



**Board of Directors Meeting
South Bay City Council of Governments
Eileen Hupp, Chairman
Tuesday, June 4, 2019**

1. Welcome Eileen Hupp, Chair
 - a. Flag Salute
2. Self-Introductions and Sign-In All Participants
3. Approval of Minutes Serena Josel, Secretary
4. Industry Insights
5. Government Affairs Report PEAR Strategies
 - a. May Revision 2019-2020 [LINK](#)
 - b. AB 39 (Muratsuchi) Education finance: local control funding formula: aspirational funding level: reports
 - c. AB 1083 (Burke) Energy Infrastructure Procurement Requirements- CA Council on Science and Technology
 - d. AB 1482 (Chiu) Tenancy: Rent Caps
 - e. SB 43 (Allen) Carbon Taxes
 - f. SB 736 (Umberg) Creative Economy Task Force
 - g. Matrix Review
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 Senate District 33

- 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
9. Financial Report Elise Swanson Treasurer
- a. Profit and Loss
 - b. Balance Sheet
10. Adjournment/Announcements All
- a. Special thanks to The South Bay Cities Council of Governments for hosting us
 - b. Special thanks to Wanda Love- Gardena Valley Chamber of Commerce for refreshments
 - c. South Bay WIB - Chris Cagle
 - d. South Coast AQMD
 - e. Los Angeles Air Force Base
11. Annoucments-
- a. ***The SBACC will be dark for the month of July. Our next board meeting is Tuesday, August 6, 2019***

AB 39 (Muratsuchi) Education finance: local control funding formula: aspirational funding level: reports

Recommended Position

Support

Background

Existing law establishes a public school financing system that requires state funding for county superintendents of schools, school districts, and charter schools to be calculated pursuant to a local control funding formula, as specified. Existing 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.

Existing 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. Existing law requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to compute the supplemental and concentration grant add-ons as certain percentages of the amount of the base grant.

The current Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), which, for school districts and charter schools, is comprised of the following components:

A base grant of the following amounts per ADA in 2018-19:

- a. \$8,235 for grades K-3, which includes a 10.4% grade span adjustment for class size reduction
- b. \$7,571 for grades 4-6
- c. \$7,796 for grades 7-8
- d. \$9,269 for grades 9-12, which includes a 2.6% grade span adjustment for college and career readiness

According to the United States Census Bureau, state and local per-pupil spending in California was \$10,467 in 2017, which ranked 29th among the 50 states and the District of Columbia (DC) and was \$925 below the national average of \$11,392.

Summary

Increases the school district and charter school LCFF base grant funding targets, and creates a new grant-add on. Specifically, this bill:

For the 2020-21 school year, establishes base grants per average daily attendance (ADA) as follows:

1. for kindergarten and grades 1 to 3, inclusive, \$13,462
2. For grades 4 to 6, inclusive, \$12,377
3. For grades 7 to 8, inclusive, \$12,745
4. For grades 9 to 12, inclusive, \$15,152

Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to create a grant add-on to the total sum of a school district's or charter schools' LCFF rates based on the following:

1. First, compute the school district, charter school, or county office of education's (COE) LCFF base grant based on the proposed increased targets
2. Second, compute the total of all of the school district, charter school and COE base grants
3. Third, compute each school district, charter school and COE's percent share of the statewide total by dividing the school district, charter school or COE's LCFF base grant based on the proposed increased targets by the statewide total

3. Requires the grant add-on amounts created by this bill to be treated as funds apportioned under the existing LCFF statutes for the purposes of Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) and the Statewide System of Support.
4. Establishes that the funding for the grant add-on created by this bill is subject to a separate appropriation by the Legislature; and excludes the grant add-on created by this bill from the continuous appropriation.
5. Requires the SPI to annually compute an annual adjustment to the grade span adjusted base grants, as determined by the Department of Finance, equal to the amount of the grant add-on created by this bill.
6. Expands the requirements for LCFF funding information the SPI must post on the California Department of Education's (CDE) website.

