



**Board of Directors Meeting
John Heffernan, Chairman
Tuesday, March 3, 2020**

1. Welcome John Heffernan, 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. Gov. Newsom State of the State
 - b. AB 648 (Nazarian) Wellness Programs
 - c. AB-2246 (Mayes) Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975: exemption: Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
 - d. AB 1907 (Santiago) CEQA Emergency Shelters- Supportive and Affordable Housing Exemption- Discussion
 - e. SB 873 (Jackson) Gender: Discrimination Pricing
 - f. SB 996 (Portantino) State Water Resources Control Board: Constituents of Emerging Concern Program
 - g. Paid Family Leave Act- Budget Trailer Bill
 - h. CalChamber IMPACT CA
 - i. AB 5 Coalition [LINK](#)
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- Tyler Curley
- i. Office of Assemblymember Burke - Robert Pullen-Miles
- j. Office of Assemblymember Gipson - Chris Wilson
- k. Office of Assemblymember Muratsuchi – Cody Bridges
- l. Office of Assemblymember O'Donnell- Hina Ahmad
- m. Office of Supervisor Hahn- Jennifer Lamarque
- n. South Bay WIB - Chris Cagle
- o. South Coast AQMD
- p. Los Angeles Air Force Base

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

- 7. Chair's Report J. Heffernan
 - a. Identification of Potential Sponsors
- 8. Financial Report Charles Gale, Treasurer
 - a. Profit and Loss
 - b. Balance Sheet
- 9. Adjournment/Announcements All
 - a. Special thanks to the Torrance Chamber of Commerce for hosting us
 - b. Special thanks to Hawthorne Chamber of Commerce for Breakfast.
 - c. **Next SBACC Meeting is Tuesday, April 7, 2020**



**Board of Directors Meeting
Kaiser Permanente Medical Offices
John Heffernan, Chairman
Tuesday, February 4, 2020**

Z. Shaikh, B. Unver, H. Rogers, W. Love, M. Garth, J. Heffernan, D. Hoffman, M. Lyon, S. Kramer, D. Duperron, C. Bos, S. Josel, M. Waroneck, D. Leger, E. Swanson, D. Knoll, K. Stroman, H. Butzine, V. Hart, C. Gale, C. Cardoza, H. Shafani, S. Delacruz, A. Aviles, M. Hansen

1. Welcome John Heffernan, Chair
 - a. Flag Salute
2. Self-Introductions and Sign-In All Participants
3. Approval of Minutes Serena Josel, Secretary
 - a. Motion to Approve: M. Hansen
 - b. 2nd: E. Swanson
 - c. Motion Carries
4. Industry Insights
 - a. Consulate General of Canada- Zaib Shaikh- Provided insight as to how USMCA and trade impact the US Economy and the South Bay. Provided background on Canadian companies in the United States.
5. Government Affairs Report PEAR Strategies
 - a. Two Year Bill Review – Review of standing 2 year bills in that are still alive and those who have expired at Jan deadline.
 - b. AB 713 (Mullin) California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018- AB 713 makes important changes to the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) by exempting information that has been deidentified in accordance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), and by exempting certain information held by business associates of covered entities governed by HIPAA
 - i. Recommendation to Support: S. Josel
 - ii. 2nd: D. Duperron
 - iii. Motion Carries:
 - c. SB 37 (Skinner) Corporation Taxes: Tax Rates- 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.

- i. Recommendation to Oppose: D. Duperron
 - ii. 2nd: M. Lyon
 - iii. Motion Carries:
- d. Prop 13_March 2020- would authorize a \$15 billion bond for school modernization and construction projects. Here's how it would break down: \$9 billion for K-12 schools ,and \$2 billion each for community colleges and the state's two public university systems, the California State University and University of California.
 - i. Motion to Support: C. Gale
 - ii. 2nd: S. Cramer
 - iii. Motion Carries
 - 1. Abstain: D. Hoffman
- e. Measure FD_March 2020- Should voters approve by a two-thirds vote, the resulting parcel tax of \$0.06 per square foot would collect approximately \$134 million a year from residents. Government parcels, non-profits, and low-income seniors would be exempt from the parcel tax.
 - i. Motion to Oppose: M. Lyon
 - ii. 2nd: D. Duperron
 - iii. Substitute Motion to take a Watch: M. Waroneck
 - iv. 2nd: D. Hoffman
 - v. Motion Carries
 - 1. Oppose: M. Lyon
- f. Measure R_March 2020- A ballot measure concerning the Sheriff's Civilian Oversight Commission, jail populations, and incarceration rates is on the ballot for Los Angeles voters in Los Angeles County, California, on March 3, 2020.
- g. Sacramento Advocacy Day—June 4, 2020
- 6. Office Holders, Administrative Agencies and Community Partners - Please limit your reports to no more than 3 minutes.
 - a. South Bay Cities Council of Governments - D. Leger 3/19 will be the general assembly. The COG is applying for a homeless grant services from the County of Los Angeles. Applications for the Metro Service Council open to applications.

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

7. Chair's Report J. Heffernan
 - a. Legislative Mixer
8. Financial Report Charles Gale, Treasurer
 - a. Profit and Loss- Report attached
 - b. Balance Sheet- Report attached
 - i. Motion to Accept and File: D. Knoll
 - ii. 2nd: D. Hoffman
 - iii. Motion Carries
9. Adjournment/Announcements All
 - a. Special thanks to Kaiser Permanente for hosting us
 - b. Special thanks to Donna Duperron and the Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce for Breakfast.
 - c. **Next SBACC Meeting is Tuesday, March 3, 2020**

Governor Newsom Delivers State of the State Address on Homelessness

Published: Feb 19, 2020

SACRAMENTO – Governor Gavin Newsom delivered his State of the State address on homelessness before a joint convention of the California Legislature today.

Below is the text as prepared for delivery:

State of the State Address California Governor Gavin Newsom February 19, 2020

Thank you, Madame Lieutenant Governor. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for welcoming Jen and me to your house.

Madame Pro Tem, Members of this Legislature, fellow Californians.

Thank you once again for the privilege of this podium.

