer in turn invests the capital into the affordable housing project.

Federal credits come in two forms, known as 9% and 4% credits. The 9% credit is generally reserved for new construction, and each state receives an annual ceiling of 9% credits. The 4% credit can be claimed for rehabilitation or new construction, but a developer is only eligible for 4% credits if they finance at least 50% of the development's cost with tax-exempt bonds. There is no annual ceiling for 4% credits, but the funding provided through tax-exempt private activity bonds is limited; the current ceiling is \$4.68 billion. Additionally, tax-exempt bonds are allocated by a separate entity, the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (CDLAC). In order to make any changes to its rules and regulations, CDLAC must meet the procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), which CTCAC is not required to do.

In 2022, \$260,154,576 was allocated to 6 projects representing 575 new units of affordable housing in San Francisco. Simply put, these projects would not have been possible without these allocations.

In 1987, the Legislature authorized a state LIHTC program to augment the federal tax credit program. These "enhanced" state tax credits can only be awarded to projects that have also received, or are concurrently receiving, an allocation of federal 4% LIHTC. In 2019, AB 101 was signed into law, providing an additional \$500 million in these "enhanced" state LIHTCs, subject to appropriation.

Challenge

Prior to AB 101 in 2019, authorizing the additional \$500 million in state LIHTC, the State was not reaching its tax-exempt bond ceiling (at the time, approximately \$4 billion), meaning that developers were not utilizing the federal 4% tax credits. AB 101 encouraged developers to fully utilize remaining tax-exempt private activity bond financing by limiting the allocation of these state LIHTCs to projects that have also received, or were concurrently receiving, an allocation of federal 4% LIHTC.

Since 2019, because state and local jurisdictions have been allocating more funding to affordable housing construction, more developers started applying for the tax-exempt bonds to ensure their projects were financially feasible. As a result, tax-exempt bonds became oversubscribed. CDLAC instituted a competitive process for awarding the private activity bonds, which negatively impacted San Francisco; in the first round of funding, no affordable housing projects in San Francisco were awarded any bond allocations.

While CDLAC worked with San Francisco and other jurisdictions to make changes to its competitive process for subsequent rounds, the concern remains that, given the State's efforts to hold jurisdictions throughout California accountable for meeting their affordable housing requirements, these state LIHTCs will continue to be oversubscribed, which will negatively impact developments in San Francisco that are competing for this funding.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 346 proposes changes to CTCAC and CDLAC regulations that would streamline the allocation of LIHTCs. Most relevant to San Francisco would be allowing CDLAC to be more nimble in implementing changes to its regulations by removing the requirement for regulation changes to go through the APA process. This would result in a reduction in the overall length of time to make regulatory changes in response to feedback from local jurisdictions like San Francisco.

Additionally, AB 346 proposes expanding the eligible uses of the state's LIHTC credits to include projects that also receive federal 9% credits. While San Francisco has a smaller allocation of the federal 9% credit allocation, because more projects would be eligible for the state's LIHTC credits, there could be reduced competition for private-activity tax-exempt bonds, which means San Francisco's projects would be more competitive for that funding and thus for federal 4% tax credits.

Departments Impacted & Why

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) would see significant positive impact. MOHCD supports developers as they apply for various funding sources for affordable housing projects. This includes applying for LIHTC and private activity bond allocations. This streamlined process would require less staff time for supporting these applications, and potentially reduce timelines for developments to break ground and open. Additionally, if more

projects are eligible to receive State LIHTC, and thus demand for private activity bonds decreases, this could result in more State funding for affordable housing projects, meaning MOHCD can leverage its local funding more effectively.

Fiscal Impact

San Francisco allocated more than \$184 million in funding for affordable housing construction and rehabilitation in FY 2021-2022. Through AB 346, more projects would be eligible to receive State LIHTC, and thus demand for private activity bonds would decrease. This would result in reduced local costs for the City to spend on gap loan funding to ensure projects can close on time.

Support / Opposition

The California Housing Partnership is a co-sponsor of AB 346. A broad range of affordable housing advocates have registered support for AB 346, including the San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund and MidPen Housing Corporation, which have both partnered with the City to develop multiple affordable housing construction and rehabilitation/renovation projects. There is no formal opposition on file as of 5/8/2023.