Arguments in Support:

The Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) states, "We support the Newsom Administration's proposed \$2 billion allocation in the 2019-20 state budget to provide a cost-of-living-adjustment (COLA) on the existing LCFF targets. However, despite these worthy efforts, we believe a new goal with an aspirational target is required to reach the Proposition 98 constitutional goals of investing in our students and to fund the new fixed costs that continue to escalate year after year. Using AB 39 as a framework, ACSA urges the legislature and the Newsom Administration to establish new LCFF targets with the goal of achieving the national average in per-pupil funding over an unspecified number of years."

Status

Date	Action
05/29/19	Referred to Com. on ED.
05/23/19	In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.
05/22/19	Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Senate.
05/20/19	Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
05/16/19	From committee: Do pass. (Ayes 17. Noes 1.) (May 16).
05/16/19	Joint Rule 62(a), file notice suspended. (Page 1760.)
05/15/19	In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.
05/13/19	Joint Rule 62(a), file notice suspended. (Page 1609.)
05/09/19	Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
05/08/19	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on APPR. Read second time and amended.

Support

Alameda County Office Of Education
 Alameda Unified School District
 Albany Unified School District
 Arcadia Unified School District
 Association Of California School Administrators
 Atascadero Unified School District
 Avid Center
 Brentwood Union School District
 Cabrillo Unified School District

California Association Of School Business Officials (Casbo)
 California Association Of Suburban School Districts
 California Charter Schools Association Advocates (Ccsaa)
 California Federation Of Teachers
 California Retired Teachers Association
 California School Boards Association
 California School Employees Association
 California School Funding Coalition

California State Pta
California Teachers Association
Central Valley Education Coalition
Clovis Unified School District
Compton Unified School District
Contra Costa County Superintendents Coalition
Cypress School District
Fruitvale School District
Glendora Unified School District
Golden Valley Unified School District
Grossmont Union High School District
Igo Ono Platina Union School District
Jurupa Unified School District
Laguna Beach Unified School District
Los Angeles Unified School District
Monrovia Unified School District
Murrieta Valley Unified School District
Oakland Unified School District
Office Of The Riverside County Superintendent Of
Schools
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District
Paramount Unified School District
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District
Pleasant Valley School District
Redding School District
Redondo Beach Unified School District
Riverside County Public K-12 School District
Superintendents Sacramento City Unified School
District

Dinuba Unified School District
El Dorado Union High School District
El Segundo Unified School District
Etiwanda School District
Folsom Cordova Unified School District
Fresno Unified School District

San Benito High School District
San Bernardino County District Advocates For Better
Schools (Sandabs)
San Diego County Office Of Education
San Francisco Unified School District
San Ysidro School District
Santa Barbara Unified School District
Savanna School District
Schools For Sound Finance
Scotts Valley Unified School District
Shasta Union Elementary District
Small School Districts Association
South Bay Union School District
Torrance Unified School District
Tulare Joint Union High School District
West Covina Unified School District
Westminster School District

AB-1083 (Burke) Energy and energy infrastructure procurement requirements: California Council on Science and Technology

Recommended Position

Support

Background

Existing law requests the California Council on Science and Technology to undertake and complete a study analyzing the regional and gas corporation specific issues relating to minimum heating value and maximum siloxane specifications adopted by the Public Utilities Commission for biomethane before it can be injected into common carrier gas pipelines.

California Council on Science and Technology: CCST was established in 1988 pursuant to Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 162 (Farr and Garamendi) and modeled after the U.S. National Academies. CCST convenes experts from California’s academic and research institutions to provide objective advice and analysis in response to requests from the Governor, Legislature and other State entities on policy issues relating to science and technology. CCST is operated as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit governed by a Board of Directors, and its core funding is provided by the following institutions: University of California; California State University; California Community Colleges; California Institute of Technology; Stanford University; NASA Ames Research Center; NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Sandia National Laboratories and SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory.

