Board of Directors Meeting
South Bay City Council of Governments
Eileen Hupp, Chairman
Tuesday, August 6, 2019

1. Welcome
   a. Flag Salute
   Eileen Hupp, Chair
2. Self-Introductions and Sign-In
   All Participants
3. Approval of Minutes
   Serena Josel, Secretary
4. Presentation
   a. Serena Josel - Kaiser Permanente
5. Government Affairs Report
   PEAR Strategies
   a. AB 25 (Chau) California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018
   b. AB 394 (Obernolte) CEQA Exemptions Fire Safety
   c. AB 516 (Chiu) Authority to remove vehicles
   d. AB 846 (Burke) Customer Loyalty Programs
   e. AB 1066 (Gonzalez) Unemployment Insurance: Trade Disputes
   f. AB 1321 (Gipson) Public Lands: Automated Technology
6. Office Holders, Administrative Agencies and Community Partners - Please limit your reports to no more than 3 minutes.
   a. U.S. Chamber of Commerce - Jennings Imel and Vartan Dijhanian
   b. League of California Cities - Jeff Kiernan
   c. South Bay Cities Council of Governments - Hon. Olivia Valentine
   d. Office of Congresswoman Waters - Blanca Jimenez
   e. Office of Congressman Lieu – Aurelia Friedman
   f. Office of Senator Allen - Sam Liu
   g. Office of Senator Bradford - Nital Patel
   h. Office of Senator Lena Gonzalez-
   i. Office of Assemblymember Burke - Robert Pullen-Miles
   j. Office of Assemblymember Gipson - Chris Wilson
   k. Office of Assemblymember Muratsuchi - Andrew DeBlock
   l. Office of Assemblymember O’Donnell – Sarah Patterson
m. Office of Supervisor Hahn- Jennifer Lamarque
n. City of Long Beach- Lou Baglietto

7. [Officeholder representatives, non-chamber members, and guests are respectfully asked to leave the meeting at this point]

8. Chair’s Report Eileen Hupp
   a. Profit and Loss
   b. Balance Sheet
   c. 2018 Tax Returns
10. Adjournment/Announcements All
   a. Special thanks to The South Bay Cities Council of Governments for hosting us
   b. Special thanks to Elise Swanson from the San Pedro Chamber for breakfast
   c. Next SBACC Meeting is Tuesday, September 10, 2019
   d. South Bay WIB - Chris Cagle
   e. South Coast AQMD
   f. Los Angeles Air Force Base
June 11, 2019

The Honorable Autumn Burke  
California State Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 5150  
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: AB 1083 (BURKE) ENERGY AND ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENTS: CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY HEARING SCHEDULED – MAY 1, 2019  
SUPPORT – AS INTRODUCED FEBRUARY 21, 2019

Dear Assembly Member Burke:

The South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce is pleased to SUPPORT your AB 1083, which seeks more information on the impacts to California ratepayers of legislation that proposes to mandate procurement of energy-related projects.

AB 1083 would provide the legislature with additional analysis prior to the evaluation of procurement bills. California enacted the requirement for utilities to develop an Integrated Resources Plan (IRP), with the objective of providing reliable and least-cost electric services to Californians. SB 530 (DeLeon, 2015) requires that the utilities incorporate renewable energy planning into their IRP process. In this manner, the utilities are directed to set goals that will help the state meet the goals of obtaining greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions through a diversified portfolio of resources.

Despite this process, legislation mandating a procurement continues to be introduced on a yearly basis. Much of this legislation includes procurement of one type of energy, and dictates the exact amounts to be procured. Unfortunately, this process means that the demand for that particular type of energy goes up. When demand goes up, costs go up. These costs are then passed onto California ratepayers.

The purpose of the IRP process is to meet California’s GHG goals by using a diverse mix of resources to ensure costs are kept in check. As we have reiterated many times—California’s businesses pay among the highest rates in the country for energy, and those costs will continue to go up as costs related to wildfire and prevention and resiliency building are passed along to ratepayers.
To that end, **AB 1083** seeks to have the California Council on Science and Technology, a non-partisan, nonprofit organization established by the legislature in 1988 to provide technical input on policy issues, evaluate procurement bills to determine potential impacts to ratepayers. Given the complexity of rate structures, this bill would provide much needed additional information on the rate impacts of procurement bills that will help guide the legislature in their decision-making with respect to energy bills.

For these reasons, we **SUPPORT AB 1083**.

Sincerely,

Eileen Hupp  
SBACC Chair

Cc:  Office of Senator Allen  
Office of Senator Bradford  
Office of Assemblymember Burke  
Office of Assemblymember Gipson  
Office of Assemblymember Muratsuchi  
Office of Assemblymember O’Donnell
June 11, 2019

The Honorable Ben Allen
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 4076
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: SB 43 (ALLEN) CARBON TAXES
HEARING SCHEDULED - MARCH 20, 2019
OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED – INTRODUCED DECEMBER 3, 2018

Dear Senator Allen:

The South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce (SBACC) respectfully OPPOSED UNLESS AMENDED to your SB 43.

SB 43 is a challenging bill for many reasons. SB 43 proposes to create a new regulatory scheme to measure the “carbon intensity” of every product sold in the state of California. When considering the massive expanse of such a system, the logistics and enormity of such a task stand out. Sales tax touches almost every part of the economy of California. While we appreciate the desire to study such an issue, we believe that the study must consider all of the following.

Expansion of Core Purpose of Study

As currently drafted, SB 43 directs the agencies to evaluate the “feasibility and practicality of” a carbon-based tax. This language should be expanded to include economic impacts to business, including California’s competitiveness with other states, impacts on gross domestic product, increases in transportation costs, and other economic impacts to Californians.

Evaluation of Fairness

A tax based on the carbon-intensity of products is regressive, meaning that low-income Californians spend a larger proportion of their income on basic necessities that will be subject to this tax. This study should evaluate mechanisms to ensure that a retail carbon tax avoids this regressive impacts on low-income
individuals and communities, and whether it is fair to apply a carbon-based tax to retail goods but not other sectors of the economy, including areas such as agriculture, air travel, and water usage.

**Impact on Transportation Revenues**

Imposing a carbon-based tax on fuel will drastically increase already high gasoline prices. CalChamber supported the bi-partisan effort to raise funds for long-deferred maintenance and improvement of California’s roads and infrastructure. However, such funds are tied to fuel consumption. This bill has a stated intent to “encourage the use of less carbon-intensive products.” This study must evaluate the impact on transportation infrastructure funds that would result from a decrease in fuel usage, and how such deficits would impact California’s transportation system.

**Impacts on Sales & Use Tax Revenues**

The bill includes a goal of revenue neutrality. The study should evaluate how reductions in sales resulting from reductions in consumer purchasing behaviors will impact revenues, and whether the higher prices will disproportionately impact certain Californians.

