

June 14, 2016

The following is a list of bills of interest that are currently active in the U.S. Congress and California State Legislature. It provides a status update on those measures with an approved City position. Highlighted items indicate updated information from the last report.

Section 1: Recommended Bill(s)						
Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
Budget/trailer bill	Gov. Brown	By-Right Housing approvals	Oppose	Oppose	Budget hearings	
<p>Status: The housing proposal was introduced as part of the Governor’s “May Revise.” If it is not included in the budget, it will likely included in a budget trailer bill.</p>						
<p>Vote Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes have been taken yet 						
<p>District Voting Record</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet 						
<p>Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority. 						
<p>Description</p> <p>Governor Brown’s affordable housing proposal pre-empts local discretionary land use approvals of some housing developments by making such approvals ministerial actions. The goal is to spur new development quickly by eliminating permitting roadblocks. Newly constructed structures with two or more dwelling units that are already zoned for housing, and contain at least 10% or 20% affordable units (depending on access to transit), must be approved “by right.”</p>			<p>Analysis</p> <p>Because these housing developments must be approved “by right,” the projects cannot have public review, project-level environmental review, or any design review. The Governor’s proposal takes away all local control and prohibits the City from addressing community concerns relating to traffic, parking, appearance, and other development impacts for such projects. Eliminating opportunities for public review of major developments goes against the principles of local democracy and public engagement. Local officials have no say in these projects, which creates distrust in local government when public concerns cannot be addressed. It also does little to solve the state’s affordable housing problem since the threshold for affordable units is so low.</p>			
<p>Supporters:</p> <p>Affordable housing advocates, Realtor’s Association</p>						
<p>Opposition:</p> <p>The League of California Cities, environmental organizations, labor organizations</p>						

Section 2: Bills with an existing City position						
Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
H.R. 1732	Shuster (R-PA)	The Regulatory Integrity Protection Act	N/A	SUPPORT	Senate	April 15
<p>Status: Passed the House on May 12, 2015. Referred to the Senate.</p> <p>A nearly identical bill was passed by the House and Senate, but was vetoed by President Obama in January 2016. The chances of an override vote being successful are unlikely.</p> <p>Vote Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the House 261-155. 						

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

District Voting Record

- Congressman Hunter voted “yes” and is a co-sponsor of the bill.

Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform:

“Oppose efforts that place local streams, creeks, wetlands, and other municipal waterways or ditches under federal regulation.”

Description

H.R. 1732 requires the Obama administration to withdraw its “Waters of the United States” rule that expands the federal government’s authority under the Clean Water Act to apply to local streams, wetlands, ditches, and adjacent lands. The bill also requires the EPA and Army Corps to engage in outreach to stakeholders (including local governments) before putting forward a replacement bill.

Analysis

H.R. 1732 would have costly economic and legal impacts for public agencies and private citizens through the imposition of new regulations. Its definitions of tributaries, waterways, and other wetlands would include many streams and ditches in San Marcos, putting them under federal regulatory control. That will result in greater costs, time, and restrictions for local projects.

President Obama has threatened to veto H.R. 1732.

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
H.R. 232	Paulsen (R-MN)	The Small BREW Act	N/A	SUPPORT	Ways and Means Cmte	TBA

Status: Referred to the House Ways and Means Committee

Vote Summary:

- No votes have been taken on the House floor yet

District Voting Record

- Congressman Hunter is a co-sponsor of the bill

Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform:

Support federal proposals that fund or enhance community development.

Description

H.R. 232 reduces the federal beer excise tax that small brewers pay per barrel. Under current law, brewers making less than 2 million barrels pay \$7/per barrel on the first 60,000 barrels, and \$18/per barrel after that. This bill reduces the tax to \$3.50/barrel for the first 60,000 barrels.

Analysis

Because of economies of scale, small brewers pay significantly more for raw materials than national and international beer manufacturers. This bill would lower the tax burden for craft breweries to allow them to retain a higher percentage of their earnings. That will allow them to reinvest in their local communities, hire additional workers, and potentially expand. It would be a significant cost savings for the small breweries in San Marcos and help them level the playing field economically against larger, national beer manufacturers.