Summary

1083 would promote transparency and guides development of energy policy in developing cost effective legislation that takes into account impacts to ratepayers. This bill would, *on January 1, 2023*, request the council 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.

The bill would request that the analysis be in writing and include relevant data on specified subjects, and would request that the council provide the written analysis to those policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature within 60 days of the request. Upon providing the written analysis to those committees, the bill would request the council contemporaneously post the analysis on its internet website and make a copy of the analysis available to a member of the public upon request.

AB 1083 will 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.

Status

Date	Action
05/22/19	Referred to Com. on RLS.
05/14/19	In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.

Date	Action
05/13/19	Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Senate. (Ayes 74. Noes 0. Page 1637.)
05/08/19	Read second time. Ordered to Consent Calendar.
05/07/19	Read second time and amended. Ordered returned to second reading.
05/06/19	From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended. To Consent Calendar. (Ayes 12. Noes 0.) (May 1).
03/07/19	Referred to Com. on U. & E.
02/22/19	From printer. May be heard in committee March 24.
02/21/19	Read first time. To print.

Support

California Chamber of Commerce
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
San Diego Gas & Electric
Sempra Energy Utilities
Southern California Public Power Authority (SCPPA)

Opposition

None on file.

AB 1482 (Chiu) Tenancy: rent caps

Recommended Position

Oppose

Background

Existing law governs the hiring of residential dwelling units and requires a landlord to provide specified notice to tenants prior to an increase in rent. Existing law, the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act, prescribes statewide limits on the application of local rent control with regard to certain properties. That act, among other things, authorizes an owner of residential real property to establish the initial and all subsequent rental rates for a dwelling or unit that meets specified criteria and subject to certain limitations.

Summary

This bill would create a cap on the potential annual rent increase a property owner can charge a tenant. The cap would be 5% of the lowest rent from the previous year plus the percentage change in the cost of living, as measured by CPI. Over the past 25 years the CPI in California has averaged approximately 2.5%. However, CPI fluctuates year-to-year and region-to-region, based on macro- and local economic conditions. This bill specifies that the cap could never exceed 10%, which is the standard for price gouging for housing and other goods established by the State in 1872 in Penal Code Section 396.

This bill would apply to nearly all of the 5 million units, containing 14.7 million people, not subject to rent control. The bill would exclude dormitories and deed-restricted affordable units, as well as units that have been issued a certificate of occupancy within the past ten years. It would enable the owner of assisted housing developments once rental restrictions expire to establish the initial unassisted rental rate for units, after which the rent cap would apply. It would only apply to units with existing tenants. The requirements of the bill would sunset after 10 years.

Status

Date	Action
05/29/19	Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Senate.
05/20/19	Read third time and amended. Ordered to third reading. (Page 1725.)
05/09/19	Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
05/08/19	From committee: Do pass. (Ayes 12. Noes 4.) (May 8).
04/25/19	From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 6. Noes 1.) (April 25). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
04/23/19	Re-referred to Com. on H. & C.D.
04/22/19	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on H. & C.D. Read second time and amended.
04/01/19	Re-referred to Com. on H. & C.D.
03/28/19	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on H. & C.D. Read second time and amended.
03/28/19	Referred to Com. on H. & C.D.

Date	Action
02/25/19	Read first time.
02/23/19	From printer. May be heard in committee March 25.
02/22/19	Introduced. To print.

Arguments in Support:

According to Service Employees International Union (SEIU), "A majority of California renters do not live in jurisdictions with local rent control laws, and state law currently allows landlords to implement unlimited rent increases with very short notice to tenants. Increasingly, and predictably, this is causing renters to lose their homes and is driving our state's unprecedented homeless ness. "

Arguments in Opposition:

According to the California Apartment Association and California Chamber of Commerce, "AB 1482, along with a dozen other bills that target the rental housing industry, would create a huge disincentive to invest in rental housing at a time when California so desperately needs more homes." They note that specifically, this bill would make property financing more difficult, stop new housing construction, cost taxpayers more, benefit the wealthiest residents, create a slippery slope, and impose rent control.