Traditionally, this is when Governors stand before you and report, with practiced grandiosity, that the “state of our state is strong and getting stronger.”

And, largely, that is still true.

And yes, Eleni, California is still, proudly, America’s coming attraction.

By any standard measure, by nearly every recognizable metric, the State of California is not just thriving but, in many instances, leading the country, inventing the future, and inspiring the nation.

We remain the fifth-largest economy in the world—enjoying 118 consecutive months of net job growth, some 3.4 million jobs created since the Great Recession and nearly 4 million small businesses call California their home.

More than half of all U.S. venture capital still flows to California companies.

We’ve averaged 3.8 percent GDP growth over five years—compared, respectively, to 2.5 percent national growth.

Yes, California today is an enterprising, modernizing, pluralizing, unionizing, nation-state of opportunity.

Just consider this fact: 1 in 7 new jobs created by the U.S. economy since 2010 has been created right here in California.

So when you hear the boasts, bleats, and tweets of Washington politicians tripping over themselves to take credit for the economy, remember the real VIPs of America’s GDP—the millions of California workers, investors and entrepreneurs who are actually producing their own California Dreams.

We’ve built a record reserve, including the largest rainy-day fund in state history. We’ve achieved the highest credit rating in nearly two decades.

And we’ve disappeared the infamous wall of debt, following the prudent principle of never spending more than we have.

California is the rocket fuel powering America’s resurgence, that—let me be clear—was put into motion by President Barack Obama.

Even so, California never stands still and never rests on its laurels.

Last year, we worked in historic partnership to achieve historic progress.

Together, we addressed some of our most stubborn issues and built brighter futures for millions of Californians.

Those achievements cannot be fully appreciated as line items in a budget or bill numbers across a desk.

We see it in the faces of dreamers and doers across our remarkable state.

In the patients who have new, affordable access to primary care, provided by doctors who look like them, know their culture, speak their language, and understand their story.

In the first responders—putting badges on uniforms and their lives on the line—knowing that now California has the best and best-resourced wildfire programs.

In the working parent with more money in her pocket, thanks to expanded paid family leave, a thousand dollar Working Families tax credit and lower costs due to tax-free diapers and tampons.

In the high school student planning a more promising future with two free years of community college.

In the college athletes who will finally have the opportunity to be justly compensated for their own name, image, and likeness.

With one bill, California changed the rules of the game nationwide.

In the Central Valley finally getting the economic attention it deserves.

In the communities finally getting safe and clean drinking water and neighborhoods breathing a little easier, thanks to California’s landmark partnership with leading automakers.

And, if the voters approve it, we may soon see more school buildings newly free of lead and toxic mold, thanks to a bipartisan statewide school bond.

In city after city, household after household, the hard work of this legislature is making dreams more real for more Californians than ever before.

When Justice Brandeis wrote in 1932 that “a single courageous state may...serve as a laboratory” of democracy, he could easily have been referencing California today.

Because, unlike the Washington plutocracy, California isn’t satisfied serving a powerful few on one side of the velvet rope.

The California Dream is for all.

To that end, there are 1.6 million fewer Californians living in poverty today than in 2011—a full quarter of the nation’s decrease.

But no amount of progress can camouflage the most pernicious crisis in our midst, the ultimate manifestation of poverty: homelessness.

That’s why I’m devoting today’s remarks to this crisis.

Let’s call it what it is, a disgrace, that the richest state in the richest nation—succeeding across so many sectors—is failing to properly house, heal, and humanely treat so many of its own people.

Every day, the California Dream is dimmed by the wrenching reality of families, children and seniors living unfed on a concrete bed.

Military veterans who wore the uniform of our country in a foreign land, abandoned here at home.

LGBTQ youth fleeing abuse and rejection from their families and communities.

Faces of despair. Failed by our country’s leaders and our nation’s institutions.

As Californians, we pride ourselves on our unwavering sense of compassion and justice for humankind—but there’s nothing compassionate about allowing fellow Californians to live on the streets, huddled in cars or makeshift encampments.

And there’s nothing just about sidewalks and street corners that aren’t safe and clean for everybody.

The problem has persisted for decades—caused by massive failures in our mental health system and disinvestment in our social safety net—exacerbated by widening income inequality and California’s housing shortage.

The hard truth is we ignored the problem.

We turned away when it wasn’t our sister, our brother, our neighbor, our friend.

And when it was a loved one, help wasn’t there.

Most of us experienced homelessness as a pang of guilt, not a call to action.

Back in 2005, when we started our point-in-time counts, there were over 188,000 homeless people in California—35,000 more than we have today. Even at that peak, the state didn’t treat it with the urgency required.

It became normalized.

Concentrated in skid rows and tent cities in big urban centers.

Now it’s no longer isolated.

In fact, some of the most troubling increases have occurred in rural areas, in small towns, and remote parts of our state.

No place is immune.

No person untouched.

And too often no one wants to take responsibility.

I’ve even heard local officials proclaim in public: it’s not my problem.

Servants of the public too busy pointing fingers to step up and help? That’s shameful.

After all, every homeless Californian, living on a boulevard of broken dreams, is a casualty of institutional failures—a person who’s fallen through every possible hole in the safety net.

Homelessness impacts everyone, but not equally. Some communities have been hit much harder.

Urban renewal and gentrification broke up communities of color and throttled their abilities to move into the middle class.

These are systemic issues rooted in poverty and racial discrimination.

Black Californians comprise 8 percent of Los Angeles County’s population—but 42 percent of its homeless.

And a recent poll found that nearly half of Latinos in the state are afraid that they or a family member could become homeless.

The State of California can no longer treat homelessness and housing insecurity as someone else’s problem, buried below other priorities which are easier to win or better suited for soundbites.

It is our responsibility.

And it must be at the top of our agenda.

This crisis was not created overnight and it will not be solved overnight—or even in one year.

But as a State, we must do everything we can to ensure no Californian is homeless.

We must replace California’s scattershot approach with a coordinated crisis-level response.

To meet this moment with the commitment it demands, we will advance a new framework.

We will reduce street homelessness quickly and humanely through emergency actions.

We will be laser-focused on getting the mentally ill out of tents and into treatment.

