



**STATE LEGISLATION
COMMITTEE**
Wednesday, June 26, 2024
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. Members of the public may view the meeting by clicking the link below or calling the below number provided:

<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m6e08bb5ea38d2936376e208ad63db58b>

Meeting ID: 2664 105 0717 **Meeting Password:** SnwJjiGw274

Join by Phone at +1-415-655-0001 (Please dial # after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)

(Public Comment Instructions available on page 6)

Members

Mayor's Office (Chair) – Eileen Mariano
Supervisor Dean Preston -- Preston Kilgore
Supervisor Connie Chan -- Frances Hsieh
Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney's Office -- Rebekah Krell
Controller's Office -- Hannah Kohanzadeh
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 May 22, 2024.

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 will review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

New Business

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter: Kathryn Angotti

AB 2043 (Boerner): Medi-Cal: nonmedical and nonemergency medical transportation.

Recommended Position: Support

This bill aims to ensure that public paratransit service operators are not unduly burdened by the costs of nonemergency medical transportation or nonmedical transportation. It mandates the State Department of Health Care Services to guarantee fair reimbursement for these services, allowing them to direct Medi-Cal managed care plans to reimburse public paratransit operators at fee-for-service rates. Additionally, the department must collaborate with these operators to understand their challenges and issue new guidelines by June 1, 2026, to ensure the fiscal burden is not unfairly placed on them. Implementation hinges on obtaining federal approvals and securing federal financial support.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter: Kathryn Angotti

AB 2583 (Berman): School and walk zones.

Recommended Position: Support

This bill aims to enhance safety in school zones by implementing new requirements on circulation elements to create walk zones, reduce speed limits in school zones, and shift school zones signage requirements. Specifically, the bill requires (1) cities to identify and establish school walk zones in their circulation element — walk zones are roadways and sidewalks within 1,000 feet in all directions of the boundary line of a school grounds, (2) a prima facie speed limit of 20 miles per hour would be established in school zones instead of 25 mph as currently required, and (3) local authorities will be given school zone signage options of “speed limit 20 when flashing” and the beacons are flashing, “when children are present” and children are present, or stating specific hours.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter: Kathryn Angotti

SB 532 (Wiener): Parking payment zones.

Recommended Position: Support

SB 532 modernizes municipal parking payment requirements by allowing cities to institute pay-by-phone only zones subject to specified criteria, including robust signage requirements and the adoption of an accessible and equitable cash payment plan that allows for the alternate payment of cash that doesn't rely on traditional parking meters. In practice, this bill would allow cities to keep all their parking meters, while allowing them to offer a combination of parking meters and pay by mobile device parking spots, or they can offer parking zones that pay by mobile device only.

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Presenter: Rebecca Peacock

SB 1255 (Durazo): Public water systems: needs analysis: water rate assistance

program.

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would require certain water systems to begin providing water rate assistance to eligible ratepayers, defined to mean a low-income residential ratepayer with an annual household income that is no greater than 200% of the federal poverty guideline level, on or before April 1, 2027. The bill would require a qualified system to automatically enroll an eligible ratepayer in the water rate assistance program if available information indicates that they are qualified to receive assistance and provide a water bill credit.

The bill would require a qualified system, on or before July 1, 2026, to provide an opportunity for each ratepayer to provide a voluntary contribution as part of the ratepayer's water bill to provide funding for the qualified system's water rate assistance program. The bill would require a qualified system to recommend a voluntary contribution amount on the bill of each ratepayer, other than an eligible ratepayer, at a level that will raise sufficient funding to provide a discount to eligible ratepayers, pay for the qualified system's administrative costs to implement the program, and establish a balancing account if the qualified system chooses to do so. The bill would require a qualified system to notify ratepayers of the voluntary contribution on the water bill and provide each ratepayer the option and method of opting out of the voluntary contribution, as specified.

Qualified systems with an existing water rate assistance program that meets minimum requirements of this bill are not required to comply but can collect voluntary contributions to supplement or expand the existing program.

The bill would authorize a qualified system to use any state or federal funds that are available to support a ratepayer assistance program by offsetting or supplementing the funds collected from voluntary contributions.

Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

SB 1230 (Rubio): Strengthen Tobacco Oversight Programs (STOP) and Seize Illegal Tobacco Products Act.

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1230 strengthens the enforcement of California's anti-tobacco laws by increasing the civil penalties for violations of the Stop Tobacco Access to Kids Enforcement Act. This bill also permits the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA) to seize flavored tobacco products/tobacco flavor enhancers at retail locations, which are currently prohibited under state law.

Department of Technology

Presenter: Brian Roberts

AB 2797 (Ashby): Telephone corporations: carriers of last resort: tariffs.

Recommended Position: Oppose

AB 2797 would allow AT&T and other carriers of last resort (COLRs) a fast-track method for relieving themselves of obligations to serve. The COLR rules were created by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) in the late 1990's to ensure universal service while ushering in competition for telecommunications

services. (AT&T is the state's largest COLR, but various smaller local phone companies are also COLRs.)

AB 2797 would establish a new regime where a COLR could be deemed relieved of its COLR obligations by notice to the CPUC demonstrating that there are at least two "alternative voice providers" that offer voice service in the area. The alternative provider could be a wireless provider and would not have to assume COLR responsibilities. The COLR seeking to be relieved of its obligations, would have to agree to certain customer notification, transition planning and digital equity planning obligations. However, these commitments would be self-executing, with no administrative review by the CPUC or opportunity for the public to comment.