SB 43 (Allen) Carbon taxes

Recommended Position

Oppose

Background

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to approve a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020 and to ensure that statewide greenhouse gas emissions are reduced to at least 40% below the 1990 level by 2030

Summary

This bill tasks the ARB to investigate and make recommendations for the feasibility and practicality of assessing the carbon intensity (CI) of all retail products. Specifically, ARB under SB 43 will prepare a report to the Legislature containing a consideration of the CI of all consumer products, including the energy and fuel required to produce and transport those goods.

SB 43 proposes to create a new regulatory scheme to measure the “carbon intensity” of every product sold in the state of California and then evaluate replacing the sales tax with this carbon-based tax. 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. We can appreciate the desire to study such an issue, we believe that the study will be costly and, to be conducted properly, requires additional input from many agencies that will be impacted by this type of tax change.

Status

Date	Action
05/28/19	In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.
05/28/19	Read third time. Passed. (Ayes 25. Noes 10.) Ordered to the Assembly.
05/21/19	Read second time and amended. Ordered to third reading.
05/20/19	From committee: Do pass as amended. (Ayes 4. Noes 2.) (May 16).
05/14/19	Set for hearing May 16.
05/13/19	May 13 hearing: Placed on APPR. suspense file.
05/03/19	Set for hearing May 13.
04/29/19	Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
04/25/19	From committee: Do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 4. Noes 2. Page 845.) (April 24).
04/22/19	From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on GOV. & F.
04/04/19	Set for hearing April 24.

Date	Action
03/20/19	From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on GOV. & F. (Ayes 5. Noes 2. Page 383.) (March 20). Re-referred to Com. on GOV. & F.
02/12/19	Set for hearing March 20.
01/16/19	Referred to Coms. on EQ. and GOV. & F.
12/04/18	From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 3.
12/03/18	Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/21/19)

350 Silicon Valley
350 SoCal Climate Action
Fossil Free California
South Bay 350 Los Angeles
The Nature Conservancy

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/21/19)

Agricultural Council of California
Auto Care Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Construction and Industrial Materials Association
California Fuels & Convenience Alliance
California League of Food Producers

SB 736 (Umberg) Creative Economy Task Force

Recommended Position

Support

Background

Existing law, the Economic Revitalization Act, establishes the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development, also known as "GO-Biz," to, among other duties, serve the Governor as the lead entity for economic strategy and the marketing of California on issues relating to business development, private sector investment, and economic growth.

SB 736 would establish the Creative Economy Task Force, to be managed by the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) for the purpose of studying financial support to cities, counties and joint powers agencies to help keep California competitive against other states.

Summary

This bill would establish the Creative Economy Task Force within GO-Biz, chaired by the Director of GO-Biz and comprised of various representatives from the Governor's Office, the Department of Finance, rural and urban tourism organizations, the California State Association of Counties, and the League of California Cities and representatives appointed by the Senate and the Assembly. The bill would require the task force to study and submit a report to the Legislature by June 30, 2020, regarding the creation of a state fund designated to assist local governments to compete with other states in the bidding processes for major events, which includes arts and cultural events, entertainment events, agricultural events, sporting events, and international conferences. The bill would provide that the task force terminates on December 31, 2020.

1. Establishes the Creative Economy Task Force Act intended to explore strategies for the state to assist local governments in attracting major events (arts and cultural events, entertainment events, agricultural events, sporting events, and international conferences) to spur job growth and to boost the economy.
2. Establishes, until December 31, 2020, a Creative Economy Task Force within GO-Biz comprised of representatives from: the Governor's Office; Department of Finance; California State Senate; California State Assembly; tourism organizations in urban and rural counties; the California State Association of Counties; League of California Cities; and, a private or nonprofit group with a track record of financing, planning, and executing large scale major events.
3. Requires the Task Force to study the creation of a state fund to assist local governments to compete with other states in the bidding process for major events and provide a report to the Legislature by June 30, 2020.