We will provide stable funding to get sustainable results.

We will tackle the underproduction of affordable housing in California.

And we will do all of this with real accountability and consequences.

First, we’ve started with emergency actions to do everything we can now, to make an immediate, tangible impact.

After decades of neglect and inadequate responses, we are putting our entire state government on notice to respond with urgency.

Last month, I issued an Executive Order deploying emergency mobile housing trailers and services for homeless families and seniors.

The first trailers have been deployed to Oakland and Los Angeles County.

The next, I’m pleased to announce today, are headed to Santa Clara, Riverside, Contra Costa, and Sonoma Counties, as well as the City of Stockton.

That same Executive Order builds on our work last year to identify all excess state land.

Today, we are making available 286 state properties—vacant lots, fairgrounds, armories and other state buildings—to be used by local governments, for free, for homelessness solutions.

We have lease templates ready to go—and we’re ready for partnership.

We have also directed Caltrans to make better use of other unoccupied spaces to get homeless housing up as fast as possible.

We have great examples under development in San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, and Los Angeles.

We’re able to move faster than ever before on things like leases and land because we established a Strike Team across many agencies, including Health & Human Services, Caltrans, and the CHP—all with one goal: to break through bureaucratic barriers.

As the state moves fast, we must also move together with cities and counties who are critical allies in addressing this emergency.

Two months ago, we issued a 100-day challenge to our local partners: to focus on one part of their homeless population and address it with intentionality.

Dozens of communities across our state are stepping up.

But as we continue with these emergency actions, we must eliminate roadblocks to housing and shelter.

Last year, because of your leadership, I was proud to sign two important bills.

One streamlined the permitting process for navigation centers statewide.

The second exempted all shelters and homeless housing from environmental review in Los Angeles.

This year, let’s expand that law and extend it to all homeless shelters and supportive housing statewide.

We need more housing, not more delays.

We are also pushing for new models of homeless housing—like hotel/motel conversions and pre-fab and tiny homes—and as we do, we’ll cut the red tape to get to “yes” on these innovative approaches.

While we take emergency measures to increase shelter and services, we must also comprehensively address the hardest part of this problem.

The chronically homeless—those out on the streets for more than a year, with complex behavioral health needs.

For centuries, the default “treatment” was confinement in asylums, where people deteriorated out of sight.

In the 1940’s and 50’s, our nation began the trend toward “deinstitutionalization.”

Not a single policy, but a series of policies.

Outrage over conditions in institutions—as well as the creation of new medications to treat mental illness—sparked a movement to treat people in their communities, rather than locking them away.

California passed the Short-Doyle Act in 1957 to fund community mental health services.

The federal government, too, pursued this worthy goal.

President Kennedy envisioned a system in which, in his words, “the reliance on the cold mercy of custodial isolation will be supplanted by the open warmth of community concern.”

State mental hospitals were closed. But the promise of community mental health was never fully realized.

The states were burdened with the responsibility but provided little in the way of support.

Laws were changed that made it harder to compel mental health treatment. Governor Ronald Reagan signed the Lanterman-Petris-Short Act in 1967, designed to end the inappropriate lifetime commitment of people with mental illness.

And critically, in 1975, a U.S. Supreme Court decision, O’Connor v. Donaldson, ruled that “mental illness alone cannot justify a state locking a person up against his will.”

All of these changes, coincided with safety net cuts, block grants, and tightened eligibility standards of the 80’s and 90’s, along with wholesale razing of skid rows and SROs—which for so many was the only housing option.

The cumulative impact made county jails the de facto mental health institutions.

Patients and their families were left with inadequate options to get the mental health care they needed.

In a politically polarized world, liberals and conservatives blame one another for these failures.

Historically speaking, both are right.

It’s time to stop pointing fingers and join hands in a transformational solution.

This year, we have proposed CalAIM, a once-in-a-generation reform of our Medi-Cal system, based on the obvious, but long-ignored principle, that physical health and brain health are inextricably linked.

After all, 10 million Californians—1 in 4—suffer from some type of behavioral health condition. It’s not a narrow issue, nor a new one.

The deeper truth is that our healthcare system has been designed to treat *some* of our parts, not the *sum* of our parts. That must change.

This landmark proposal calls for leveraging Medi-Cal as a tool to help California’s most vulnerable residents: the homeless, our children, and people cycling in and out of the criminal justice system.

This is about integrating care. Targeting social determinants of health and expanding our Whole Person Care pilots statewide.

Health care and housing can no longer be divorced. After all, what’s more fundamental to a person’s well-being than a roof over their head?

Doctors should be able to write prescriptions for housing the same way they do for insulin or antibiotics.

That’s the aim of CalAIM, transforming Medi-Cal as we know it, backed by a \$695 million budget request to make this real.

Of course, the effectiveness of all of this hinges on an individual being capable of accepting help, to get off the streets and into treatment in the first place.

Some, tragically, are not.

That’s why we need better legal tools, ones that allow local governments, health providers, and law enforcement to more effectively help people access the treatment they need.

California’s behavioral health laws may have been ahead of their time, but today, call out for reform.

We must tailor these policies to reflect the realities of street homelessness today, which are so different than they were 50 or even 15 years ago when these laws were enacted.

And while we made progress on limited and general conservatorships last year, further improvements are warranted.

All within the bounds of deep respect for civil liberties and personal freedoms—but with an equal emphasis on helping people into the life-saving treatment that they need at the precise moment they need it.

Clearly, it’s time to respond to the concerns of experts who argue that thresholds for conservatorships are too high and should be revisited.

Take Laura’s Law, which allows loved ones and service providers to ask courts to compel those who need treatment into community-based outpatient care.

The problem is, it’s too hard to use.

We need to remove some of the conditions imposed on counties trying to implement the law, so we can expand who benefits.

And with Housing Conservatorships, we should authorize counties throughout the state to establish these programs, like the one recently developed in San Francisco.

That said, we know that the most urgent issue is not the legal inability to conserve people but the unavailability of housing and care for those who most need it.

Policy is an empty promise without creating more placements.

One clear opportunity to do this is by reforming Proposition 63, the Mental Health Services Act.