**Consultation with All Agencies Affected by a Sales Tax to Carbon Tax Swap**

**SB 43** currently requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to consult with the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration in evaluating the feasibility and practicality of replacement of the sales tax. However, this concept impacts more than just these agencies. Many agencies are funded by and implement sales & use tax, or regulate the products to which such a tax would apply. Additionally, other agencies have experience in toxicology, energy technology, labor, economic development, housing, and business development. The bill should be expanded to include all agencies that are affected by or regularly evaluate energy, environmental, tax, transportation, agriculture, economic development, and finance issues.

**Barriers for Retail**

The study must work with economic development agencies and businesses to evaluate the impact to retail product manufacturers and stores. A swap from a simple sales tax to a carbon-based tax will mean significant upgrades to point of sale systems, retail displays, and the logistics of a sales tax that have driven the technological development of the point of sale system used by most retailers today. The study should evaluate how wholesale changes to displays, labeling, and transparency will change consumer behavior and the economic impact of these changes, including consulting with experts in the areas of social and behavioral science and economic decision making of consumers.

**Duplicates Existing California Climate Policy**

California’s ambitious climate goals have resulted in world-leading programs, including fuel efficiency standards on vehicles, air quality controls, renewable goals, and a market-based greenhouse gas program. Cap-and-Trade was recently extended by bi-partisan action, and has resulted in millions of dollars of funds made available to state agencies to fund air quality and GHG emission reductions. A “carbon intensity”-based tax would stack additional costs associated on top of these programs. Stacking these programs will result in tremendous increases in energy, transport, manufacturing, and all other industries that would be
subject to both the sales tax and carbon policies. Any study must consider the impact and efficacy of replacement of all carbon-based programs, including impacts on the various programs currently funded by cap-and-and trade.

**Determining the Carbon Intensity of a Product is a Large Burden**

California’s businesses manufacture or sell billions of products. California manufacturers often have more than one production facility, which means the same product may travel from different locations in the state based upon retail demand. The study must evaluate the size of the agency, the number of employees, and the process by which products will be evaluated for carbon-intensity. And this is only after the study evaluates what carbon-intensity even means, which will necessarily require a many-factored evaluation for each item made at each facility during different times of the year, and perhaps even different times of the day resulting from changes in energy sources.

**The Study Must Include Input from the Entities Subject to a New Carbon Tax**

A robust study must include input from all stakeholders, including businesses and manufacturers that will necessarily have to implement such a program. The study should ensure meaningful public participation in the evaluation of a carbon-based tax replacement.

For these reasons, we must respectfully **OPPOSE** your **SB 43 (Allen) UNLESS AMENDED**. We look forward to discussing potential amendments to incorporate our concerns set forth above.

Sincerely,

Eileen Hupp
SBACC Chair

Cc: Office of Senator Allen  
Office of Senator Bradford  
Office of Assemblymember Burke  
Office of Assemblymember Gipson  
Office of Assemblymember Muratsuchi  
Office of Assemblymember O’Donnell
July 29, 2019

TO: Members, Senate Committee on Appropriations

SUBJECT: AB 1404 (SANTIAGO) NONPROFIT SPONSORS: REPORTING OBLIGATIONS
OPPOSE – AS AMENDED JUNE 27, 2019

We respectfully OPPOSE AB 1404 (Santiago).

This bill raises significant privacy concerns in that it would force specified “nonprofit sponsors” to disclose private compensation information regarding certain individuals. Specifically, the bill requires covered nonprofit sponsors to annually disclose the “name and title of each listed person receiving deferred compensation allocated by a nonprofit sponsor, the total amount and type of the compensation paid to each listed person, and reportable compensation, including base compensation, bonus and incentive compensation, other reportable compensation, and other nontaxable benefits.”

We are concerned that the disclosure of such information would violate the right to privacy of such individuals and violate the federal Right to Financial Privacy Act (12 U.S.C. §§ 3401-3423) and the California Right to Financial Privacy Act (Govt. Code § 7470, et seq.). Disclosure of confidential compensation information may also raise concerns under state and federal antitrust laws.

More generally, we do not think it is appropriate to propose state legislation targeted at one particular organization, especially when the motivation appears to be, at least in part, to gain leverage as part of current negotiations over a collective bargaining agreement. Legislation that targets a particular organization or group of individuals without a reasonable purpose is discriminatory and likely violates the due process and equal protection clauses of the federal and state constitutions. While the bill purports to apply to any “nonprofit sponsor,” the materials prepared by the sponsor leave no doubt that this legislation is targeted at one particular organization. We believe it is inappropriate for the legislative process to be utilized in this fashion.

Similarly, we believe that legislation targeted at one organization threatens to put that organization at a competitive disadvantage, especially if it forces one entity to disclose information that could be utilized by market competitors.

For these reasons, we respectfully OPPOSE AB 1404.

Sincerely,

Eileen Hupp
SBACC Chair

Cc: Office of Senator Allen
    Office of Senator Bradford
Office of Assemblymember Burke
Office of Assemblymember Gipson
Office of Assemblymember Muratsuchi
Office of Assemblymember O’Donnell
TO: Members, Senate Education Committee  
FROM: South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce (SBACC)  
SUBJECT: ACA 14 (GONZALEZ) UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA: SUPPORT SERVICES: EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY STANDARDS  
OPPOSE – AS AMENDED JUNE 13, 2019

We OPPOSE ACA 14 (Gonzalez), as amended June 13, 2019, as it is an unnecessary prohibition on University of California contracts, and ultimately will raise UC costs by preventing the University from using its restricted budget in the most efficient manner possible. Students, employers, and taxpayers are all depending on the UC’s ability to continue expanding enrollment without compromising on the quality of the education it provides and without substantially increasing the state’s General Fund contribution. ACA 14 will only make that challenge more difficult.

WITHOUT STATUTORY AUTHORITY PERMITTING IT, ALL UC SUPPORT SERVICE CONTRACTS WOULD BE BARRED UNDER ACA 14

ACA 14 targets the University of California and places contracting prohibitions on the UC that are not applicable to any other state agency. Specifically, ACA 14 prohibits the UC from contracting out for support services unless “authorized to do so by statute and only to the extent necessary to address one or more of the following needs”. Without subsequent statutory authority permitting a contract, this Constitutional Amendment would bar all UC support service contracts. Even if the legislature provides subsequent statutory authority to permit a contract, ACA 14 would only permit a contract under limited circumstances such as a “bona fide emergency circumstance,” or licensed, clinically trained workers from a registry. Even then, ACA 14 limits some of these contracts to a maximum of 10 days, which will further discourage any contractor from even bidding or accepting the contract.