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
S. 375	Cardin (D-MD)	The Small BREW Act	N/A	SUPPORT	Finance Committee	TBA

Status: Referred to the Senate Finance Committee

Vote Summary:

- No votes have been taken yet

District Voting Record

- Neither U.S. Senator has voted on it yet. Neither is a cosponsor.

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform:

Support federal proposals that fund and enhance community development.

Description

S.375 (the Senate companion to H.R. 232) reduces the federal beer excise tax that small brewers pay per barrel. Under current law, brewers making less than 2 million barrels pay \$7/per barrel on the first 60,000 barrels, and \$18/per barrel after that. This bill reduces the tax to \$3.50/barrel for the first 60,000 barrels.

Analysis

Because of economies of scale, small brewers pay significantly more for raw materials than national and international beer manufacturers. This bill would lower the tax burden for craft breweries to allow them to retain a higher percentage of their earnings. That will allow them to reinvest in their local communities, hire additional workers, and potentially expand. It would be a significant cost savings for the small breweries in San Marcos and help them level the playing field economically against larger, national beer manufacturers.

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
S. 2555	Thune (R-South Dakota)	The Mobile Now Act	N/A	OPPOSE	Senate Cmte on Commerce	TBA
Status: Read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.						
Vote Summary: No votes have been taken yet						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Congressman Hunter: No votes taken yet.• Senator Feinstein: No votes taken yet.• Senator Boxer: No votes taken yet.						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority.						
Description <p>The Mobile Now Act would substantially modify existing federal rules that regulate wireless services. This bill: expands the types of services that are covered by federal zoning rules, expands and codifies the FCC’s recent “Shot Clock Ruling” that relates to application deadlines, preempts a local government’s ability to require the removal of outdated wireless technology, prohibits local governments from requiring a provider to prove there is a gap in coverage, bars local governments from governing the size or placement of emergency backup power systems, and imposes limitations on fees that local agencies can assess.</p>			Analysis <p>The federal government has already expanded its zoning authority over cities as it relates to wireless technology. The state of California, through AB 57, has gone a step further and started using these federal deadlines as a way to deem approved projects that have passed the deadline. This federal bill goes a step beyond that and takes away additional zoning authority from cities, even for issues that affect safety, like the placement of emergency backup power. It will also affect the application submittal documents that we currently require from wireless and other telecommunications providers. It is a blatant attack on local authority.</p>			
Supporters: This bill is supported by all of the major cell phone and telecommunications providers.						
Opposition: U.S. Conference of Mayors						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
-------------	-----------	------------	---------------	---------------------------------	---------------	--------------

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

AB 34	Bonta (D)	Medical marijuana	Oppose	OPPOSE	Approp. Committee	April 28, 2015
Status: Referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Held under submission. <u>This bill will not move forward this year.</u>						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No votes have been taken on the Assembly floor yet.						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Neither of San Marcos’ legislators have voted on the bill yet						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority.Support measures that limit the ability of minors to engage in alcohol consumption and other substances like marijuana, synthetic marijuana, and spice.						
Description AB 34 establishes the Division of Medical Cannabis Regulation and Enforcement within the Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control. It enacts a new bureaucratic licensing system for medical marijuana that is controlled exclusively by the state.			Analysis AB 34 is directly at odds with local control because it makes no reference to the current extensive regulatory authority that cities have over medical marijuana businesses (including the power to prohibit them outright). Under this bill, the exclusive authority to license or revoke a license is given to the state. The bill would also mandate local jurisdictions assist the state with the enforcement of the bill, potentially costing local agencies a lot of time and money when there are problems.			
Supporters: The United Food and Commercial Workers Union, the American Nurses Association of California, and several marijuana growers.						
Opposition: League of CA Cities, the Police Chiefs Association, Deputy District Attorneys Association, California Association of Code Enforcement Officers, College and University Police Chiefs Associations, Family Winemakers Association, and several local law enforcement organizations						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 57	Quirk (D)	Wireless telecommunications facilities	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Signed into law	
Status: Passed by the Assembly and Senate. Signed into law.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly (repassage): 66 yes, 8 no, 6 no recorded votes Senate: 28 yes, 6 no, 6 no recorded votes 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Yes Assemblymember Waldron: Yes 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority. 						
Description This bill requires applications for the siting or collocation of a wireless telecommunications facility to automatically be deemed approved if the city or county fails to approve or disapprove the application within the FCC's deadlines and if all public notice requirements have been met. It is written to apply to all			Analysis Under current law, if a city or county fails to approve a wireless application by the FCC's deadline, the applicant is able to bring the matter to court for a resolution. This bill goes beyond federal law and actually approves the application, regardless if additional work is required or more issues need investigation. It is another example of the erosion of municipal land use authority. This bill is being supported by all of the wireless companies because they believe			