As written, its resources too often don’t reach the people who need it the most.

We are not proposing changing the funding formula for how much each county gets.

Rather, reform must focus funding on street homeless, at-risk and foster youth, and those involved in the criminal justice system.

We must also expand the kinds of services it can pay for, specifically addiction treatment; we need to stop tolerating open drug use on our streets.

Additionally, we should compel counties to spend more of what they’ve got by lowering the 33 percent reserve threshold they are allowed to hold back.

Even with the current threshold, 40 of our 58 counties are above that line.

That is over \$160 million unspent that could help people get off the streets and into treatment.

My message is this: spend your mental health dollars by June 30th, or we’ll make sure they get spent for you.

Because it’s all about accountability. Matching resources to results.

For too long, there were no requirements for progress—it was always voluntary.

I want to thank my Council of Homelessness Advisors for bringing consequences to the forefront of the discussion.

It’s time to match our big-hearted empathy with tight-fisted accountability.

In the past two years, \$1.5 billion has been allocated to help local governments solve homelessness.

This includes \$650 million in Emergency Homelessness Aid we recently approved.

Up until now, state aid has been block granted to local governments by formula.

Spending decisions have been relatively unrestricted and locally driven. But the problem has gotten worse.

The results speak for themselves.

We need a new approach.

In the budget I just submitted, I proposed a new California Access to Housing Fund, and, with it, a whole new way of investing in homeless solutions.

We have a clear purpose for this Fund: paying for what works.

Gap financing for innovative housing models like hotel/motel conversions and securing vacant units wherever we can find them.

Stabilizing and expanding board and care homes.

And preventing homelessness in the first place through rent subsidies and rapid rehousing to help people one job loss, one illness, away from homelessness.

With this first-in-the-nation statewide housing fund, we can braid together state and philanthropic dollars, as well as health care, mental health, and social services—paying for housing, not overhead, by capping all administrative costs at 10 percent.

Nimble and flexible to evolve from best practices to next practices.

With deep regional coordination.

And clear metrics.

Number of new leases signed.

Number of new housing units converted or built.

Number of people stabilized with rent subsidies.

Number of people moved off the streets.

To get us started with urgency, I am calling on this Legislature to invest an essential and unprecedented \$750 million into this fund.

Based on the severity of the crisis, we need early legislative action to set up the legal authorities to enter into contracts with service providers now—not waiting until months from now—because we don’t have months.

The public has lost patience, you have all lost patience, and so have I.

To reverse decades of neglect, and turn around a crisis this deep-rooted, we need more than one-time funding.

We need significant sustainable revenue.

So in the coming months, I pledge to work closely with you to identify this ongoing revenue to provide the safer, cleaner streets our communities deserve.

It’s time to muster the political will to meet this moment.

The people of California are demanding bold, permanent solutions.

Anything less won’t get the job done.

We’ll match this with a new legal obligation to address this crisis head-on.

Requiring that our new funding isn’t replacing existing spending but creating new solutions.

Some have recommended a legal “Right to Shelter.”

It’s a provocative idea which forced the State to explore the limits of what local governments can be compelled to do.

But right now, our imperative must be bringing governments together as working partners, not sparring partners in a court of law.

So instead we are proposing strict accountability, comprehensive audits and a “do-it-or-lose-it” policy to hold local governments responsible for results.

Take action or lose access to this new funding.

To track progress, the state will establish a unified homelessness data system to capture accurate, local information.

Because you can’t manage what you don’t measure.

It’s time for the failed policy of “not my problem” to be replaced with one of shared responsibility across every sector and every community. Look: not one city, not one county, not even one state can shoulder this responsibility alone. This is a national crisis.

Federal decision-making contributed to this moment and our federal government has an obligation to match its rhetoric with specific, constructive, and deliverable results.

California has and will continue to extend its hand of partnership to Washington, seeking to jointly address this issue.

Honestly, this partnership should be a given.

But empty words and symbolic gestures won’t mask a 15 percent across-the-board cut to HUD’s budget.

I’m old enough to remember when HUD was in the housing business. And I’m hopeful it will be again.

After all, homelessness isn’t a blue or a red issue. It’s an everyone issue—a blight on the soul of America.

Of course, the fundamental building block of California’s solution has to be more housing.

A comprehensive response to our collective failure to build enough of it.

When we don’t build housing for people at all income levels, we worsen the homeless crisis.

It’s a vicious cycle and we own it.

And the only sustainable way out of it is to massively increase housing production.

Let’s match our courage on homelessness with courage on housing supply.

Last year, we made a new, historic \$1.75 billion investment to boost production—which as part of a \$7 billion affordable housing package.

We secured new judicial penalties against cities that don’t plan and zone for their fair share of housing.

We protected tenants like never before—finally outlawing discrimination against people with housing vouchers, creating a national law to provide legal assistance to at-risk tenants, and we worked together to crack down on rent spikes and unjust evictions, passing the nation’s strongest statewide renter protections.

Thanks to your leadership, last year, I signed 18 bills to boost housing production.

But time and time again, bigger, bolder reform hasn’t happened—in part because of some legitimate concerns.

Many of our lowest-income residents understandably worry about being pushed out of their own communities because of gentrification.

Middle-class homeowners worry that their single-family home could lose its value—a scary prospect given a house is often a family’s biggest asset.

These real concerns should not be brushed aside.

At the same time, we also know the status quo is simply unacceptable—we aren’t building enough housing.

Look, I get cities need to meet their housing goals in a way that matches their community but doing nothing is no longer an option.

I respect local control but not at the cost of creating a two-class California.

Not at the cost of imperiling the California Dream.

We must grow our communities so people can live, work, and thrive—spending more time with their family, less in traffic.

This means a commitment—right now, this year—to major reform that will eliminate red tape, and delays for building critically needed housing—like affordable, multifamily homes—especially near transit and downtowns.

I am committed to working with leaders in both the Senate and Assembly to craft and pass needed reforms.

Our objectives are clear: to increase density in a way that promotes equity, affordability, and inclusion; to increase certainty that “units planned” become “units built” in a way that respects environmental and labor protections; and to hold local governments accountable for both of these pillars—more density and more certainty.