AB 2797 would not require or incentivize investment in modern telecommunications infrastructure at all. It would facilitate disinvestment in AT&Ts more economically challenging rural and low-income markets. The proposed contains no administrative review by the CPUC or public input of any kind.

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.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Joshua Cardenas, Mayor's Office, at: joshua.cardenas@sfgov.org.

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 sof@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 in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

To view the meeting via computer systems:

<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m6e08bb5ea38d2936376e208ad63db58b>

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

To view the meeting via phone:

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

Webinar ID: 2664 105 0717

NOTE: Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press # to enter the meeting.

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.

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 Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: eileen.f.mariano@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, May 22, 2024
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. Members of the public may view the meeting by clicking the link below or calling the below number provided:

<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m5552088a3f1a0e15f8a917f5e8b0cfa2>

Meeting ID: 2662 134 7780 **Meeting Password:** TmfHxMNs844
Join by Phone at +1-415-655-0001 (Please dial # after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)

(Public Comment Instructions available on page 7)

Members

Mayor's Office (Chair) – Eileen Mariano
Supervisor Dean Preston -- Preston Kilgore
Supervisor Connie Chan -- Frances Hsieh
Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney's Office -- Rebekah Krell
Controller's Office -- Hannah Kohanzadeh
Treasurer's Office -- Eric Manke

AGENDA

Meeting commenced at 10:03 am.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Eileen Mariano, Preston Kilgore, Frances Hsieh, Holly Lung, Rebekah Krell, and Eric Manke. Hannah Kohanzadeh was not present when the Chair announced the roll call, but was present in Committee following the second agenda item.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on April 24, 2024.

Motion to Approve: Frances Hsieh
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore
Approved: 6-0

III. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item).

The City's state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

IV. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action). Discussion and possible action item: the Committee will 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 Public Utilities Commission

Presenter: Scott Ammon

AB 2054 (Bauer-Kahan): Energy: employment, gifts, and rates.

Recommended Position: Support

The bill would require investor-owned utilities (IOUs) such as Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to submit an application for rate recovery to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for any costs recorded in balancing accounts which exceed their authorized forecast. For these costs, the bill would require the CPUC to conduct a reasonableness review before authorizing IOUs to recover the costs in rates. For wildfire expenses, the bill requires IOUs to include in their application a cost-benefit analysis of the proposed expenses and at least one credible alternative. If the CPUC approves costs for IOU rate recovery, the bill authorizes the CPUC to allocate cost recovery between ratepayers and shareholders. The bill would also prohibit leadership at the CPUC, the CPUC's Public Advocates Office, and the California Energy Commission (CEC) from accepting employment (for at least 3 years) or receiving gifts from any entity subject to their regulation.

The SFPUC recommends a support position for AB 2054.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion to Support AB 2054: Eric Manke

Seconded by: Holly Lung

Approved: 7-0

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Presenter: Dylan Schneider

SB 1361 (Blakespear): California Environmental Quality Act: exemption: local agencies: contract for providing services for people experiencing homelessness.

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1361 exempts from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) any actions taken by local agencies related to contracting for services for people experiencing homelessness, and further defines what "services" entail under its provisions, to ensure timely and impactful responses to the homelessness crisis in California.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motioned by Preston Kilgore and seconded by Frances Hsieh, the Committee voted to rescind the below vote and allow another round of voting for SB 1361:

Motion to Support SB 1361: Hannah Kohanzadeh
Seconded by: Holly Lung
Approved: 6-0
Abstain: 1 (Frances Hsieh)

The Committee voted to approve SB 1361 with five members supporting and two abstaining. Preston Kilgore and Frances Hsieh abstained.

San Francisco Adult Probation Department

Presenters: Victoria Westbrook and Alek Hartwick

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

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1186 modifies and enhances California's current youth restitution system, so it may effectively provide survivors with more equitable, timely, and stable compensation.

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

San Francisco Adult Probation Department

Presenter: Victoria Westbrook and Alek Hartwick

AB 1986 (Bryan): State prisons: banned books.

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1986 requires the Office of Inspector General (OIG), which is an independent agency that oversees CDCR, to post CDCR's Centralized List of Disapproved Publications publicly. It will also require CDCR to remove a publication from its list if the OIG finds that there is insufficient evidence to ban a book. AB 1986 is a Black Caucus Reparations priority.

Public Comment: No public comment.
Motion to Support AB 1986: Preston Kilgore
Seconded by: Frances Hsieh
Approved: 6-0
Abstain: 1 (Hannah Kohanzadeh)

San Francisco Adult Probation Department

Presenter: Victoria Westbrook and Alek Hartwick

SB 1001 (Skinner): Death penalty: intellectual disabled persons.

Recommended Position: Support

Existing state law and rulings by the US Supreme Court have deemed the

execution of a person who is intellectually disabled as cruel and unusual punishment. Intellectual disability is defined as someone who has below average intelligence and whose life skills, before adulthood, demonstrate difficulty in thinking and understanding that impacts conceptual, social, and practical skills.

SB 1001 would provide important safeguards to California's existing law to help prevent the execution of those who are intellectually disabled. Specifically, SB 1001 would retain the requirement that a person's intellectual disability had to be present when they were young, e.g.; during their developmental period, but would not require the disability to have been formally diagnosed during that time period.