ACA 14 MANDATES THE “SAME” WAGES AND IS INCONSISTENT WITH CALIFORNIA’S EQUAL PAY LAW

ACA 14 further constrains contracting even when the statutory exemption to contract meets one of the five purposes and has been authorized by statute, by requiring the contract to meet 4 other criteria, including mandating any contractor to “receive” the same wage and benefits for contracted workers that University employees performing “similar work” receive. This is inconsistent with California’s Equal Pay Law, which: (1) requires an employer to “pay” the same wage rate to employees who perform “substantially similar” work and (2) recognizes that wage disparities do not automatically equate into
wage discrimination or a violation of law. Specifically, under Labor Code Section 1197.5, there are numerous, lawful, bona fide factors as to why an employer may pay different rates between employees performing substantially similar work, such as: (1) different educational or training backgrounds amongst employees; (2) different career experience; (3) varying levels of seniority or longevity with the employer; (4) objective, merit-based system of the employer; (5) a compensation system that measures earning by quantity or quality of production; (6) geographical differences that impact the cost of living and job market; and, (7) shift differentials. Mandating same wage and benefits for “similar work,” without recognizing objective, lawful, distinctions as to why workers may be paid differently, is inconsistent with California’s equal pay laws and will significantly increase the UC’s costs.

Moreover, the “benefits” and “wages” are personal in the sense that personal choices can dictate and change the amount an individual receives. For example, one employee may elect more pre-tax deductions than another, which will change the employee’s “wages” that they ultimately “receive.” Additionally, another employee may elect a certain level of health care that another employee does not, which also affects the benefits “received.” How is the UC expected to analyze these personal decisions and distinctions and ensure that a contractor “receives” the same wages and benefits as employees? It’s a significant and potentially impossible challenge for the UC to achieve.

**ACA 14 IMPACTS ALL UC ENTITIES, INCLUDING UC MEDICAL CENTERS, CLINICS AND LABORATORIES**

The prohibition on contracting out for support services under ACA 14 not only effects the UC campuses but also UC medical centers, clinics and laboratories. The support service contracts which are prohibited under ACA 14 include “but are not necessarily limited to” numerous general support services but also medically related services such as “billing and coding services, sterile processing, hospital or nursing assistant services, medical imagining or respiratory therapy technician services, other patient care technical and service bargaining unit work.” In some counties, such as Sacramento, the UC Medical Center remains the only level 1 trauma center for both adults and children and just like all UC Medical Centers, does not receive state funding for clinical care. With health care costs increasing nationally, California should not make it more difficult for our medical centers and clinics to keep health care costs down.

**UC BUDGETARY FLEXIBILITY CRITICAL TO MEETING THE STATE’S FUTURE WORKFORCE NEEDS**

State funding for the UC was reduced significantly during the economic downturn, and while recent state budgets have started to restore some of this funding, the University is still operating with less state support than it previously had. At the same time, the UC is seeking to increase enrollment to serve more students and meet the state’s future workforce needs while keeping tuition rates flat to the extent possible. To meet both of these objectives, the UC must have the flexibility to find more cost-effective ways to maintain university operations without compromising the quality of the education and other services it provides.

**THE UC HAS ALREADY ADDRESSED THIS ISSUE IN ITS “FAIR WAGE/FAIR WORK’ PLAN**

The University of California has already incrementally increased its minimum wage for both employees and contracts workers, and has pledged to better oversee contracts generally. The UC “Fair Wage/Fair
Work” Plan, which went into effect October 1, 2015 requires 1) increased minimum wages for all UC workers, 2) annual audits of service contracts to ensure appropriate wages and working conditions are being met, and 3) a dedicated hot-line to report worker complaints. Thus, the concerns that this Constitutional amendment, is trying to address, were proactively addressed by the UC in their “Fair Wage/Fair Work” Plan. The UC minimum wage rose to $15 per hour in October 2017 and the audits and hotline continue to provide protection for employees and service contract workers.

Not only does ACA 14 unnecessarily take authority away from the UC Board of Regents, which is charged with governing the university, it also restricts the UC’s ability to operate more efficiently to serve more students and meet workforce demands.

For these reasons and more, we OPPOSE ACA 14 (Gonzalez).

Sincerely,

Eileen Hupp
SBACC Chair

Cc: Office of Senator Allen
Office of Senator Bradford
Office of Assemblymember Burke
Office of Assemblymember Gipson
Office of Assemblymember Muratsuchi
Office of Assemblymember O’Donnell
June 11, 2019

The Honorable Tom Umberg
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 3076
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: SB 736 (UMBERG) CREATIVE ECONOMY INCENTIVE PROGRAM
SUPPORT – AS AMENDED MARCH 27, 2019

Dear Senator Umberg:

The South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce is proud to SUPPORT your SB 736 (Umberg), the Creative Economy Incentive Program as amended March 27, 2019 because it will spur tourism, jobs, and economic growth in California by helping local jurisdictions compete with other states to attract large events.

Creative industries make a significant contribution to employment and economic growth in California. Each year, dozens of cultural, sporting, agricultural, and entertainment events attract international attention. Other states, such as Texas and Louisiana, have used similar programs to attract large sporting events, including NCAA tournaments, NBA All-Star Games, and Junior Olympics. Cities and counties compete vigorously to attract these events, which provide an important source of revenue for hotels, restaurants, shopping and transportation, as well as valuable publicity for the municipality. Beyond the event itself, they foster innovation and encourage spillover effects that create opportunities for other industries by attracting investment, tourism, and tax revenue.

Though California’s natural beauty is always appealing, California cannot fall behind other states in competing for nation-wide events. SB 736 would establish the Creative Economy Incentive Program (CEIP), to be managed by the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) for the purpose of administering financial support to cities, counties and joint powers agencies to help keep California competitive against other states. Importantly, SB 736 would do so in a financially safe way, by providing a thorough list of application criteria for applicants to provide to GO-Biz and by ensuring that funds will only be distributed after the local entity has been selected to host the event.

In order to keep California competitive with other states and promote tourism, we SUPPORT your SB 736.

Sincerely,

__________________________________________
Eileen Hupp  
SBACC Chair  

Cc: Office of Senator Allen  
    Office of Senator Bradford  
    Office of Assemblymember Burke  
    Office of Assemblymember Gipson  
    Office of Assemblymember Muratsuchi  
    Office of Assemblymember O’Donnell
AB 5  (Gonzalez D)  Worker status: employees and independent contractors.
Last Amended: 7/11/2019
Status: 7/11/2019-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Location: 7/10/2019-S. APPR.
Summary:
Would state the intent of the Legislature to codify the decision in the Dynamex case and clarify its application. The bill would provide that the factors of the “ABC” test be applied in order to determine the status of a worker as an employee or independent contractor for all provisions of the Labor Code and the Unemployment Insurance Code, except if a statutory exemption from employment status or from a particular obligation related to employment or where a statutory grant of employment status or a particular right related to employment applies. The bill would exempt specified professions from these provisions and instead provide that the employment relationship test for those professions shall be governed by the test adopted in S. G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal.3d 341 if certain requirements are met.