It’s time for California to say yes to housing. We cannot wait.

So this is the challenge before us and those are the tough choices we must make.

Overcoming adversity and tackling intractable problems are as ingrained in California’s character as our sun-kissed coast and our bread-basket valley.

With homelessness, I know it can be done because I’ve seen successes along the way.

15 years ago, when I was Mayor of San Francisco, in the face of long odds and stiff opposition, we established Project Homeless Connect to bring local government services directly to people. It has been wildly successful and adopted in 250 other cities.

Last year, I went back to Homeless Connect and spoke with a man named Richard Oliva.

Four years ago, Richard was homeless, drug addicted and seeking medical help at one of Connect’s neighborhood fairs.

Thanks to this program, Richard got clean, obtained disability support and ultimately moved into subsidized permanent housing.

AB 648 (Nazarian) Wellness programs

Recommended Position

Oppose

Background

Existing federal law, the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), enacted various health care coverage market reforms that took effect January 1, 2014. Among other things, PPACA sets forth various requirements related to wellness programs, which encompass programs of health promotion or disease prevention.

The Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975, provides for the licensure and regulation of health care service plans by the Department of Managed Health Care (department) and makes a willful violation of the act a crime. Existing law also provides for the regulation of various insurers by the Department of Insurance, headed by the Insurance Commissioner.

Summary

This bill imposes stringent requirements on already federally regulated wellness programs and creates employer criminal and civil liability for violations of those requirements which will discourage and likely eliminate the potential for voluntary workplace wellness programs that benefit employees and contribute to a healthy workforce.

Establishes the Wellness Program Protection Act, and imposes various requirements related to wellness programs on health care services plans (health plans)/insurers/employers, including prohibitions to retaliate against an enrollee/insured/member/employee if the health plan/insurer/employer's action is in response to an individual's election not to participate in a wellness program; and, to share any personal information or data collected through a wellness program.

This bill establishes rules that govern wellness programs instituted by health plans, insurers and employers. Specifically, this bill:

1. Prohibits an employer from requiring an employee to participate in a wellness program as a condition of employment.
2. Prohibits a health plan/insurer/employer from retaliating or taking any adverse action against an enrollee/insured/member/employee if the health plans/insurer's/employer's action is in response to a matter related to a wellness program.
3. Requires a health plan/insurer/employer to comply with data privacy protections, limit sharing of data and destroy data upon conclusion of the program, and provide clear written explanations about program parameters, data collection and enrollee rights. Establishes enrollee/insured/member/employee rights to view and challenge the accuracy of their personal records.

4. Allows the Department of Managed Health Care (DMHC) Director or State Insurance Commissioner to adopt regulations to conform to federal law if this bill conflicts with federal law.
5. Subjects a person who willfully violates this bill's provisions to existing enforcement procedures and any other sanctions and penalties permitted by existing law.
6. Specifies that any person who violates the employment provisions of this bill is guilty of a misdemeanor.
7. Allows any person who believes they have been discharged or otherwise discriminated against by an employer in violation of the employment provisions of this bill to file a complaint with Department of Industrial Relations (DIR).

Status

Date	Action
01/28/20	In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.
01/27/20	Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Senate. (Ayes 41. Noes 21. Page 3911.)
01/27/20	Assembly Rule 63 suspended. (Ayes 58. Noes 18. Page 3893.)
01/27/20	Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
01/23/20	Read second time and amended. Ordered returned to second reading.
01/23/20	From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended. (Ayes 12. Noes 5.) (January 23).
05/16/19	In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.
04/24/19	In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.
04/04/19	From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 6. Noes 1.) (April 3). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
04/01/19	Re-referred to Com. on L. & E.
03/28/19	Assembly Rule 56 suspended. (Page 911.)
03/28/19	Read second time and amended.
03/27/19	From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on L. & E. (Ayes 10. Noes 3.) (March 26).
03/13/19	Re-referred to Com. on HEALTH.
03/12/19	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on HEALTH. Read second time and amended.

Date	Action
03/11/19	Referred to Coms. on HEALTH and L. & E.
02/19/19	From printer. May be heard in committee March 21.
02/15/19	Read first time. To print.

Arguments in Support:

Consumer Reports (CR), a sponsor of this bill, writes that this bill will ensure that privacy protections exist and are sufficient to protect all enrollees of wellness programs. CR also states that this bill will also protect program enrollees against misuse and sharing of their personal data and will curb the reach of employer and insurer control over employees' and enrollees' data. CR contends that this bill will empower individuals to make more informed decisions to join or not to join a wellness program, and ensure that those who do participate can do so without giving up their right to privacy and without suffering discrimination or penalty based on participation.

Arguments in Opposition:

The California Chamber of Commerce (CCC) and other organizations, in a previous version of this bill, contend that this bill creates significant liability for employers and imposes requirements which would likely end voluntary workplace Wellness Programs that benefit employees and contribute to a healthy workforce. The CCC states that employee wellness programs are generally provided as an additional voluntary benefit or perk for working for the employer and their goal is to encourage healthy lifestyles.

AB-1907 (Santiago) California Environmental Quality Act: emergency shelters: supportive and affordable housing: exemption

Recommended Position

Discussion

Background

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment.

Summary

This bill would require the state board to establish by an unspecified date and then maintain an ongoing, dedicated program called the Constituents of Emerging Concern Program to support and conduct research to develop information and, if necessary, provide recommendations to the state board on constituents of emerging concern in drinking water that may pose risks to public health. The bill would require the state board to establish the Stakeholder Advisory Group and the Science Advisory Panel, both as prescribed, to assist in the gathering and development of information for the program, among other functions. The bill would require the program to provide opportunities for public participation, including conducting stakeholder meetings and workshops to solicit relevant information and feedback for development and implementation of the program.

This bill would establish in the State Treasury the CEC Action Fund, which, upon appropriation by the Legislature, would be administered by the state board to support and pay the costs associated with the establishment and implementation of the program, as specified.

This bill would authorize the state board to promulgate regulations pursuant to which the state board's Division of Financial Assistance may provide financial assistance to any public water system upon a showing that the costs of testing drinking water in compliance with this act would impose a financial hardship, with eligibility preference given to public water systems serving fewer than 10,000 individuals.