Public Comment: No public comment.
Motion to Support SB 1001: Eric Manke
Seconded by: Frances Hsieh
Approved: 6-0
Abstain: 1 (Hannah Kohanzadeh)

San Francisco Adult Probation Department

Presenter: Victoria Westbrook and Alek Hartwick

SB 1005 (Ashby): Youth Courts.

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1005 gives statutory authority for minors, with referral from a probation officer and consent of the minor's parent, to waive traditional juvenile court system hearing and sentencing procedures and experience a court of fellow minors.

Public Comment: No public comment.
Motion to Support SB 1005: Eric Manke
Seconded by: Holly Lung
Approved: 6-0
Abstain: 1 (Hannah Kohanzadeh)

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter: Katie Angotti

AB 1777 (Ting): Autonomous vehicles.

Recommended Position: Support and Seek Amendments

This bill would make a number of changes to the California Vehicle Code to require autonomous vehicle (AV) manufacturers to comply with a number of new requirements aimed at improving interactions and communication with emergency responders. It also would require new data reporting from AV companies with testing or deployment permits. Finally, it would ensure that AVs can be cited for moving traffic violations, and clarifies that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) may impose incremental enforcement actions against AV manufacturers who do not comply with the provisions of the bill.

Public Comment: No public comment.
Motion to Support AB 1777: Frances Hsieh
Seconded by: Preston Kilgore

Approved: 7-0

The Department of Environment

Presenter: Huy Le

SB 1143 (Allen): Household hazardous waste producer responsibility.

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1143 will require producers of household hazardous consumer products to fund and ensure convenient access to a system for the safe collection, transportation, and disposal of household hazardous waste (HHW), shifting the cost burden of managing HHW disposal from local jurisdictions and ratepayers to the producers.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion to Support SB 1143: Frances Hsieh

Seconded by: Preston Kilgore

Approved: 7-0

The Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 2075 (Alvarez): Resident Access Protection Act.

Recommended Position: Oppose Unless Amended

AB 2075 would enact the Resident Access Protection Act which grants a resident of a long-term care (LTC) facility the right to in-person, onsite access to a visitor and health care and social services providers during any public health emergency (PHE) in which visitation rights of residents are curtailed by a state or local order. This bill would set a concerning precedent of limiting the authority of public health officers and their ability to protect public health in a declared emergency.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion to Support AB 2075: Hannah Kohanzadeh

Seconded by: Preston Kilgore

Approved: 7-0

The Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 2132 (Low): Health care services.

Recommended Position: Support

AB 2132 would mandate testing and preventive treatment for tuberculosis (TB) in primary care settings by requiring providers to conduct TB risk assessments and provide or refer for follow-up care as recommended by the US Preventive Task Force (USPTF).

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion to Support AB 2132: Eric Manke

Seconded by: Holly Lung

Approved: 7-0

The Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 2871 (Maienschein): Overdose fatality review teams.

Recommended Position: Support & Amend

To improve local coordination in the response to the ongoing overdose crisis, AB 2871 would authorize a county to establish an interagency overdose fatality review (OFR) team. The team would be able to assist with identifying and reviewing overdose fatalities, facilitate communication among the various entities involved with responding to overdoses, and integrate local overdose prevention efforts through strategic planning, data dissemination, and community collaboration.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion to Support AB 2871: Holly Lung

Seconded by: Frances Hsieh

Approved: 7-0

The Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

SB 1251 (Stern): Mosquito abatement inspections.

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1251 would require investor-owned utilities to enter into an agreement with a mosquito abatement or vector control district, or city or county health department within 180 days of a request to allow the district to inspect the utility vaults.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion to Support SB 1251: Eric Manke

Seconded by: Holly Lung

Approved: 7-0

The Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

SB 1333 (Eggman and Roth): Communicable diseases: HIV reporting.

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1333 allows the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) and local health departments (LHDs) to disclose personally identifying information in public health records of persons with HIV or AIDS for the coordination of, linkage to, or reengagement in care.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion to Support SB 1333: Preston Kilgore

Seconded by: Eric Manke

Approved: 7-0

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Presenter: Kyra Geithman

AB 2353 (Ward): Property taxation: welfare exemption: delinquent payments: interest and penalties.

Recommended Position: Support

AB 2353 would ensure nonprofit affordable rental housing developers can access the existing welfare property tax exemption without floating unnecessary tax payments while their application is under review, reducing the cost of constructing affordable housing.

Earlier this legislative cycle, Asm. Ward introduced AB 86, which also would have allowed nonprofit developers to access the welfare tax exemption. The State Legislation Committee approved a "Support" position, with the Assessor's Office abstaining. Asm. Ward has been working with the California Assessors' Association to address concerns. Currently, no formal opposition has been submitted by any organizations.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion to Support AB 2353: Preston Kilgore

Seconded by: Frances Hsieh

Approved: 5-0

Abstain: 2 (Holly Lung and Hannah Kohanzadeh)

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

Meeting ended at 11:26 am.

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.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Joshua Cardenas, Mayor's Office, at: joshua.cardenas@sfgov.org.

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 sof@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 in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

To view the meeting via computer systems:

<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m5552088a3f1a0e15f8a917f5e8b0cfa2>

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

To view the meeting via phone:

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

Webinar ID: 2662 134 7780

NOTE: Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press # to enter the meeting.

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.