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	5/8/2023
Submitting Department	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
Contact Name	Kyra Geithman
Contact Email and Phone Number	kyra.geithman@sfgov.org (628) 652-5835
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kyra Geithman
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 1053

Asm. Gabriel, District 46, Democrat

Income tax credits: low-income housing: California Debt Limit Allocation

Committee rulemaking

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 1053 would allow for loans from the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to be issued during construction instead of waiting until permanent conversion for funds to come in. This will save on construction loan interest and origination fees for affordable housing projects in San Francisco.

Background/Analysis

In San Francisco, more than half of funding for affordable housing construction comes from State funding programs, including multiple programs administered by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) that provide loans to developers to rehabilitate, preserve, or construct affordable rental housing that are structured as permanent financing. Developers receive an award of funding based on a proposed project and use that commitment to secure a construction loan to start construction.

State law is silent on whether HCD makes its loan funds available during the construction phase of a project or only during conversion to permanent financing. As a matter of practice, HCD has chosen the latter.

Challenge

A significant obstacle in delivering affordable housing is the high costs incurred throughout the process. This includes the amount of interest owed by a project sponsor as a project waits to begin construction. Rising interest rates have meant that project sponsors are owing more, and these costs are more often than not being carried by local governments. The longer that a project has to wait to begin construction, the more that is owed in interest. This often results in increased costs of hundreds of thousands of dollars per project and as high as \$14 million in one project, meaning cities like San Francisco have to commit millions each year to support multiple projects facing this challenge.

In a time of high and/or rising interest rates, like the current period, these expenses can create serious financing challenges or even jeopardize the ability of developers to complete projects without additional subsidies, which add time and cost to affordable projects.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill, by allowing developers to receive HCD loan funds during the construction period, potentially reduces construction period interest expenses. The state has been working in recent years to align its housing programs, and this bill would further that work.

The California Housing Partnership has calculated this bill will result in the construction of an additional 500 affordable homes over the next ten years within existing funding. The impact will be even greater at higher levels of state investment and could lead to hundreds of millions of dollars in additional resources, as each unit of housing requires considerable subsidy. Developers would have the discretion to request either a construction loan, permanent financing, or a combination of both. This bill would further HCD's efforts to modernize and improve the impact of the state's investment in affordable housing.

Departments Impacted & Why

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) would see the greatest impact. MOHCD supports developers as they apply for various funding sources for affordable housing projects, and also provides financing that closes the gap between what funding has been secured through State programs and what funding is needed for the project to be completed.

Fiscal Impact

San Francisco allocated nearly \$184 million in funding through multifamily housing loans and grants for affordable housing construction and rehabilitation in FY 2021-2022 budget. Through AB 1053, construction costs would decrease; current estimates project that developers incur over \$1 million on average per project in unnecessary construction loan interest costs. This would result in reduced local costs for the City to spend on gap loan funding to ensure projects can close on time.

Support / Opposition

The California Housing Partnership Corporation and the California Coalition for Rural Housing are co-sponsors of AB 1053. A broad range of affordable housing advocates have registered support for AB 1053, including the San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund, All Home CA, and MidPen Housing Corporation, which have both partnered with the City to develop multiple affordable housing construction and rehabilitation/renovation projects.

There is no formal opposition on file as of 5/8/2023. However, in 2021, a similar bill (AB 1423, Daly) was nearly identical to AB 1053 and was vetoed by the Governor who cited legal questions and concerns with placing HCD, and therefore taxpayer dollars, in a subordinate position to a private lender. San Francisco did not issue any letters of support or opposition regarding AB 1423 in 2021.

Additionally, HCD estimates ongoing General Fund costs of approximately \$6.02 million annually for additional staff funding operations and to administer a process that allows applicants to use funds for construction financing, although actual costs would depend upon implementation structure, the number of funding recipients who elect to receive construction financing, complexity of loan closing negotiations, and participation of first lenders. Ongoing costs would also fluctuate depending on demand for construction financing.



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	5/8/2023
Submitting Department	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
Contact Name	Kyra Geithman
Contact Email and Phone Number	kyra.geithman@sfgov.org (628) 652-5835
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kyra Geithman
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 469

Sen. Allen, District 24, Democrat

Sen. Wiener, District 11, Democrat

Removing Barriers to State-Funded Affordable Housing

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 469 removes a critical barrier to the financing and construction of affordable housing by clarifying that the use of state affordable housing dollars does not trigger a requirement for voter approval under Article 34 of the California Constitution.