Status

Date	Action
02/14/20	From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 15.

Date	Action
02/13/20	Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.

AB 2246 (Mayes) Surface Mining and Reclamation Projects Act of 1975

Recommended Position

Support

Background

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 prohibits a person, with exceptions, from conducting surface mining operations unless, among other things, a permit is obtained from, a specified reclamation plan is submitted to and approved by, and financial assurances for reclamation have been approved by the lead agency for the operation of the surface mining operation.

The act exempts certain activities from the provisions of the act, including, among others, emergency excavations or grading conducted by the Department of Water Resources or the Central Valley Flood Protection Board for the specified purposes; surface mining operations conducted on lands owned or leased, or upon which easements or rights-of-way have been obtained, by the Department of Water Resources for the purpose of the State Water Resources Development System or flood control; and surface mining operations on lands owned or leased, or upon which easements or rights-of-way have been obtained, by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board for the purpose of flood control.

Summary

AB 2246 would amend the state's Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) to allow the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) to act as its own lead agency for actions subject to SMARA. Metropolitan is in the process of preparing reclamation plans for work along its Colorado River Aqueduct in Riverside and San Bernardino counties. Lead agency status would streamline the administrative and compliance process for Metropolitan, which is sponsoring the legislation.

This bill would additionally exempt from the provisions of the act emergency excavations or grading conducted by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for the specified purposes and surface mining operations conducted on lands owned or leased, or upon which easements or rights-of-way have been obtained, by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for the purpose of repairing, maintaining, or replacing pipelines, infrastructure, or related transmission systems used for the distribution of water in the specified counties.

The bill would require the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to provide an annual report to the Department of Conservation and any affected county by the date specified by the department on these surface mining operations. To the extent this bill adds to the duties of local governments acting as a lead agency, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

Status

Date	Action
02/14/20	From printer. May be heard in committee March 15.
02/13/20	Read first time. To print.

SB 873 (Jackson) Gender: discrimination: pricing

Background

Existing law, the Gender Tax Repeal Act of 1995, prohibits a business establishment from discriminating against a person because of the person's gender with respect to the price charged for services of similar or like kind and specifies that this prohibition does not apply to price differences based specifically upon the amount of time, difficulty, or cost of providing the services.

Summary

Increased Litigation. Exposes businesses to costly litigation for a consumer's assertion that any price difference on "substantially similar" goods, even a nominal amount, is based on gender and therefore the consumer is entitled to a minimum of \$4,000.

SB 873 creates significant exposure to costly litigation for small and large businesses for any good or product that is "substantially similar," but priced differently. The proposed definition of "substantially similar" is basically two products that do not have any "substantial differences." This ambiguity of this definition will make it extremely challenging regarding which products to even compare and will result in litigation. Enforcement of SB 873 is Civil Code Section 52(a), which is the same code section that has contributed to the disability access drive by litigation scheme in California. Specifically, Civil Code Section 52(a) provides a private right of action with a minimum statutory damage of \$4,000, per violation, with the right to attorney's fees.

Gender Repeal Act Abuse

See *Reese v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.* 73 Cal.App.4th 1225 (1999) (a male customer tried to pursue a class action against the retailer for offering "Ladies Day" promotional discounts for oil changes. Evidence indicated the customer actually went into the retailer that day solely to create a claim against Wal-Mart for gender discrimination); *Surrey v. TrueBeginnings*, 168 Cal.App.4th 414 (1999) (denying a male customer who claimed he was denied free internet dating services as a violation of the Gender Tax Repeal Act, summary judgment based upon his lack of standing); and *Angelucci v. Century Supper Club*, 41 Cal.4th 160 (2007) (male customers pursued litigation against a nightclub for charging women a lower admission price). Expanding Civil Code Section 51.6 to thousands of goods will only expand the number of individuals who will target businesses and intentionally seek out alleged violations for personal financial gain.

Status

Date	Action
01/29/20	Referred to Coms. on JUD., GOV. & F., and APPR.
01/22/20	From printer. May be acted upon on or after February 21.
01/21/20	Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.

SB 996 (Portantion) State Water Resource Control Board: Constituent Emerging Concern Program

Recommended Position

Support

Background

Existing law, the California Safe Drinking Water Act, requires the State Water Resources Control Board to administer provisions relating to the regulation of drinking water to protect public health. The state board's duties include, but are not limited to, conducting research, studies, and demonstration programs relating to the provision of a dependable and safe supply of drinking water, enforcing the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, and adopting and enforcing regulations.

Constituents of Emerging Concern (CECs) are a diverse group of chemicals and microorganisms that are not currently regulated in drinking water. They can be detected in very small amounts. Over the years, particular CECs have received growing public attention as potential pollutants in drinking water supplies. Yet, the full extent and risk of their presence is not well understood.

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and the California Municipal Utilities Association are co-sponsoring legislation in response to this growing issue that would establish a CEC Drinking Water Program at the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board). The program would set up a consistent and science-based approach for assessing the public health and drinking water consequences of CECs, while identifying which CECs warrant further action.

Summary

The bill would establish a Constituents of Emerging Concern (CECs) Drinking Water Program at the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) to set up a consistent and science-based approach for assessing the public health and drinking water consequences of CECs and identifying which CECs warrant further action. This bill is co-sponsored by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) and the California Municipal Utilities Association.

SB 996 would require the State Board to:

- Establish a CECs Drinking Water Program to identify, evaluate, and prioritize actions for CECs in drinking water sources.
- - Create a Science Advisory Panel of at least seven members comprised of experts from the fields of public health science, water and wastewater engineering, toxicology, epidemiology, chemical sciences and biological sciences. The panel's duties shall include recommending new CEC monitoring requirements, identifying CEC candidates based on potential public health effects, evaluating new monitoring approaches for CECs, and

developing recommended standard testing and reporting procedures, among other duties.

- Create a Stakeholder Advisory Group of at least nine members representing broad stakeholder interests including public water and wastewater systems, trade associations, the business community, and academic institutions. The advisory group will provide input on matters associated with the program, including research needs, program funding and implementation strategies.
- Establish in the State Treasury the CEC Action Fund, which upon appropriation would be administrated by the State Board.