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 Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: eileen.f.mariano@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 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 Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	6/14/2024
Submitting Department	Municipal Transportation Agency , SFHP
Contact Name	Kathryn Angotti
Contact Email and Phone Number	Kathryn.Angotti@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kathryn Angotti
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

AB 2043

Assemblymember Boerner, Assembly District #77, D-Encinitas Medi-Cal: nonmedical and nonemergency medical transportation.

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill aims to ensure that public paratransit service operators are not unduly burdened by the costs of nonemergency medical transportation or nonmedical transportation. It mandates the State Department of Health Care Services to guarantee fair reimbursement for these services, allowing them to direct Medi-Cal managed care plans to reimburse public paratransit operators at fee-for-service rates. Additionally, the department must collaborate with these operators to understand their challenges and issue new guidelines by June 1, 2026, to ensure the fiscal burden is not unfairly placed on them. Implementation hinges on obtaining federal approvals and securing federal financial support.

Background/Analysis

Existing law establishes the Medi-Cal program, managed by the State Department of Health Care Services, providing health care services to eligible low-income individuals through managed care or fee-for-service models. This program, partially governed and funded by federal Medicaid provisions, includes coverage for emergency and nonemergency medical transportation, and nonmedical transportation.

Before the mandate for Medi-Cal managed care plans to include transportation coverage for their members, eligible public transit agencies could seek partial reimbursement for Medi-Cal-covered nonemergency medical transportation and nonmedical transportation trips. Following this change, transportation funding is now allocated directly to a Medi-Cal managed care plan to cover transportation expenses for its Medi-Cal members.

Challenge

Local and regional transit operators are federally required to provide nonmedical transportation and nonemergency medical transportation to those who need specialized transportation assistance to get to doctor's appointments, physical therapy, or other medically necessary services. In 2016, a change in the law had inadvertently made it more difficult for reimbursements to operators to occur; AB 2043 will promote reimbursement for providing these services to Medi-Cal patients from funds already designated for that purpose.

If passed, this bill would create an opportunity for the SFMTA to receive partial reimbursement for paratransit trips provided to eligible Medi-Cal recipients, resulting in a substantial amount of returned funds that can be reutilized. A previous version of this bill was vetoed by the governor last year because it required the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to pursue a series of federal approvals that were not allowable under federal guidance; AB 2043 amends this, with the biggest change being extended time needed for implementation because it first *authorizes*, but does not *direct*, the state Medi-Cal program to direct managed care plans to reimburse paratransit operators at the existing fee-for-service rates.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

The bill establishes that the State Department of Health Care Services may ensure that undue fiscal burden is not placed upon operators for Medi-Cal covered nonemergency medical transportation and nonmedical transportation trips by:

1. Ensuring that Medi-Cal managed care plans reimburse public paratransit service operators who are enrolled as Medi-Cal providers at the department's fee-for-service rates for conducting nonemergency medical transportation or nonmedical transportation service for trips that do not include fixed-route transportation service.
2. Engaging with public paratransit service operators to understand their unique challenges when providing nonemergency medical transportation or nonmedical transportation services; based on the findings, the department shall provide updated guidance measures to operators by June 1, 2026, that ensures the fiscal burden of transporting beneficiaries is not unfairly placed onto operators.

Departments Impacted & Why

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
SF Health Plan

Fiscal Impact

This bill could result in a reimbursement to the SFMTA of up to \$3 million per year in costs for ADA paratransit services.

Support / Opposition

Support

AARP
Access Services
California Special Districts Association
Eastern Sierra Transit Authority
Orange County Transportation Authority
Stanislaus Regional Transit Authority

Oppose

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 Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	6/14/2024
Submitting Department	Municipal Transportation Agency
Contact Name	Kathryn Angotti
Contact Email and Phone Number	Kathryn.Angotti@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kathryn Angotti
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

AB 2583

Assemblymember Berman, Assembly District #23, D-Menlo Park School and walk zones.

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill aims to enhance safety in school zones by implementing new requirements on circulation elements to create walk zones, reduce speed limits in school zones, and shift school zones signage requirements. Specifically, the bill requires (1) cities to identify and establish school walk zones in their circulation element — walk zones are roadways and sidewalks within 1,000 feet in all directions of the boundary line of a school grounds, (2) a prima facie speed limit of 20 miles per hour would be established in school zones instead of 25 mph as currently required, and (3) local authorities will be given school zone signage options of “speed limit 20 when flashing” and the beacons are flashing, “when children are present” and children are present, or stating specific hours.

Background/Analysis

Provisions detailed in the Planning and Zoning Law require a legislative body, city, or county to adopt a comprehensive general plan that includes a circulation element to plan for transportation routes.

Existing law also establishes a prima facie speed limit of 25 miles per hour in school zones under various circumstances and authorizes local authorities to reduce the prima facie speed limit based on engineering and traffic surveys.

Finally, existing law authorizes a local authority to modify the prima facie speed limit based on distance from a school if the highways have a maximum of 2 traffic lanes and a maximum posted prima facie speed limit of 30 miles per hour immediately before and after the school zone. While the federal MUTCD allows cities to use multiple sign types for school zones, the state MUTCD only allows cities to use signs that state “When Children are Present” in school zones.