Status

Date	Action
05/24/19	In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.
05/23/19	Read third time. Passed. (Ayes 38. Noes 0.) Ordered to the Assembly.
05/21/19	Ordered to special consent calendar.
05/16/19	Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
05/16/19	From committee: Do pass. (Ayes 6. Noes 0.) (May 16).
05/10/19	Set for hearing May 16.

Date	Action
05/06/19	May 6 hearing: Placed on APPR. suspense file.
04/26/19	Set for hearing May 6.
04/23/19	From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 9. Noes 0. Page 770.) (April 22). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
04/22/19	From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on B., P. & E.D.
04/04/19	Set for hearing April 22.
04/03/19	Re-referred to Com. on B., P. & E.D.
03/28/19	Re-referred to Com. on RLS.
03/28/19	Withdrawn from committee.
03/27/19	From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on EQ.
03/18/19	April 24 set for first hearing canceled at the request of author.
03/15/19	Set for hearing April 24.
03/14/19	Referred to Coms. on EQ. and TRANS.
02/25/19	Read first time.
02/25/19	From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 27.
02/22/19	Introduced. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/16/19)

Los Angeles Tourism & Convention Board (co-source)
San Diego Tourism Authority (co-source)
San Francisco Travel (co-source)
Visit Anaheim (co-source)
Basecamp Hospitality
Bittel Enterprises
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo – College of Ag, Food, and
Environmental Sciences
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo – Experience Industry
Management Department
California Business Roundtable
California Chamber of Commerce
California Hotel & Lodging Association
California Resources Corporation
California Travel Association
Cannery Row Company
Certified Folder Display Service, Inc.

City of Indian Wells
City of San Luis Obispo
County of San Bernardino Economic Development
Agency
Covington Capital Management
Del Monte Foods, Inc.
DogTrekker.com
First Foundation Advisors
Four Seasons Hotel Los Angeles at Beverly Hills
Gateway Hotel Santa Monica
Greater Palm Springs Convention and Visitors
Bureau
Hilton Anaheim
Hilton Los Angeles
Hotel Angeleno
Karen Lippe-Ferrell Marketing and Public Relations
Long Beach Convention and Visitors Bureau

Los Angeles Chargers
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Los Angeles Football Club
Mammoth Lakes Tourism
Omni Hotel Los Angeles
PIER 39
Placer County Visitors Bureau
Royal Palace Westwood Hotel
San Diego Tourism Authority
San Francisco Travel Association
San Jose Earthquakes
San Jose Sports Authority
San Mateo County/Silicon Valley Convention and
Visitors Bureau
Santa Monica Travel and Tourism
SAP Center at San Jose | San Jose Sharks
Shasta Cascade Wonderland Association Sheraton
Grand Los Angeles

Solvang Conference and Visitors Bureau Starline
Tours
Tellefsen Investments, Inc.
U.S. Cultural & Heritage Marketing Council Ventura
County Lodging Association
Visit Concord
Visit Richmond
Visit Sacramento
Visit San Jose
Visit SLO CAL
Visit Temecula Valley
Visit Tri-Valley
Visit Vacaville
Visit Yosemite Madera County
Warner Brothers Studios
Winchester Mystery House

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/16/19)

None on File

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

Supporters believe that this bill will “spur jobs and economic growth by providing local jurisdictions with a tool to successfully compete with local entities in other states for the purpose of attracting creative economy events.” According to supporters, “Creative industries make significant contributions to employment and economic growth in California. Each year, dozens of cultural, sporting, agricultural, and entertainment events attract international attention. 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 an expansive showcase for the host cities and counties. They foster innovation and encourage spillover effects that create opportunities for other industries by attracting investment, tourism, consumer spending and by generating tax revenue. The time is now for California to create a process that fosters growth and encourages creative economy output.”