Status

Date	Action
02/14/20	From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 15.
02/13/20	Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.

Paid Family Leave Act- Budget Trailer Bill

Recommended Position

Oppose

Background

Trailer bill language (referred to as “TBL”) don’t always follow a standard trail of logic. Instead, trailer bills are sometimes used as vessels to sneak past opposition, avoid a 2/3 vote, or even thwart problematic ballot initiatives. At the beginning of each year, dozens of trailer bills are introduced by the Assembly and Senate Budget Committees. When first introduced, they are empty except for some generic placeholder language. They stay like that for months while closed door negotiations take place between the Legislature, Governor’s staff, and select stakeholders. Once agreement is reached, the Governor’s staff at Department of Finance provides language to drop into the trailer bills and so begins the frenzy of lobbying activity.

Summary

Would significantly harm small employers in California by requiring all employers to provide 12-weeks of protected leave of absence each year and up to 7 months of job protected leave for employers with 5 or more employees when pregnancy disability leave is involved. This is in addition to existing leaves of absences already required, exposing employers to costly litigation for any alleged violation of these leave laws. The PFL Trailer Bill language is similar to a 2019 Senate Bill, SB 135 (Jackson), which failed passage— arguably because it would have placed the same significant burdens on small businesses as this proposed language.

However, the PFL Trailer Bill language greatly expands the definition of “family member” to include a child of a domestic partner, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, or domestic partner. Additionally, the bill removes the requirement that a “child” be under the age of 18 or a dependent adult child. Because a domestic partner, a child of a domestic partner, a grandparent, a grandchild, or a sibling are not family members covered under FMLA, these leaves will not coincide.

Accordingly, the employee could take leave under the PFL Trailer Bill for 3 months to care for a domestic partner, child of a domestic partner, grandparent, grandchild, or sibling, return to work, and then take another 3 months off under FMLA for the employee’s own medical condition or the medical condition of a spouse, child or parent or for the birth, adoption or foster care placement of a child.

South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
Balance Sheet
As of January 31, 2020

	<u>Jan 31, 20</u>	<u>Jan 31, 19</u>
ASSETS		
Current Assets		
Checking/Savings		
1310 · Malaga Bank - Main - 4...	<u>34,739.47</u>	<u>39,405.15</u>
Total Checking/Savings	<u>34,739.47</u>	<u>39,405.15</u>
Total Current Assets	<u>34,739.47</u>	<u>39,405.15</u>
TOTAL ASSETS	<u>34,739.47</u>	<u>39,405.15</u>
LIABILITIES & EQUITY		
Equity		
3150 · Surplus/(Deficit)	<u>34,525.70</u>	<u>42,654.42</u>
Net Income	<u>213.77</u>	<u>-3,249.27</u>
Total Equity	<u>34,739.47</u>	<u>39,405.15</u>
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	<u>34,739.47</u>	<u>39,405.15</u>

Profit & Loss

January 2020

	Jan 20	Jan 19
Ordinary Income/Expense		
Income		
4000 · Operating Income		
4100 · Memberships - Continuing	200.00	300.00
4120 · Sponsorship - General	5,000.00	0.00
4160 · Interest	0.00	3.73
Total 4000 · Operating Income	5,200.00	303.73
Total Income	5,200.00	303.73
Expense		
5000 · Program Expenses		
5180 · Rent - Facility Program	0.00	1,000.00
5220 · Food & Beverage Installation dinner	127.28	0.00
Total 5220 · Food & Beverage	127.28	0.00
5240 · Supplies - Recognition	-247.05	0.00
Total 5000 · Program Expenses	-119.77	1,000.00
6200 · Administrative		
6111 · Prof Services - PEAR Strate...	5,106.00	2,553.00
Total 6200 · Administrative	5,106.00	2,553.00
Total Expense	4,986.23	3,553.00
Net Ordinary Income	213.77	-3,249.27
Net Income	213.77	-3,249.27

SBACC Status Report
Monday, March 02, 2020

Measure	Summary	Status / Location	Organization	Position
AB 36 Bloom D	<p>Residential tenancies: rent control. 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. (Amended: 4/22/2019 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 2/3/2020-From committee: Filed with the Chief Clerk pursuant to Joint Rule 56. Location: 1/31/2020-A. DEAD</p>	SBACC	Oppose
AB 535 Brough R	<p>Personal income taxes: credit: professional license fees. Would allow a credit against personal income taxes for each taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2021, and before January 1, 2026, in an amount equal to 50% of 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. (Amended: 1/15/2020 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 2/3/2020-From committee: Filed with the Chief Clerk pursuant to Joint Rule 56. Location: 1/31/2020-A. DEAD</p>	SBACC	Support
AB 628 Bonta D	<p>Employment: victims of sexual harassment: protections. 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. (Amended: 5/16/2019 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 2/3/2020-Died on unfinished business file, reconsideration pending. Location: 2/3/2020-A. DEAD</p>	SBACC	Oppose

<p>AB 713 Mullin D</p>	<p>California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018. The California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 (CCPA) grants a consumer various rights with regard to personal information relating to that consumer collected by a business. The act also grants a consumer the right to request a business to delete any personal information about the consumer collected by the business and requires a business to do so upon receipt of a verified request, except as specified. The act excepts certain categories of personal information and entities from its provisions, including medical information, as specified. This bill would except from the CCPA information that was deidentified in accordance with specified federal law, was derived from protected health information, individually identifiable health information, or identifiable private information, consistent with specified federal policy, as provided. (Amended: 1/23/2020 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 1/23/2020-From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on JUD. Location: 1/9/2020-S. JUD.</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>AB 764 Bonta D</p>	<p>Sugar-sweetened beverages: nonsale distribution incentives. 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. (Amended: 5/28/2019 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 2/3/2020-Died on inactive file. Location: 2/3/2020-A. DEAD</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>
<p>AB 882 McCarty D</p>	<p>Discrimination in employment: drug rehabilitation programs. Under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, it is unlawful to engage in specified discriminatory employment practices, including hiring, promotion, and termination based on certain protected characteristics, including race, unless based on a bona fide occupational qualification or applicable security regulations. The act also prohibits housing discrimination based on specified personal characteristics, including physical or mental disability. This bill would revise the definitions of "physical disability" and "mental disability" to include a person who has completed, or is in the process of completing, a rehabilitation program to end illegal drug use, or who is erroneously regarded to be engaging in illegal drug use. (Amended: 1/6/2020 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 2/3/2020-From committee: Filed with the Chief Clerk pursuant to Joint Rule 56. Location: 1/24/2020-A. DEAD</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>