The original version of this bill included a provision that required cities to change all school zone signage from “when children are present” to specified timeframes such as 7am-9am and 2pm-5pm; this requirement did not take into account the nuances of many schools whose start/end time vary significantly and there is limited evidence to demonstrate whether this approach results

in better safety outcomes. Discussions have been held with the author's office, and the following amendment has been drafted to resolve this:

1. Instead of requiring cities to change all signs in school zones from "when children are present" to time frames, jurisdictions will be given the following options to implement in school zones where appropriate:
 - a. When signs are flashing
 - b. When children are present
 - c. Specified time frames

While cities are given the ability to decide which signage they want to use, Caltrans, through the MUTCD will likely provide cities with guidance with respect to how the signs should be used and in what circumstances.

The SFMTA supports reducing speeds in the City and especially in school zones. This bill aligns with our Vision Zero efforts.

The SFMTA has already reduced speed limits to 15 mph in all the school zones where we have been authorized by state law to do — 181 school zones. This bill would reduce the speed limit in all other school zones that we could not reduce to 15 mph, to 20 mph.

Challenge

This bill aims to increase safety for pedestrians, particularly children, teachers and caregivers, in school zones. The reduction in speed limits is consistent with our efforts to curb traffic injuries and fatalities in the city. School and Senior Zones encourage slow speeds (15 mph and 25 mph, respectively) where there are high numbers of children or seniors. In 2011, San Francisco was the first large city in California to lower speeds to 15 mph in 181 public and private schools.

While reducing speed limits by 5 mph may seem insignificant, it can be the difference in whether or not someone survives a crash. Compared to the 20% chance of survival someone has being struck by a vehicle traveling 40 mph, a person has a 90% chance of surviving being struck by a vehicle going 20 mph. Lower speed limits make streets safer for all users: when drivers move more slowly, they give themselves more time to notice other drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians, and they contribute to a calmer, safer environment on the street. Introducing lower speed limits across the city is a significant step forward in San Francisco's progress toward Vision Zero. Data from peer cities like Seattle has shown that signage alone can lower driver speed and reduce the number of crashes. This bill will contribute to the holistic approach San Francisco takes in addressing speed management.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

With the suggested amendments, the bill will work to enhance safety in school zones by:

1. Requiring local jurisdictions to create "walk zones" in the circulation element
2. Reducing speed limits in school zones from 25 mph to 20 mph
3. Shifting the school zone sign requirement to the following options: "when lights are flashing," "when children are present," or to specific timeframes

Departments Impacted & Why

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Fiscal Impact

SFMTA would be required to produce and install the signs.

Support / Opposition

Support

Streets for All [Sponsor]
Active SGV
American Academy of Pediatrics, California
Bike East Bay
Bike LA
Calbike
California Federation of Teachers AFL-CIO
California Teachers Association
Car-lite Long Beach
CCA EJ
Cleaneart4kids.org
Conor Lynch Foundation
East Bay for Everyone
Everybody's Long Beach
Long Beach Bike Co-op
Los Angeles Unified School District
Los Angeles Walks
Marin County Bicycle Coalition
Pedal Movement
Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco Bay Area Chapter
Safe Routes Partnership
SoCal Families for Safe Streets
Transbay Coalition
Youth Climate Strike Los Angeles

Oppose

Safer Streets LA



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 Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	June 14, 2024
Submitting Department	Municipal Transportation Agency
Contact Name	Kathryn Angotti
Contact Email and Phone Number	Kathryn.Angotti@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Kathryn Angotti
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 532

Senator Wiener, Senate District #11, D-San Francisco

Parking payment zones.

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 532 modernizes municipal parking payment requirements by allowing cities to institute pay-by-phone only zones subject to specified criteria, including robust signage requirements and the adoption of an accessible and equitable cash payment plan that allows for the alternate payment of cash that doesn't rely on traditional parking meters. In practice, this bill would allow cities to keep all their parking meters, while allowing them to offer a combination of parking meters and pay by mobile device parking spots, or they can offer parking zones that pay by mobile device only.

Background/Analysis

Paid parking is the best tool cities have to create parking availability, which benefits businesses, minimizes circling and double-parking, reduces emissions, speeds public transit, and makes streets safer and more efficient. It brings in more customers to spend money at local businesses by reducing the chance that a customer gives up and goes somewhere else because they can't find parking or avoids an area altogether because of parking challenges.

Existing law allows a local authority to designate parking meter zones and set the fee rates for those zones through ordinance. CA Vehicle Code Section 22508(e) states that "A local authority may allow but shall not require the payment of parking meter fees by a mobile device." This means that current law allows local authorities to permit payment of parking fees by a mobile device but cannot require it. It also requires the use of parking meters as the term is used in statute "parking meter fees". Current law does not require payment of parking fees by cash.

Challenge

The current CVC requiring cities to use parking meters presents many issues. Parking meters are expensive (costing an average of \$20 million/ year in installation, maintenance, and operations expenses), subject to blight and vandalism, space-consuming, prone to unsafe conditions for staff when collecting coins, and are not conducive for providing need-based discounts.

Parking meters are continuously incurring costs; they are commonly targets for purposeful destruction and vandalism. First, parking meters are often graffitied which requires city resources to clean and makes streets look unattractive and draws complaints from neighbors. They are also purposefully broken to get free parking as state law allows free parking at a broken meter. This reduces city revenue and turnover which negatively impacts businesses. Collecting physical coins from meters present safety risks to city staff and fraudsters use parking meters to steal customers' money and identities through other means, such as credit-card skimmers, coin-slot jams, and fake QR codes.