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

cities, including charter cities.	cities and counties are ignoring the FCC's timelines, even though these applications are time consuming and require significant attention. They also do not like the recourse provided to them under federal law.
Supporters: AT&T, Sprint, T-Mobile, Verizon, CalChamber, California Wireless Association, California Manufacturers and Technology Association, the Wireless Infrastructure Association, TechAmerica, TechNet	
Opposition: League of CA Cities, CA State Association of Counties, Rural County Representatives of CA, Urban Counties Caucus, American Planning Association (CA Chapter); about 20 cities (including Vista).	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 216	C. Garcia	Product sales to minors: vapor products	Watch	SUPPORT	Signed into law	4/22/15
Status: Passed the Assembly and Senate. Signed into law.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-passed the Assembly 77-1 with 2 not voting Passed the Senate 35-2 with 3 not voting 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: YES Assemblymember Waldron: YES 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support measures that limit the ability of minors to engage in alcohol consumption and other substances. 						
Description AB 216 would make it illegal for stores to sell non-nicotine vaping and e-cigarette devices to anyone under the age of 18. Current law only prevents minors from purchasing vaping and e-cigarette devices that come <i>with</i> nicotine cartridges. This bill would make it illegal for stores to sell these devices to minors even if they do not come with cartridges.			Analysis AB 216 would help prevent children from obtaining devices that could be used to smoke nicotine, cannabis, and other harmful products. It complements the City's existing efforts to prohibit minors from using vaping devices. Our City ordinance already prohibits selling these devices separately to children, so this proposed law would match our current ordinance and bring consistency statewide.			
Supporters: CA School Employees Association, CA Narcotic Officers Association, Breast Cancer Fund						
Opposition: None on file.						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 219	Daly (D)	Public works concrete delivery	Watch	OPPOSE	Signed into law	TBA
Status: Signed into law.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 51 ayes, 27 noes, 2 no recorded votes Senate: 24 ayes, 13 noes, 3 not voting. 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: NO Assemblymember Waldron: NO 						