<p>AB 1066 Gonzalez D</p>	<p>Unemployment insurance: trade disputes: eligibility for benefits. Would restore eligibility for unemployment benefits after the first 3 weeks of a trade dispute for an employee who left work because of the trade dispute. The bill would also codify specified case law that holds that employees who left work due to a lockout by the employer, even if it was in anticipation of a trade dispute, are eligible for benefits. The bill would specify that the bill's provisions do not diminish eligibility for benefits of individuals deprived of work due to an employer lockout or similar action, as specified. (Amended: 8/30/2019 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 1/13/2020-Ordered to inactive file at the request of Senator Leyva. Location: 1/13/2020-S. INACTIVE FILE</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>
<p>AB 1907 Santiago D</p>	<p>California Environmental Quality Act: emergency shelters: supportive and affordable housing: exemption. Would, until January 1, 2029, exempt from environmental review under CEQA certain activities approved by or carried out by a public agency in furtherance of providing emergency shelters, supportive housing, or affordable housing, as each is defined. The bill would require a lead agency that determines to carry out or approve an activity that is within this CEQA exemption to file a notice of exemption, as specified. (Introduced: 1/8/2020 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 1/30/2020-Referred to Coms. on NAT. RES. and H. & C.D. Location: 1/30/2020-A. NAT. RES.</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Watch</p>
<p>ACA 1 Aguiar-Curry D</p>	<p>Local government financing: affordable housing and public infrastructure: voter approval. The California Constitution prohibits the ad valorem tax rate on real property from exceeding 1% of the full cash value of the property, subject to certain exceptions. This measure would create an additional exception to the 1% limit that would authorize a city, county, city and county, or special district to levy an ad valorem tax to service bonded indebtedness incurred to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing, or the acquisition or lease of real property for those purposes, if the proposition proposing that tax is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, or city and county, as applicable, and the proposition includes specified accountability requirements. (Amended: 3/18/2019 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 8/19/2019-Read third time. Refused adoption. Motion to reconsider made by Assembly Member Aguiar-Curry. Hearing: 3/2/2020 #1 ASSEMBLY MOTION TO RECONSIDER Location: 5/20/2019-A. RECONSIDERATION</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>

<p>ACA 14 Gonzalez D</p>	<p>University of California: support services: equal employment opportunity standards. Would enact the University of California Equal Employment Opportunity Standards Act, which would, effective January 1, 2021, except as specified, require the regents to ensure that all contract workers, as defined, who are paid to perform support services for students, faculty, patients, or the general public at any campus, dining hall, medical center, clinic, research facility, laboratory, or other university location, are at all times subject to and afforded the same equal employment opportunity standards, as defined, as university employees performing similar services. (Amended: 8/30/2019 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 9/14/2019-Read third time. Refused adoption. Reconsideration granted. Hearing: 3/2/2020 #16 <i>SENATE ASSEMBLY BILLS - THIRD READING FILE</i> Location: 9/3/2019-S. THIRD READING</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>
<p>SB 37 Skinner D</p>	<p>Corporation taxes: tax rates. 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 those new applicable tax rates by a factor of 1.5 for those taxpayers that have a specified decrease in full-time employees employed in the United States as compared to an increase in contracted employees or foreign full-time employees, as described. (Amended: 1/16/2020 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 2/3/2020-Returned to Secretary of Senate pursuant to Joint Rule 56. Location: 2/3/2020-S. DEAD</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>
<p>SB 246 Wieckowski D</p>	<p>Oil and gas severance tax. Current law imposes various taxes, including taxes on the privilege of engaging in certain activities. The Fee Collection Procedures Law, the violation of which is a crime, provides procedures for the collection of certain fees and surcharges. This bill would impose an oil and gas severance tax upon any operator for the privilege of severing oil or gas from the earth or water in this state at specified rates, calculated as provided. (Amended: 1/6/2020 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 2/3/2020-Returned to Secretary of Senate pursuant to Joint Rule 56. Location: 2/3/2020-S. DEAD</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>
<p>SB 567 Caballero D</p>	<p>Workers' compensation: hospital employees. Would define "injury," for a hospital employee who provides direct patient care in an acute care hospital, to include infectious diseases and musculoskeletal injuries. The bill would create rebuttable presumptions that these injuries that develop or manifest in a hospital employee who provides direct patient care in an acute care hospital arose out of and in the course of the employment. The bill would extend these presumptions for specified time periods after the hospital employee's termination of employment. The bill would also make related findings and declarations. (Amended: 1/8/2020 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 2/4/2020-Returned to Secretary of Senate pursuant to Joint Rule 56. Location: 1/17/2020-S. DEAD</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>

<p>SB 669 Caballero D</p>	<p>Water quality: Safe Drinking Water Fund. 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. (Introduced: 2/22/2019 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 2/3/2020-Returned to Secretary of Senate pursuant to Joint Rule 56. Location: 2/3/2020-S. DEAD</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>SB 749 Durazo D</p>	<p>California Public Records Act: trade secrets. 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. (Amended: 9/10/2019 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 9/15/2019-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a) (15). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 9/13/2019)(May be acted upon Jan 2020) Location: 9/15/2019-A. 2 YEAR</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>
<p>SCA 5 Hill D</p>	<p>Taxation: school districts: parcel tax. 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. (Amended: 4/22/2019 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 5/21/2019-Ordered to inactive file on request of Senator Hill. Location: 5/21/2019-S. INACTIVE FILE</p>	<p>SBACC</p>	<p>Oppose</p>

Total Measures: 16

Total Tracking Forms: 16