Position: Oppose

AB 9  (Reyes D)  Employment discrimination: limitation of actions.
Last Amended: 7/11/2019
Status: 7/11/2019-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Location: 7/10/2019-S. APPR.
Summary:
The California Fair Employment and Housing Act makes specified employment and housing practices unlawful, including discrimination against or harassment of employees and tenants, among others. Existing law authorizes a person claiming to be aggrieved by an alleged unlawful practice to file a verified complaint with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing within one year from the date upon which the unlawful practice occurred, unless otherwise specified. This bill would extend the above-described period to 3 years for complaints alleging employment discrimination, as specified. The bill would specify that the operative date of the verified complaint is the date that the intake form was filed with the Labor Commissioner.

Position: Oppose

AB 23  (Burke D)  Office of Small Business Advocate: Deputy of Business and Workforce Coordination.
Last Amended: 4/29/2019
Status: 7/1/2019-In committee: Referred to APPR. suspense file.
Location: 7/1/2019-S. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE
Summary:
Would establish a Deputy of Business and Workforce Coordination in the Office of Small Business Advocate, to be appointed by the Director of the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development. The bill would require the Office of Small Business Advocate to collaborate and coordinate with specified entities to determine the extent to which existing workforce development efforts and programs address the labor needs of small businesses across industry sectors and regions in the state and to engage industry and business on ways to better align career technical education courses, workforce training programs, and pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs with regional and local labor market demand.

Position: Support

AB 36  (Bloom D)  Residential tenancies: rent control.
Last Amended: 4/22/2019
Status: 4/25/2019-Re-referred to Com. on RLS. pursuant to Assembly Rule 96(a).
Location: 4/25/2019-A. RLS.
Summary:
The Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act prescribes statewide limits on the application of local rent
control with regard to certain properties. This bill would modify those provisions to authorize an owner of residential real property to establish the initial and all subsequent rental rates for a dwelling or unit that has been issued its first certificate of occupancy within 20 years of the date upon which the owner seeks to establish the initial or subsequent rental rate, or for a dwelling or unit that is alienable separate from the title to any other dwelling unit or is a subdivided interest in a subdivision and the owner is a natural person who owns 10 or fewer residential units within the same jurisdiction as the dwelling or unit for which the owner seeks to establish the initial or subsequent rental rate, subject to certain exceptions.

Position: Oppose

**AB 39** (Muratsuchi D)  
**Education finance: local control funding formula: aspirational funding level: reports.**  
**Current Text:** Amended: 5/8/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)  
**Last Amended:** 5/8/2019  
**Status:** 6/24/2019-In committee: Referred to APPR. suspense file.  
**Location:** 6/24/2019-S. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE  
**Summary:**  
Current law requires funding pursuant to the local control funding formula to include, in addition to a base grant, supplemental and concentration grant add-ons that are based on the percentage of pupils who are English learners, foster youth, or eligible for free or reduced-price meals, as specified, served by the county superintendent of schools, school district, or charter school. Current law specifies the amount of the base grant in the 2013-14 fiscal year, as provided, and requires that amount to be adjusted for changes in cost of living in subsequent fiscal years. This bill would express the intent of the Legislature to increase the base grants to amounts equal to the national average per-pupil funding level, as provided.

Position: Support

**AB 51** (Gonzalez D)  
**Employment discrimination: enforcement.**  
**Current Text:** Amended: 3/26/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)  
**Last Amended:** 3/26/2019  
**Status:** 7/10/2019-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 7. Noes 1.) (July 9). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.  
**Location:** 7/10/2019-S. APPR.  
**Summary:**  
Would prohibit a person from requiring any applicant for employment or any employee to waive any right, forum, or procedure for a violation of any provision of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) or other specific statutes governing employment as a condition of employment, continued employment, or the receipt of any employment-related benefit. The bill would also prohibit an employer from threatening, retaliating or discriminating against, or terminating any applicant for employment or any employee because of the refusal to consent to the waiver of any right, forum, or procedure for a violation of specific statutes governing employment.

Position: Oppose

**AB 71** (Melendez R)  
**Employment standards: independent contractors and employees.**  
**Current Text:** Amended: 2/25/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)  
**Last Amended:** 2/25/2019  
**Status:** 4/26/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was L. & E. on 1/17/2019)  
(May be acted upon Jan 2020)  
**Location:** 4/26/2019-A. 2 YEAR  
**Summary:**  
Current case law establishes a three-part test, known as the “ABC” test, for determining whether a worker is considered an independent contractor for purposes of specified wage orders. Under this test, a worker is properly considered an independent contractor only if the hiring entity establishes; 1) that the worker is free from the control and direction of the hirer in connection with the performance of the work, both under the contract for performance of the work and in fact; 2) that the worker performs work outside the usual course of the hiring entity's business; and 3) that the worker is customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or business of the same nature as the work performed for the hiring entity. This bill would, instead, require a determination of whether a person is an employee or an independent contractor to be based on a specific multifactor test, including whether the person to whom service is rendered has the right to control the manner and means of accomplishing the result desired, and other identified factors.
**Position:** Oppose

**AB 161  (Ting D)  Solid waste: paper waste: proofs of purchase.**
**Current Text:** Amended: 6/27/2019  [html]  [pdf]
**Last Amended:** 6/27/2019
**Status:** 7/3/2019-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (July 3). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
**Location:** 7/3/2019-S. APPR.
**Summary:**
Current law prohibits certain stores from providing a single-use carryout bag to a customer at the point of sale and prohibits full-service restaurants from providing single-use plastic straws to consumers unless requested by the consumer. This bill would require a business, as defined, that accepts payment through cash, credit, or debit transactions, subject to certain exceptions, to provide a proof of purchase to a consumer only at the consumer’s option and would prohibit a business from printing a paper proof of purchase if the consumer opts to not receive a proof of purchase, unless otherwise required by state or federal law.

**Position:** Oppose

**AB 171  (Gonzalez D)  Employment: sexual harassment.**
**Current Text:** Amended: 7/3/2019  [html]  [pdf]
**Last Amended:** 7/3/2019
**Status:** 7/10/2019-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 4. Noes 1.) (July 10). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
**Location:** 7/10/2019-S. APPR.
**Summary:**
Current law prohibits an employer from discharging or in any manner discriminating or retaliating against an employee who is a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking for taking time off work to obtain specified relief or because of the employee’s status as a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, if the victim provides notice to the employer of the status or the employer has actual knowledge of the status. Current law authorizes an employee to file a complaint with the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement for a violation of these prohibitions within one year from the date of occurrence of the violation. Current law makes it a misdemeanor for an employer to refuse to rehire, promote, or restore an employee who has been determined to be so eligible by a grievance procedure or legal hearing. This bill would expand the scope of these provisions by defining “employer” for purposes of these provisions to mean any person employing another under any appointment or contract of hire and to include the state, political subdivisions of the state, and municipalities.