Parking meters take up valuable real estate on our streets that can be utilized in other ways by the community, such as for outdoor dining parklets, vendors, or bicycle parking. They also take up space on the sidewalk that can be more practically used by pedestrians, especially people with disabilities who may need more space to get around.

Modern technology exists to facilitate mobile payments for a wide variety of goods and services, including parking payments. However, current law does not allow a local authority to require payment of parking fees by mobile device. By preventing mobile-only parking payment zones, current law effectively requires local authorities to maintain outdated physical meter technology if they elect to price parking to manage parking demand or advance other goals such as encouraging mode shift.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill would allow cities to explore new ways to accept payment for parking beyond the physical parking meter. This bill would remove the requirement for cities to have physical parking meters and allow them to require parking payment by mobile device, with the satisfaction of the following requirements:

1. Installation of signs within 100 feet of any space that is part of a mobile payment-only zone that clearly state that payment is required and how payments may be made
2. Adoption of an accessible and equitable parking cash payment plan that must be approved by the local authority and provides reasonably accessible alternative means for cash payment of parking fees
3. Requires that the local authority consult and collaborate with local stakeholder groups, including but not limited to racial equity, privacy protection, and economic justice groups, to develop the plan
4. Requires local authorities that adopt an accessible and equitable parking cash payment plan to report on the plan's impact on equity, accessibility, and costs of the plan to the local governing body and the state legislature.

This bill also presents opportunities to allow us to make parking payment more accessible. Moving payment from physical meters and to the cloud makes it possible for cities to link parking charges to existing state and local programs for those without bank accounts. So, if you receive CalFresh benefits, for example, you could receive a parking discount. These programs could allow for seamless parking discounts, something a cash-based system cannot provide.

Departments Impacted & Why

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Fiscal Impact

Physical meters are expensive to install and maintain. For example, parking meter installation, management, and maintenance cost the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

(SFMTA) \$20 million a year. These funds could be used to provide other essential services such as street safety projects or transit service.

Support / Opposition

Support

California Mobility and Parking Association (Sponsor)

CaCTI – support in concept

Oppose

None



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 Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	6/14/24
Submitting Department	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Contact Name	Rebecca Peacock
Contact Email and Phone Number	rpeacock@sfwater.org / 415-757-8365
SLC Meeting Presenter	Rebecca Peacock, Emily Lam
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 1255

Senator Durazo, Senate District #26, D-Los Angeles

Public water systems: needs analysis: water rate assistance program.

Recommended Position

- SPONSOR SUPPORT
 SUPPORT if amended
 OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would require certain water systems to begin providing water rate assistance to eligible ratepayers, defined to mean a low-income residential ratepayer with an annual household income that is no greater than 200% of the federal poverty guideline level, on or before April 1, 2027. The bill would require a qualified system to automatically enroll an eligible ratepayer in the water rate assistance program if available information indicates that they are qualified to receive assistance and provide a water bill credit.

The bill would require a qualified system, on or before July 1, 2026, to provide an opportunity for each ratepayer to provide a voluntary contribution as part of the ratepayer’s water bill to provide funding for the qualified system’s water rate assistance program. The bill would require a qualified system to recommend a voluntary contribution amount on the bill of each ratepayer, other than an eligible ratepayer, at a level that will raise sufficient funding to provide a discount to eligible ratepayers, pay for the qualified system’s administrative costs to implement the program, and

establish a balancing account if the qualified system chooses to do so. The bill would require a qualified system to notify ratepayers of the voluntary contribution on the water bill and provide each ratepayer the option and method of opting out of the voluntary contribution, as specified.

Qualified systems with an existing water rate assistance program that meets minimum requirements of this bill are not required to comply but can collect voluntary contributions to supplement or expand the existing program.

The bill would authorize a qualified system to use any state or federal funds that are available to support a ratepayer assistance program by offsetting or supplementing the funds collected from voluntary contributions.

Background/Analysis

The water sector and ratepayer advocates have been exploring mechanisms for a Low-Income Rate Assistance (LIRA) program for several years.

More recently, ratepayers have been significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, with many water and wastewater utility customers falling behind on their payments. While state and federal funds provided some arrears relief, the need for on-going assistance for low-income customers remains a significant equity and

social justice issue given that water is an essential human right. A LIRA program would offer significant relief to those communities that need it most including disadvantaged, environmental justice, and low-income communities that are often disproportionately comprised of people of color.

Challenge

While there has been interest among the legislature and California utilities around implementing low-income rate assistance programs, Proposition 218 limits the kinds of funding that can be used for such a purpose. Prop. 218, passed in 1996, prevents publicly owned systems from imposing rates on customers that exceed the actual cost of providing service. This means utilities cannot use ratepayer funds for LIRA programs as it is considered a subsidy of one class of ratepayer for another class of ratepayers.

The SFPUC has worked to develop a Customer Assistance Program that serves low-income ratepayers by offering bill discounts of up to 40%. This program is compliant with Prop. 218 because it utilizes funds collected from lease revenues. While we are fortunate to have this as an option, many smaller utilities do not, and funding sources remain limited for the SFPUC. If the funds needed for our customer assistance program exceed our lease revenue available, we would want the option to run the voluntary opt -out program in this bill to supplement what is currently available.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 1255 addresses the limitations of Proposition 218 by requiring water and wastewater utilities to use voluntary contributions from ratepayers to fund LIRA

programs. Ratepayers are able to opt out of providing contributions at any time. Water systems are also able to use funds from other federal and state sources that do not conflict with Proposition 218.