Background/Analysis

Adopted by ballot initiative in 1950 following an overtly racist campaign as a backlash to federal funding for public housing, Article 34 requires local voter approval of any "low-rent housing project" that is "developed, constructed, or acquired in any manner by any state public body." Article 34 was not intended to cover affordable housing that receives state funding and developed by private entities such as nonprofit affordable housing developers.

Article 34 granted the Legislature the power to author laws to implement it – a power the Legislature has exercised numerous times over the ensuing decades. In recent years, as the state has invested in programs administered by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the Legislature has used its authority under Article 34 to make clear that an affordable housing developer's receipt of funds from some new programs does not trigger an Article 34 local election. For example, the Legislature has enacted statutory exemptions for the Homekey Program, Housing Accelerator Program, Portfolio Restructuring Program, and Veterans Housing and Homelessness Prevention Program.

Last year, the legislature passed SCA 2 (Allen/Wiener, Chapter 182, Statutes of 2022), which repeals Article 34 altogether, subject to voter approval. The ballot measure will appear on the November 2024 ballot. San Francisco issued a letter in support of SCA 2.

Challenge

Out of an abundance of caution, the state has required applicants for some funding sources to demonstrate Article 34 compliance before developments may proceed. All new 100% affordable housing projects funded by the City are required to receive Article 34 authority. This adds unnecessary costs, delays, and uncertainty to housing projects.

To qualify for an exemption from Article 34, developers often face additional hurdles. Specifically, developers can only use a limited amount of public financing to cover the project to comply with the exemption which requires no more than 49% of units to be restricted to low-income households. As a result, developers must identify and secure other sources of funding to complete the development. This in turn drives up costs and increases the time it takes to build affordable housing. A report from the UC Berkeley Turner Center on Housing Innovation notes that "on average, every additional source of funding on a project is associated with an increase of \$6,400 per unit, or 2%, in total development costs." The study also found that 80% of affordable housing projects in the sample examined used four to eight sources of funding. In some cases, developers have been forced to abandon affordable housing projects that would have otherwise gone forward without Article 34.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill provides that the term "low-rent housing project," as defined in Section 1 of Article 34 does not apply to any development composed of urban or rural dwellings, apartments, or other living accommodations that consists of the acquisition, rehabilitation, reconstruction, alterations work, new construction or any combination of lodging facilities or dwelling units using any of the following:

1. Money appropriated and disbursed by the Business, Consumer Services and Housing (BCSH) Agency, Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA).
2. An allocation of federal or state low-income housing tax credits from the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC).

Departments Impacted & Why

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) would see significant positive impact. MOHCD supports developers as they apply for various funding sources for affordable housing projects, including ensuring they receive Article 34 authority. By codifying that these projects are exempt from Article 34 provisions, this would result in decreased staff time and prevent increased costs due to delays that may come from the application process.

Fiscal Impact

San Francisco allocated \$184 million in funding for affordable housing construction and rehabilitation in its FY 2022-23 and 2023-24 budget. The changes proposed by SB 469 would result in reduced staff time required to support affordable housing developers with the Article 34 authority process, and streamlining the application process would result in reduced costs as well; a report from the UC Berkeley Turner Center on Housing Innovation notes that "on average, every additional source of funding on a project is associated with an increase of \$6,400 per unit, or 2%, in total development costs."

Support / Opposition

The California Housing Partnership Corporation and the California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation are co-sponsors of SB 469. A broad range of affordable housing advocates have filed

formal support for SB 469, including advocacy groups (San Francisco YIMBY, YIMBY Action, Grow the Richmond) and affordable housing developers (Mercy Housing, MidPen Housing Corporation).

There is no formal opposition on file as of 5/8/2023.



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	5/2/2023
Submitting Department	Dept on the Status of Women
Contact Name	Nazneen Rydhan-Foster
Contact Email and Phone Number	naz.rydhan-foster@sfgov.org ; 415-252-3207
SLC Meeting Presenter	Nazneen Rydhan-Foster
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 1740

Asm. Sanchez, District 71, Republican

Human trafficking: notice: pediatric care facilities

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would require facilities providing pediatric services to post a notice of human trafficking resources in a visible place near the public entrance. The definition of a pediatric facility is a medical facility that provides medical services by any licensed physician to persons from birth to 21 years of age, including attendance at labor and delivery.