**Position:** Oppose

**AB 202  (Mathis R)  Endangered species: conservation: California State Safe Harbor Agreement Program Act.**
**Current Text:** Amended: 2/26/2019  [html]  [pdf]
**Last Amended:** 2/26/2019
**Status:** 7/10/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was N.R. & W. on 4/24/2019)(May be acted upon Jan 2020)
**Location:** 7/10/2019-S. 2 YEAR
**Summary:**
Would delete the January 1, 2020, repeal date of the California State Safe Harbor Agreement Program Act, thereby extending the operation of the act indefinitely. Because submission of false, inaccurate, or misleading information on an application for a state safe harbor agreement under the act would be a crime, this bill would extend the application of a crime, thus imposing a state-mandated local program.

**Position:** Support

**AB 245  (Muratsuchi D)  California Aerospace and Aviation Commission: establishment.**
**Current Text:** Amended: 5/17/2019  [html]  [pdf]
**Last Amended:** 5/17/2019
**Status:** 7/10/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was G.O. on 6/17/2019) (May be acted upon Jan 2020)
**Location:** 7/10/2019-S. 2 YEAR
**Summary:**
Would establish, within the office, the California Aerospace and Aviation Commission consisting of 15 members, as specified, to serve as a central point of contact for businesses engaged in the aerospace
and aviation industries and to support the health and competitiveness of these industries in California. The bill would require the commission to make recommendations on legislative and administrative action that may be necessary or helpful to maintain or improve the state’s aerospace and aviation industries and would authorize the commission to engage in various other activities in undertaking its mission and responsibilities, as specified.

**Position:** Support

**AB 345** (Muratsuchi D) **Oil and gas: operations: location restrictions.**

*Current Text:* Amended: 4/29/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

*Last Amended:* 4/29/2019

*Status:* 5/17/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 5/16/2019)(May be acted upon Jan 2020)

*Location:* 5/17/2019-A. 2 YEAR

*Summary:* Would require, commencing January 1, 2020, all new oil and gas development or enhancement operation, as defined, that is not on federal land, to be located at least 2,500 feet from a residence, school, childcare facility, playground, hospital, or health clinic. The bill would authorize a city or county to require by ordinance that new oil and gas development or enhancement operation be located a larger distance away from a residence, school, childcare facility, playground, hospital, or health clinic than 2,500 feet.

*Position:* Oppose

**AB 394** (Obernolte R) **California Environmental Quality Act: exemption: egress route project or activity: fire safety.**

*Current Text:* Amended: 6/13/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

*Last Amended:* 6/13/2019

*Status:* 7/9/2019-VOTE: Do pass as amended, but first amend, and re-refer to the Committee on Appropriations] (PASS)

*Location:* 7/9/2019-S. APPR.

*Summary:* Would, until January 1, 2025, exempt from CEQA egress route projects or activities undertaken by a public agency that are specifically recommended by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection that improve the fire safety of an existing subdivision if certain conditions are met. The bill would require the lead agency to hold a noticed public meeting to hear and respond to public comments before determining that a project or activity is exempt. The bill would require the lead agency to file a notice of exemption with the Office of Planning and Research and with the clerk of the county in which the project or activity will be located.

*Position:* Support

**AB 403** (Kalra D) **Division of Labor Standards Enforcement: complaint.**

*Current Text:* Amended: 5/16/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

*Last Amended:* 5/16/2019

*Status:* 7/10/2019-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 7. Noes 1.) (July 9). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

*Location:* 7/10/2019-S. APPR.

*Summary:* Current law authorizes a person who believes they have been discharged or otherwise discriminated against in violation of any law under the jurisdiction of the Labor Commissioner to file a complaint with the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement within 6 months after the occurrence of the violation. This bill would extend the period to file a complaint to within 2 years after the occurrence of the violation, except that violations of certain provisions may be filed within one year. This bill contains other related provisions and other current laws.

*Position:* Oppose

**AB 430** (Gallagher R) **Housing development: Camp Fire Housing Assistance Act of 2019.**

*Current Text:* Amended: 7/8/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

*Last Amended:* 7/8/2019

*Status:* 7/10/2019-VOTE: Do pass as amended, but first amend, and re-refer to the Committee on Appropriations] (PASS)
Location: 7/10/2019-S. APPR.

Summary:
Current law authorizes a development proponent to submit an application for a development permit that is subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process and not subject to a conditional use permit if the development satisfies specified objective planning standards, including that the development is a multifamily housing development that contains 2 or more residential units. This bill would authorize a development proponent to submit an application for a residential development, or mixed-use development that includes residential units with a specified percentage of space designated for residential use, within the territorial boundaries or a specialized residential planning area identified in the general plan of, and adjacent to existing urban development within, specified cities that is subject to a similar streamlined, ministerial approval process and not subject to a conditional use permit if the development satisfies specified objective planning standards.

Position: Support

**AB 520** (Kalra D) Public works: public subsidy.
Current Text: Amended: 2/28/2019  html  pdf
Last Amended: 2/28/2019
Location: 6/25/2019-S. THIRD READING
Summary:
Current law defines “public works” to include, among other things, construction, alteration, demolition, installation, or repair work done under contract and paid for, in whole or in part, out of public funds, but exempts from that definition, among other projects, an otherwise private development project if the state or political subdivision provides, directly or indirectly, a public subsidy to the private development project that is de minimis in the context of the project. This bill would provide that a public subsidy is de minimis if it is both less than $275,000 and less than 2% of the total project cost. The bill would specify that those provisions do not apply to a project that was advertised for bid, or a contract that was awarded before July 1, 2020.

Position: Oppose

**AB 535** (Brough R) Personal income taxes: credit: professional license fees.
Last Amended: 4/8/2019
Location: 3/21/2019-A. REV. & TAX
Summary:
Would allow a credit against personal income taxes for each taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2020, and before January 1, 2025, in an amount equal to the cost paid or incurred during the taxable year for an initial professional license fee. The bill also would include additional information required for any bill authorizing a new income tax credit.

Position: Support

**AB 628** (Bonta D) Employment: victims of sexual harassment: protections.
Current Text: Amended: 5/16/2019  html  pdf
Last Amended: 5/16/2019
Location: 5/29/2019-A. THIRD READING
Summary:
Current law prohibits an employer from discharging or discriminating or retaliating against, an employee who is a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking because of the employee’s status as a victim, if the employer has notice or knowledge of that status. Current law additionally prohibits an employer with 25 or more employees from discharging, or discriminating or retaliating against, an employee who is a victim, in this regard, who takes time off to obtain specified services or counseling. This bill would extend these employment protections to victims of sexual harassment, as defined. The bill would also extend these employment protections to specified family members, as defined, of the victims for taking time off from work to provide assistance to the victims when seeking relief or obtaining those services and counseling, as specified.