Departments Impacted & Why

We do not anticipate this bill will impact any City departments other than the SFPUC.

Fiscal Impact

At this time, we do not anticipate a material financial impact.

Support / Opposition (as of 5/16/24)

Support

Clean Water Action (co-source)
Community Water Center (co-source)
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability (co-source)
California Association of Professional Scientists
California Coastal Protection Network
California Coastkeeper Alliance
California Environmental Voters
California Water Research
Cleaneearth4kids.org
Friends of The River
Heal the Bay
Los Angeles Alliance for A New Economy
Los Angeles Waterkeeper
Mono Lake Committee
Natural Resources Defense Council
Planning and Conservation League
Union of Concerned Scientists

Oppose

None listed.



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

Date Submitted	5/6/24
Submitting Department	Department of Public Health
Contact Name	Max Gara
Contact Email and Phone Number	Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org ; 415-554-2621
SLC Meeting Presenter	Max Gara
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 1230

Senator Rubio, Senate District #22, D-Baldwin Park

Strengthen Tobacco Oversight Programs (STOP) and Seize Illegal Tobacco Products Act.

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended
 OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 1230 strengthens the enforcement of California's anti-tobacco laws by increasing the civil penalties for violations of the Stop Tobacco Access to Kids Enforcement Act. This bill also permits the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA) to seize flavored tobacco products/tobacco flavor enhancers at retail locations, which are currently prohibited under state law.

Background/Analysis

Cigarette smoking causes more than 480,000 deaths each year in the U.S., or nearly one-in-five deaths. Cigarette smoking also increases the risk of death for all causes in men and women. In California, smoking-related health care costs \$13.29 billion per year and smoking-related losses in productivity totals \$10.35 billion per year. Youth smoking is a strong predictor of future smoking habits – according to the CDC, 9 out of 10 adult smokers start smoking by age 18.

Despite laws restricting sales of tobacco products to minors, and flavored tobacco

bans, California's youth continue to have access to tobacco products with flavors designed to appeal directly to them, such as bubblegum and cotton candy.

Approximately 5.3 million young Americans use e-cigarettes regularly, and recent data indicates that rates of teen e-cigarette use continue to rise with most youth citing use of fruit and menthol or mint flavors. In 2021, a survey of San Francisco Unified School District found 20% of high school students reported having ever tried an e-cigarette, and 12.2% reported being smokers of either cigarettes or e-cigarettes.

Tobacco product use disproportionately impacts the Black/African American community, with higher morbidity from smoking related diseases. In addition, the smoking rates among LGBTQ+ individuals are higher than the general population. More than twice as many LGBTQ+ students report smoking before the age of 13 than heterosexual students.

Challenge

Existing law, SB 793, prohibits tobacco retailers from selling flavored tobacco products or tobacco product flavor enhancer. Despite the improvements to state law made by SB 793, counties across California are encountering the continued sale of flavored tobacco products to adults and minors. CDC Foundation data show

that over one-third of the e-cigarette sales in California are of prohibited flavored e-cigarettes. Additionally, approximately 50 percent of the licensed retailer locations inspected by CDTFA violate the flavored tobacco products ban.

Regulation and enforcement of SB 793 also poses a challenge to the City and County of San Francisco. SFDPH Environmental Health Branch (EHB) inspectors have identified a growing number of stores in San Francisco that sell banned flavored tobacco products, including to minors. Investigations by EHB and SFPD have found flavored products in stores, sales to minors, and tobacco sales by unlicensed stores. Between September 2023 and March 2024, adult decoys were able to purchase flavored tobacco products during 57% of the investigations carried out at San Francisco retailers. In the first half of 2024, the SFPD minor decoy was able to purchase tobacco products during every operation. Stores selling to minors and selling flavored products are mainly concentrated in the Tenderloin, the Bayview and the Mission neighborhoods. Most new community complaints about flavored tobacco sales in San Francisco are for retail locations that are not licensed tobacco sellers.

These data indicate that the current levels of administrative fines for unlicensed tobacco retailers and the penalties in place for licensed retailers do not appear to be a strong enough deterrent in comparison to the profit of selling flavored products.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 1230 would increase the civil penalties for violations of the STAKE Act (SB 793) and authorize the CDTFA to seize flavored tobacco products or tobacco product flavor enhancers that violate SB 793 at retail or other locations. SB 1230 would give more power to CDTFA to intervene in the distribution of flavored tobacco products around the state by expanding their ability to seize flavored tobacco products. This could potentially hamper distributors from selling flavored tobacco products to retail

stores and help reduce the availability of these products locally. For these reasons, San Francisco Department of Public Health recommends a support position on the bill.

Departments Impacted &Why

SB 1230 will significantly increase the fines for selling tobacco products to minors and will grant the power to state inspectors to seize and destroy flavored tobacco products. If the changes in law proposed by SB 1230 are successful in deterring the current level of flavored tobacco sales and sales to minors, it is projected EHB and SFPD will spend less time and resources re-inspecting businesses for tobacco related violations.

Fiscal Impact

CDTFA estimates that SB 1230 will likely result in a minor decrease in cigarette and tobacco product tax revenues of an unknown amount.