The bill has also been ordered to the consent calendar because there has been no opposition from both the Judiciary and Appropriate Committee parties. Items part of the consent calendar are generally non-controversial items that do not require much discussion.

Background/Analysis

Current existing law requires specific businesses and establishments to post notices on

This bill would amend Section 52.6 of the civil code related to human trafficking to add a section requiring facilities providing pediatric care to post a notice of human trafficking resources in a visible place near the public entrance.

Challenge

Human Trafficking is on the rise in California, and minors make up a significant proportion of human trafficking victims. According to the Human Trafficking in San Francisco, 2021 data, 49 percent were minors, and 39% were youth between 18 and 24. Additionally, those under 25 received few services than those over 25.

The Little Hoover Commission findings argue a strong need for increased public awareness to identify more victims and prevent further human trafficking crime.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The state requires various establishments, including bars, airports, bus stations, emergency rooms etc., to provide postings on human trafficking. This bill would provide greater notice to trafficked

minors accessing healthcare services.

Departments Impacted & Why

San Francisco Health Network/Department of Public Health would be required to provide additional postings in their pediatric facilities. As a member of the Mayor’s Taskforce on Anti-Human Trafficking and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Steering Committee, there have been discussions regarding addressing public awareness and trainings in the health network on identifying human trafficking victims and CSEC.

Fiscal Impact

On a state level, this bill would have minor fiscal impacts and likely absorbable costs to agencies that oversee facilities that provide pediatric medical services.

Support / Opposition

N/A



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 25, 2023
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook
Contact Email and Phone Number	Victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	415-930-2202
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 745

Asm Bonta & Bryan, District 18 & 55, Democrat Reentry Housing and Workforce Development Program

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Assembly Bill 745 would provide competitive grants to counties, homeless Continuums of Care, and community-based nonprofits to fund housing and reentry services and workforce development for people recently released from incarceration who are experiencing or at risk of falling into homelessness. Funding for this program will come from the General Fund and will be sustained by an additional budget request.

Background/Analysis

Greater than 95% of the people who are currently incarcerated in California will eventually return home. Reductions in the size of California’s Prison Population in recent years have resulted in over \$1.5 billion dollars in cost savings to the state. However, California currently does not have adequate infrastructure in place to ensure that those who have been touched by the criminal legal system can successfully rebuild their lives leaving this group particularly vulnerable to recidivism, unemployment, housing insecurity, and homelessness. AB 745 creates a pathway to reduce homelessness and recidivism rates by providing evidence-based housing services, and employment/workforce development services to people recently released from incarceration.

Challenge

The data is clear: the connection between homelessness and involvement with the criminal legal system – particularly incarceration – is deep and concerning. CDCR previously estimated that one-third to one-half of the 56,000 of people currently on parole are experiencing homelessness, and CDCR staff estimates that as many as 20% of people leaving prison discharge not having a stable place to live. Additionally, nearly every other person who is currently unhoused has at some point faced incarceration and is five times more likely to be unemployed than the average Californian. Studies also show that African Americans are almost seven-times more likely to be homeless than the general population in California, an issue driven by historic systemic racism. Furthermore, studies show that housing issues directly affect employment opportunities and outcomes. These policy challenges have been compounded by the affordable housing crisis in California and the lasting economic impacts of the COVID-19 health pandemic.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

By 2024-25, the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) estimates that the prison population changes will reduce state costs by \$1.5 billion. AB 745 proposes that the state require the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) in collaboration with community-based organizations and other relevant department stakeholders to create the Reentry Housing and Workforce Development program utilizing evidence-based housing and wraparound services. These programs will bring together comprehensive resources to assist eligible participants at least 90 days prior to their release from prison, including housing navigation and tenancy acquisition services. Through these integrated services, people recently released from incarceration will find the necessary housing and employment support that will ultimately save the state money in the long run, provide a much-needed stable foundation for successful reentry, and help meet the state's goals for solving homelessness.

Departments Impacted & Why

Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and California Department of Correction & Rehabilitation (CDCR)

Fiscal Impact

HCD estimates ongoing General Fund (GF) costs of \$3.27 million annually for 17 staff positions to develop the Program, establish a referral process with CDCR, develop program guidelines and administer contracts. In addition, HCD estimates a one-time consulting cost of \$1 Million (GF) for an independent evaluator to measure and evaluate program outcomes.