Position: Oppose
AB 720  (Muratsuchi D)  Community colleges: funding: instructional service agreements with public safety agencies.

Last Amended: 4/11/2019
Status: 7/1/2019-In committee: Referred to APPR. suspense file.
Location: 7/1/2019-S. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE
Summary:
Current law provides a separate formula for the allocation of apportionsments of state funds to community colleges, which uses the numbers of full-time equivalent students as its basis, for use for apportionsments for noncredit instruction and instruction in career development and college preparation. This bill would provide that instruction by community college districts under instructional service agreements with public safety agencies, as defined, would be funded under the apportionment formula used for instruction in career development and college preparation. The bill would also make various nonsubstantive changes.

Position: Support

AB 731  (Kalra D)  Health care coverage: rate review.

Last Amended: 7/11/2019
Status: 7/11/2019-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Location: 7/11/2019-S. APPR.
Summary:
Current law requires a health care service plan or health insurer offering a contract or policy in the individual or small group market to file specified information, including total earned premiums and total incurred claims for each contract or policy form, with the appropriate department at least 120 days before implementing a rate change. Current law requires a health plan that exclusively contracts with no more than 2 medical groups in the state to disclose actual trend experience information in lieu of disclosing specified annual medical trend factor assumptions and projected trends, as specified. Under current law, the contracted rates between a plan or insurer and a large group are confidential and exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act. This bill would expand those requirements to apply to large group health care service plan contracts and health insurance policies, and would impose additional rate filing requirements on large group contracts and policies.

Position: Oppose

AB 764  (Bonta D)  Sugar-sweetened beverages: nonsale distribution incentives.

Last Amended: 5/28/2019
Location: 5/20/2019-A. THIRD READING
Summary:
Would regulate promotion and marketing activities related to sugar-sweetened beverages, as defined, by prohibiting a beverage company, as defined, manufacturer, or distributor, as defined, from giving or offering incentives or other financial support to compensate distributors or retailers for the cost of promotional offers, coupons, or other incentives offered to consumers for branded products of the beverage company. The bill would exempt from that prohibition contracts between a beverage company, manufacturer, or distributor and a theme or amusement park, zoo, other attraction, or professional sports stadium that include nonfood promotions.

Position: Oppose

AB 765  (Wicks D)  Health Checkout Aisles for Healthy Families Act.

Current Text: Amended: 4/10/2019  html  pdf
Last Amended: 4/10/2019
Status: 4/26/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was HEALTH on 2/28/2019)
(May be acted upon Jan 2020)
Location: 4/26/2019-A. 2 YEAR
Summary:
Would enact the California Healthy Checkout Aisles for Healthy Families Act, and would require a store, as defined, to make available only specified beverages, including milk and natural fruit and vegetable juice, in the checkout areas of the store. The bill would require the department and the local health agency having jurisdiction over the store to administer and enforce the act. The bill would make a
violation of its provisions an infraction, and would require the first violation to result in a notice of violation. The bill would make the 2nd and 3rd violations within a 5-year period punishable by fines of not more than $250 and $500, respectively.

**Position:** Oppose

**AB 766** (Chiu D) Unsealed beverage container portion cap.

**Current Text:** Amended: 4/2/2019  [html]  [pdf]

**Last Amended:** 4/2/2019

**Status:** 4/26/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was HEALTH on 2/28/2019)

(May be acted upon Jan 2020)

**Location:** 4/26/2019-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:**
Would prohibit a retailer from selling, offering for sale, or otherwise providing to a consumer an unsealed beverage container, as defined, that is able to contain more than 16 fluid ounces, except for an unsealed beverage container designated for the consumption of water. The bill would define retailer to mean any person, firm, corporation, or business that sells, offers for sale, or otherwise provides a sugar-sweetened beverage to a consumer.

**Position:** Oppose

**AB 882** (McCarty D) Termination of employment: drug testing: medication-assisted treatment.

**Current Text:** Introduced: 2/20/2019  [html]  [pdf]

**Status:** 4/26/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(2). (Last location was L. & E. on 3/4/2019)

(May be acted upon Jan 2020)

**Location:** 4/26/2019-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:**
Current law requires an employer who regularly employs 25 or more employees to reasonably accommodate any employee who voluntarily participates in an alcohol or drug rehabilitation program, provided the employer does not suffer undue hardship. This bill would prohibit an employer, regardless of the number of employees, from discharging an employee for testing positive for a drug that is being used as a medical-assisted treatment, under the care of a physician or licensed treatment program, as specified.

**Position:** Oppose

**AB 1083** (Burke D) Long-term plans and procurement plans: energy and energy infrastructure procurement requirements: California Council on Science and Technology.

**Current Text:** Amended: 6/20/2019  [html]  [pdf]

**Last Amended:** 6/20/2019

**Status:** 7/10/2019-VOTE: Do pass as amended (PASS)

**Location:** 6/26/2019-S. E. U., & C.

**Summary:**
Would, until January 1, 2023, request the California Council on Science and Technology upon request by the chairperson of a fiscal committee or certain policy committees of either the Assembly or Senate, the Speaker of the Assembly, or the President pro Tempore of the Senate, to undertake and complete an analysis of the effects of legislation proposing to mandate procurement of electricity products, gas products, energy storage resources, or electrical or gas infrastructure by an electrical corporation, gas corporation, community choice aggregator, electric service provider, local publicly owned electric or gas utility, or any state-level energy procurement entity.

**Position:** Support


**Current Text:** Amended: 6/24/2019  [html]  [pdf]

**Last Amended:** 6/24/2019

**Status:** 7/9/2019-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 13. Noes 0.) (July 9).

Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

**Location:** 7/9/2019-S. APPR.

**Summary:**
Would require the State Air Resources Board, through a public process, to consider before January 1, 2023, allowing renewable natural gas or biogas that is delivered via a common carrier pipeline to a
crude oil production or transport facility from a source that the state board determines directly reduces emissions of methane in the state to generate specified credits under the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard regulations.

**Position:** Support

**AB 1224**  (Gray D)  *Disability insurance: paid family leave program.*

**Current Text:** Amended: 4/22/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

**Last Amended:** 4/22/2019

**Status:** 5/17/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 5/8/2019)(May be acted upon Jan 2020)

**Location:** 5/17/2019-A. 2 YEAR

**Summary:**
Current law establishes, within the state disability insurance program, the family temporary disability insurance program, also known as the paid family leave program, for the provision of up to 6 weeks of wage replacement benefits to workers who take time off work to care for a seriously ill family member or to bond with a minor child within one year of the birth or placement of the child in connection with foster care or adoption. Current law limits the temporary disability benefits paid under these provisions to not more than 6 weeks within any 12-month period. This bill would authorize up to 12 weeks of temporary disability benefits in a 12-month period, but would limit each disability benefit period to 6 weeks of temporary disability benefits.