Support / Opposition

Support: American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network (co-sponsor) ; American Heart Association (co-sponsor); American Lung Association (co-sponsor) Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids (co-sponsor); California Dental Association; California Medical Association; Children Now; others

Oppose: None



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

Date Submitted	June 14, 2024
Submitting Department	Dept. of Technology
Contact Name	Brian Roberts
Contact Email and Phone Number	Brian.roberts@sfgov.org 628-224-1187
SLC Meeting Presenter	Brian Roberts
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 2797

Assemblymember McKinnor, Assembly District #61, D-Inglewood Telephone corporations: carriers of last resort: tariffs.

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

[AB 2797](#) would allow AT&T and other carriers of last resort (COLRs) a fast-track method for relieving themselves of obligations to serve. The COLR rules were created by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) in the late 1990's to ensure universal service while ushering in competition for telecommunications services. (AT&T is the state's largest COLR, but various smaller local phone companies are also COLRs.)

AB 2797 would establish a new regime where a COLR could be deemed relieved of its COLR obligations by notice to the CPUC demonstrating that there are at least two "alternative voice providers" that offer voice service in the area. The alternative provider could be a wireless provider and would not have to assume COLR responsibilities. The COLR seeking to be relieved of its obligations, would have to agree to certain customer notification, transition planning and digital equity planning obligations. However, these commitments would be self-executing, with no administrative review by the CPUC or opportunity for the public to comment.

AB 2797 would not require or incentivize investment in modern telecommunications infrastructure at all. It would facilitate disinvestment in AT&T's more economically challenging rural and low-income markets. The proposed contains no administrative review by the CPUC or public input of any kind.

Background/Analysis

AT&T applied for relief from its COLR obligations in March 2023. In addition to initiating a formal review of the application, the CPUC required AT&T to notify its customers about the proposal and scheduled public hearings. The public response to AT&T's proposal was overwhelmingly negative, largely due to concerns about the impact on access to emergency services through 911 and the availability of alternative service in rural areas.

On May 10, 2024 the CPUC Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) assigned to the case issued a [proposed decision](#) that dismissed AT&T's application with prejudice. The ALJ held that AT&T failed to comply with the process for seeking relief from COLR obligations and reform of the COLR regulations was a more appropriate way to address AT&T's concerns. The CPUC is scheduled to vote on the proposed decision at its July 20, 2024, meeting.

The Board of Supervisors adopted [Resolution 0132-24](#) urging the CPUC to identify an alternative COLR to "preserve guaranteed access to basic phone service for those who are most vulnerable as a condition of approval of AT&T's request to relinquish its COLR obligations." The resolution

further urges the CPUC to “require lasting protection, including a published written transition plan that outline steps AT&T will take to ensure no customers are left without phone service” and to “identify an alternative COLR to maintain guaranteed access to basic phone service for all of Californians if they grant AT&T's request.” AB 2797 would not provide guaranteed access to basic phone service or identify an alternative AT&T.

Challenge

AT&T maintains that its COLR obligations require the company to maintain a costly, antiquated copper telephone network. They argue that the obligations are unnecessary because most residents rely on wireless networks and the advantages of a traditional copper network for reaching 911 are exaggerated.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2797 proposes to address AT&T's concern by removing state level review and public process associated with withdrawing from its COLR responsibilities. This would avoid all administrative review and public process. Neither the CPUC nor any other agency will be allowed to verify that AT&T or other COLRs have met their commitments. The public would have no opportunity to comment. AT&T would attest to the capabilities of these alternative providers, the providers themselves would not have to make any representations about their own service. These alternatives could charge rates up to 25% higher than AT&T.

Departments Impacted & Why

The Department of Technology currently relies on extensively on traditional copper telecommunications lines. DT subscribes to over 4300 basic business lines from AT&T on behalf of a few City departments. In addition, the City has a few 2-way trunks, HiCap trunks (for remaining PBXs, and other data circuits. AT&T's application would not directly jeopardize these services, but it is one step in AT&T's effort to abandon its traditional copper service.

Fiscal Impact

The fiscal impact to DT and the City would not be direct, since AT&T would have to go through a few additional steps in order to abandon these services, namely get FCC approval to abandon services.

Support / Opposition

AB 2797 is a gut and replace bill, so support and opposition has not yet been registered.

AT&T sponsored this bill.

We are still putting together a complete list of supporters and opponents of the bill, but the following parties have opposed AT&T's application before the CPUC:

*California Congressional Delegation
Representative Adam B. Schiff
California State Association of Counties
Urban Counties of California
League of California Cities, Los Angeles County Division,
North Bay/North Coast Broadband Consortium
the California Association of Public Authorities for In-Home Supportive Services
California State Sheriff's Association
Amador County Board of Supervisors*

*Calaveras County Board of Supervisors
Humboldt County Board of Supervisors
Inyo County Board of Supervisors
Kern County Board of Supervisors
Marin County Board of Supervisors
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
Monterey County Board of Supervisors
Napa County Board of Supervisors
Nevada County Board of Supervisors
Sierra County Board of Supervisors
Sierra County Sheriff-Coroner's Office
Trinity County Board of Supervisors
Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors
Yolo County Board of Supervisors
County Commission on Aging and Adult Services
Berkeley City Council
City of Hidden Hills
City of Oakland
Town Council of the Town of Woodside
San Mateo County
Santa Clara County
The Utility Reform Network (TURN)
Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT)*