CDCR estimates:

- a) One-time GF costs of an unknown amount, but likely in the low millions of dollars, to collaborate with HCD and others to establish a referral process for participants, design and implement protocols to prevent the discharge from prison into homelessness, and make necessary administrative and systems changes. Actual costs will depend, in part, on the number of program participants and the number of CDCR staff with technical expertise related to parole necessary to implement the bill's provisions.
- b) Ongoing GF costs of approximately \$476,000 annually for four additional staff to implement and support the referral process for participants identified prior to release from prison who must receive a referral from a homeless service provider and the participant's parole agent. CDCR notes this process is unclear and actual costs will depend on how collaboration with service providers impacts CDCR parole agents.

Cost pressures of an unknown amount, at least in the tens of millions annually, to provide grant funding for the Program. The HCD and CDCR administrative costs noted above would be incurred only to the extent that funds are appropriated for the Program.

Support / Opposition

Support

LARRP Organization (Co-Sponsor)
REPAC (Co-Sponsor)
Housing California
PATH

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	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

AB 1266
Asm. Kalra, District 25, Democrat
End Debtor’s Prison Act

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would amend the penal and vehicle code to end bench warrants for minor infractions.

Background/Analysis

Under current state law, people who have money to pay fines for traffic violations or tickets for infractions like loitering do not have to go to court. Yet courts can issue a bench warrant for a person’s arrest if they are unable to pay the penalty or if they experience barriers to appear in court. Essentially, the current law can criminalize someone for their poverty.

Research shows that punitive measures are ineffective in compelling people to pay or appear in court. Common sense, non-punitive practices like text message reminders and follow-ups help get people to appear in court. Furthermore, courts have other less punitive means to address these infractions under current law, such as trial by absentia and methods to address a failure to pay, such as creating sliding scale discounts for people with low incomes.

AB 1266 will build on the important fine and fee justice reforms in California. Recognizing the broad harm caused by civil assessment fees, Governor Newsom signed AB 199 into law, which erased retroactive debt for civil assessment fees and capped the fee at \$100, effective July 1, 2022. AB 1266 builds on this important work, ensuring that people will not be penalized for their poverty because they cannot pay a traffic fine or make a court hearing.

Challenge

Issuing a bench warrant for nonpayment is too extreme of a penalty and essentially criminalizes poverty. Arresting someone who cannot pay does not give them the means to pay but only further punishes people living in poverty while also exacerbating racial inequality. Similarly, issuing a bench warrant for someone’s arrest ignores structural issues in people’s lives, especially as many low-income people—primarily Black and brown people—face barriers, including transportation, risk of losing employment, childcare, etc., that can prevent them from being able to appear in court. The San Francisco Superior Court does not issue bench warrants for people who cannot afford to pay their fines or fees.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Eliminating bench warrants for infractions will help end a pipeline to the criminal legal system and allow struggling Californians to focus on what matters – to devote their already limited time and resources to meeting their critical needs. Currently, San Francisco Superior Court does not issue bench warrants for failure to pay or failure to appear for these types of infractions.

The state should explore other ways to ensure people appear in court or pay their fine. Common sense, non-punitive practices like text messages can be effective at getting people to appear in court.

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

A New Way of Life Reentry Project
ACLU California Action
Aouon Orange County
California Alliance for Youth and
Community Justice
California for Safety and Justice
California-Hawaii State Conference of The
NAACP
California Public Defenders Association
Care First California
Children’s Defense Fund CA
Communities United for Restorative Youth
Justice (CURYJ)
Community Legal Sevices in East Palo Alto
Dignity and Power Now
East Bay Community Law Center
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Freedom 4 Youth
Friends Committee on Legislation of
California
Indivisible Ca: Statestrong
Initiate Justice
Justice2jobs Coalition
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of The
San Francisco Bay Area
Legal Services for Prisoner With Children
Milpa (Motivating Individual Leadership for
Public Advancement)
National Association of Social Workers,
California Chapter
Policing Project
Prosecutors Alliance California

San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban
Research Association (SPUR)
Secure Justice
Showing Up for Racial Justice (SURJ) Bay
Area
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Smart Justice California
Western Center on Law & Poverty
The Maven Collaborative
The W. Haywood Burns Institute
United Core Alliance
Young Women's Freedom Center

Opposition

California District Attorneys Association
California State Sheriffs’ Association