**Position:** Oppose

**AB 1404**  (Santiago D)  *Nonprofit sponsors: reporting obligations.*

**Current Text:** Amended: 7/11/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

**Last Amended:** 7/11/2019

**Status:** 7/11/2019-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

**Location:** 7/11/2019-S. APPR.

**Summary:**
The Nonprofit Corporation Law regulates the organization and operation of nonprofit public benefit corporations, nonprofit mutual benefit corporations, and nonprofit religious corporations, including, but not limited to, health care service plans. That law requires a nonprofit public benefit corporation to furnish annually to its members a report that includes the assets and liabilities of the corporation, revenue or receipts of the corporation, and the expenses or disbursements of the corporation. This bill would require a nonprofit sponsor to make annual disclosures to the Secretary of State at the conclusion of each taxable year for which the nonprofit sponsor files an Internal Revenue Service Form 990.

**Position:** Oppose

**AB 1416**  (Cooley D)  *Business: collection and disclosures of consumer personal information.*

**Current Text:** Amended: 5/6/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

**Last Amended:** 5/6/2019

**Status:** 7/10/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was JUD. on 6/12/2019) (May be acted upon Jan 2020)

**Location:** 7/10/2019-S. 2 YEAR

**Summary:**
Would specify that the California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 also does not restrict a business’s ability comply with any rules or regulations adopted pursuant to and in furtherance of state or federal laws. The bill would establish an exception to the act for a business that provides a consumer’s personal information to a government agency solely for the purposes of carrying out a government program, if specified requirements are met.

**Position:** Support

**AB 1478**  (Carrillo D)  *Employment discrimination.*

**Current Text:** Amended: 7/11/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

**Last Amended:** 7/11/2019

**Status:** 7/11/2019-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

**Location:** 7/11/2019-S. APPR.

**Summary:**
Current law authorizes an aggrieved employee to file a complaint with the Division of Labor Standards
Enforcement of the Department of Industrial Relations. Current law, the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, authorizes an aggrieved employee on behalf of that employee and other current or former employees to bring a civil action to recover specified civil penalties, which would otherwise be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, for the violation of certain provisions affecting employees. The act prescribes specified civil penalties for violations brought under these provisions. This bill, as an alternative to filing a complaint with the division, would authorize an employee aggrieved under the provisions prohibiting specified types of discrimination described above to bring a private civil action against the employee’s employer and would not require that employee to pursue any other remedy prior to bringing that action.

**Position:** Oppose

**AB 1482** (Chiu D) Tenancy: rent caps.  
**Current Text:** Amended: 7/11/2019  [html](#) [pdf](#)  
**Last Amended:** 7/11/2019  
**Status:** 7/11/2019-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.  
**Location:** 7/11/2019-S. APPR.  
**Summary:**  
Would, with certain exceptions, prohibit an owner, as defined, of residential property from terminating the lease of a tenant that has occupied the property for at least 12 months without just cause, as defined. The bill would require, for certain just cause terminations that are curable, that the owner give a notice of violation and an opportunity to cure the violation prior to issuing the notice of termination. The bill would require, for no-fault just cause terminations, as specified, that the owner assist certain tenants to relocate, regardless of the tenant’s income, by providing a direct payment of one month’s rent to the tenant, as specified.

**Position:** Oppose

**Current Text:** Amended: 4/11/2019  [html](#) [pdf](#)  
**Last Amended:** 4/11/2019  
**Status:** 5/3/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was NAT. RES. on 3/18/2019) (May be acted upon Jan 2020)  
**Location:** 5/3/2019-A. 2 YEAR  
**Summary:**  
Would require a plaintiff or petitioner, in an action or proceeding brought pursuant to the act, to disclose the identity of any person or entity that contributes $1,000 or more, as specified, toward the plaintiff’s or petitioner’s costs of the action or proceeding. The bill also would require the plaintiff or petitioner to identify any pecuniary or business interest related to the project or issues involved in the action or proceeding of those persons or entities. The bill would authorize a court to withhold publicly those disclosures if the court finds that the public interest in keeping that information confidential clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

**Position:** Support

**AB 1779** (Daly D) Recovery residences.  
**Current Text:** Amended: 7/11/2019  [html](#) [pdf](#)  
**Last Amended:** 7/11/2019  
**Status:** 7/11/2019-From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 8. Noes 0.) (July 10). Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.  
**Location:** 7/10/2019-S. APPR.  
**Summary:**  
Would establish, and require the State Department of Health Care Services to adopt and implement, minimum standards for counties receiving public funding for recovery residences, as defined. The bill would also require a state affiliate of the National Alliance for Recovery Residences (NARR) to deny an application for, or deny or revoke the recognition, registration, or certification of, and require a county behavioral health department to terminate a contract with, a recovery residence under certain circumstances, including if the recovery residence fails to meet the minimum standards.

**Position:** Support

**SB 37** (Skinner D) Corporation taxes: tax rates.
Last Amended: 4/3/2019
Status: 4/3/2019-From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on RLS.
Location: 12/3/2018-S. RLS.
Summary: The Corporation Tax Law imposes taxes according to or measured by net income at a rate of 8.84%, or for financial institutions, at a rate of 10.84%, as specified. This bill would, for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 2020, revise that rate for corporations with net income subject to taxes under that law of $10,000,000 or more to instead impose a tax rate from 10.84% to 14.84%, or for financial institutions, from 12.84% to 16.84%, based on the compensation ratio, as defined, of the corporation. The bill would increase the applicable tax rate by 50% for those taxpayers that have a specified decrease in full-time employees employed in the United States as compared to an increase in contracted and foreign full-time employees, as described.

Position: Oppose

**SB 135**  (Jackson D)  Paid family leave.

Last Amended: 3/25/2019
Status: 6/4/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(8). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 5/30/2019)
Location: 6/4/2019-S. 2 YEAR
Summary: Current law prohibits an employer with 50 or more employees in a 75-mile radius to refuse to grant an employee a request to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for family care and medical leave if the employee worked 1,250 hours in the prior 12 months. Current law includes within “family care and medical leave” the birth, adoption, or foster care placement of a child and the serious health condition of the employee’s child, parent, or spouse. This bill would expand the scope of those provisions to instead prohibit an employer with 5 or more employees to refuse to grant an employee a request to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for family care and medical leave if the employee had 180 days of service with the employer.

Position: Oppose

**SB 163**  (Portantino D)  Health care coverage: pervasive developmental disorder or autism.

Last Amended: 6/27/2019
Status: 6/27/2019-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Summary: Would revise the definition of behavioral health treatment to require the services and treatment programs provided to be based on behavioral, developmental, relationship-based, or other evidence-based models. The bill would remove the exception for health care service plans and health insurance policies in the Medi-Cal program, consistent with the MHPAEA.

Position: Oppose

**SB 171**  (Jackson D)  Employers: annual report: pay data.

Last Amended: 7/5/2019
Status: 7/5/2019-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Location: 7/5/2019-A. APPR.
Summary: Would require, on or before March 31, 2021, and on or before March 31 each year thereafter, a private employer that has 100 or more employees and who is required to file an annual Employer Information Report under federal law, to submit a pay data report to the Department of Fair Employment and Housing that contains specified wage information. The bill would require the Department of Fair Employment and Housing to make the reports available to the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement upon request.

Position: Support as Amended
**SB 204**  (Dodd D)  **State Water Project: contracts.**


Last Amended: 5/17/2019

Status: 7/10/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was W.,P. & W. on 6/6/2019)(May be acted upon Jan 2020)

Location: 7/10/2019-A. 2 YEAR

Summary:

Would require the Department of Water Resources to provide at least 10 days’ notice to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and relevant policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature before holding public sessions to negotiate any potential amendment of a long-term water supply contract that is of projectwide significance with substantially similar terms intended to be offered to all contractors. The bill would require the department, before the execution of a specified proposed amendment to a long-term water supply contract and at least 60 days before final approval of such an amendment, to submit to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and relevant policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature certain information regarding the terms and conditions of a proposed amendment of a long-term water supply contract and to submit a copy of the long-term contract as it is proposed to be amended.

Position: Oppose

**SB 210**  (Leyva D)  **Heavy-Duty Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program.**


Last Amended: 6/24/2019

Status: 7/9/2019-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 8. Noes 3.) (July 8). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

Location: 7/8/2019-A. APPR.

Summary:

Current law requires the State Air Resources Board, in consultation with the Bureau of Automotive Repair and a specified review committee, to adopt regulations requiring owners or operators of heavy-duty diesel motor vehicles to perform regular inspections of their vehicles for excessive emissions of smoke. Current law requires the state board, in consultation with the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, to adopt regulations requiring heavy-duty diesel motor vehicles to use emission control equipment and alternative fuels. This bill would require the state board, in consultation with the bureau and other specified entities, to implement a pilot program that develops and demonstrates technologies that show potential for readily bringing heavy-duty vehicles into an inspection and maintenance program.

Position: Oppose

**SB 332**  (Hertzberg D)  **Wastewater treatment: recycled water.**

Current Text: Amended: 4/30/2019  [html](#)  [pdf](#)

Last Amended: 4/30/2019

Status: 5/17/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 5/13/2019)(May be acted upon Jan 2020)

Location: 5/17/2019-S. 2 YEAR

Summary:

Would declare, except in compliance with the bill’s provisions, that the discharge of treated wastewater from ocean outfalls is a waste and unreasonable use of water. The bill would require each wastewater treatment facility that discharges through an ocean outfall and affiliated water suppliers to reduce the facility’s annual flow as compared to the average annual wastewater discharge baseline volume, as prescribed, by at least 50% on or before January 1, 2030, and by at least 95% on or before January 1, 2040. The bill would subject the owner or operator of a wastewater treatment facility, as well as the affiliated water suppliers, to a civil penalty of $2,000 per acre-foot of water above the required reduction in overall volume discharge for the failure to meet these deadlines.

Position: Oppose

**SB 621**  (Glazer D)  **California Environmental Quality Act: expedited judicial review: affordable housing projects: reports.**


Last Amended: 6/17/2019

Status: 7/10/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was NAT. RES. on 6/6/2019)(May be acted upon Jan 2020)
Location: 7/10/2019-A. 2 YEAR
Summary:
Would require the Judicial Council, by July 1, 2020, to adopt a rule of court applicable to an action or proceeding brought to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the certification of an environmental impact report for an affordable housing project, as defined, or the granting of an approval of an affordable housing project that requires the action or proceeding, including any potential appeals therefrom, to be resolved, to the extent feasible, within 270 days of the filing of the certified record of proceeding with the court. The bill would provide that these provisions do not apply to an affordable housing project if it is in certain locations.

Position: Support

SB 669  (Caballero D)  Water quality: Safe Drinking Water Fund.
Status: 5/16/2019-May 16 hearing: Held in committee and under submission.
Location: 5/13/2019-S. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE
Summary:
Would establish the Safe Drinking Water Fund in the State Treasury and would provide that moneys in the fund are continuously appropriated to the State Water Resources Control Board. The bill would require the state board to administer the fund to assist community water systems in disadvantaged communities that are chronically noncompliant relative to the federal and state drinking water standards and do not have the financial capacity to pay for operation and maintenance costs to comply with those standards, as specified.

Position: Support

SB 736  (Umberg D)  Creative Economy Incentive Program.
Current Text: Amended: 7/1/2019  html  pdf
Last Amended: 7/1/2019
Status: 7/9/2019-VOTE: Do pass as amended and be re-referred to the Committee on [Appropriations]
(PASS)
Location: 7/9/2019-A. APPR.
Summary:
Would, until January 1, 2031, enact the Creative Economy Incentive Program, which would be administered by GO-Biz, for the purpose of providing financial support to a city, county, district, joint powers authority, nonprofit organization, or a combination thereof for the purpose of assisting in financing a creative economy event, as defined. The bill would require an applicant to apply to GO-Biz for financial support pursuant to the program on an application that contains specified minimum information, including the adopted resolution of a county or city, if any, within the market area for the creative economy event evidencing that city's or county's commitment to contribute a portion of its respective local sales and use tax revenue or other local revenue as a local contribution to the creative economy event.

Position: Support

Current Text: Amended: 6/19/2019  html  pdf
Last Amended: 6/19/2019
Location: 7/10/2019-A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE
Summary:
Would provide that specified records of a private industry employer that are prepared, owned, used, or retained by a public agency are not trade secrets and are public records, including certain records relating to employment terms and conditions of employees working for a private industry employer pursuant to a contract with a public agency, records of compliance with local, state, or federal domestic content requirements, and records of a private industry employer's compliance with job creation, job quality, or job retention obligations contained in a contract or agreement with a state or local agency.

Position: Oppose

SCA 5  (Hill D)  Taxation: school districts: parcel tax.
Last Amended: 4/22/2019
Status: 5/21/2019-Ordered to inactive file on request of Senator Hill.
Location: 5/21/2019-S. INACTIVE FILE
Summary:
The California Constitution generally conditions the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district, including a school district, upon the approval of 2/3 of the voters of the city, county, or special district voting on that tax. This bill would condition the imposition, extension, or increase of a parcel tax, as defined, by a school district or community college district upon the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition, if the proposition meets specified requirements. The measure would also make conforming changes to related provisions.

Position: Oppose
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