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority. 	
Description AB 219 expands the definition of “public works” to include the hauling and delivery of ready-mixed concrete in order to apply prevailing wage laws to workers delivering concrete. It does not apply to contracts advertised for bid or awarded prior to the effective date of the bill.	Analysis This bill will cause an increase in city contract costs. According to Caltrans, on average statewide, the hourly rate for ready-mixed drivers would increase from \$16 per hour to \$34 per hour. Actual additional costs will depend on the prevailing wage in each county. There will also be some additional state costs for monitoring and compliance. The bill disregards longstanding legal precedent that material suppliers are not subject to prevailing wage laws and other distinctions in labor law between a driver and construction worker.
Supporters: AFL-CIO (co-sponsor), Teamsters (co-sponsor), State Building and Construction Trades Council (co-sponsor), AFSCME, State Council of Laborers, CA Professional Firefighters	
Opposition: Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated General Contractors, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, CA Construction Trucking Association, Coalition of American-Latino Truckers, and numerous construction and concrete organizations	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 327	Gordon (D)	Public works volunteers	Support	SUPPORT	<u>Signed into law</u>	June 10
Status: Passed the Assembly unanimously. Passed the Senate unanimously. Signed into law by the Governor.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Passed the Assembly 78-0 (with 2 not voting)Passed the Senate 37-0 (with 3 not voting)						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Assembly Member Waldron: YesSenator Anderson: Yes						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Local controlEmployee pay and benefits should be decided at the local level						
Description Current law allows cities to use unpaid volunteers for a variety of public works projects. The allowance to use volunteers without a per diem expires on January 1, 2017. This bill extends that date until January 1, 2024.			Analysis Without this extension, the City would be required to pay volunteers for certain public works projects, like park cleanups and tree planting. It has no known opposition and is not considered to be controversial.			
Supporters: The bill is supported by the League of California Cities, many individual cities, and dozens of park and conservation organizations.						
Opposition: There is no known opposition.						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
-------------	-----------	------------	---------------	---------------------------------	---------------	--------------

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

AB 718	Chu (D)	Local government powers	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate	7/13
Status: Failed its first vote in the Senate. Reconsideration granted. This is an inactive bill.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Assembly: 56 yes, 15 no, 9 no recorded votesSenate: 18 yes, 14 no, 8 not voting (21 needed for passage)						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senator Anderson: YESAssemblymember Waldron: No						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority.						
Description AB 718 would prohibit cities and counties from enforcing any law or ordinance that prohibits sleeping in lawfully parked cars. It also prohibits impounding a car for the same reason. It was written to apply to all cities, including charter cities.			Analysis AB 718 would prohibit the City of San Marcos from enforcing its ordinance that prohibits sleeping in a car for longer than two hours on city streets. Because cars in the City’s residential areas can be parked for up to 72 hours in the same spot, this bill would allow an individual to live in a parked car for 3 days in front of someone’s house. The same could be true for businesses and shopping centers. AB 718 does nothing to solve the problem of homelessness and makes no attempt to give individuals real shelter. It just causes additional problems with sanitation and community livability. It is also another attack on local control.			
Supporters: ACLU, California Labor Federation, Housing California, San Diego Housing Federation, and dozens of homeless and housing advocacy organizations.						
Opposition: City of Encinitas, League of CA Cities, CA Business Properties Association, American Planning Association, CA Police Chiefs Association, Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, International Council of Shopping Centers, City of Ontario, CA College and University Police Chiefs.						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 988	Stone (D)	Outdoor recreation grants	Support	SUPPORT	Senate	July 16
Status: Passed the Assembly 73 to 3 (with 4 not voting). Passed the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water (8-1) and referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Held under submission.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 73 aye, 3 no, 4 not voting District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly Member Waldron: Aye Senator Anderson: Has not voted on it yet. 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support measures that provide assistance for community park facilities, open space, and recreation programs. 						
Description This bill requires the Department of Parks and Recreation to establish an Outdoor Environmental Education and Recreation Grants Program for public agencies and non-profit organizations to increase the ability of			Analysis The program would be funded through reverted and unencumbered Prop 40 bonds, which specifically authorized a portion of the proceeds for this purpose. The bill also authorizes the state to solicit private donations for this program too, which could then be used if bond funding is not available. The grant funding to local agencies			

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

underserved and at-risk populations to participate in outdoor recreation and educational experiences.	could be very beneficial to our Community Services Department and its programming.
Supporters: San Diego County Board of Supervisors, League of CA Cities, and a variety of outdoor, recreation, and environmental organizations.	
Opposition: There is no opposition on file.	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 744	Chau (D)	Planning and zoning: density bonus	Oppose	OPPOSE	Signed into law	July 15
Status: Passed the Assembly and the Senate. Signed into law.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 52-24 (4 not voting). Senate: 22-15 (3 not voting) 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly Member Waldron: NO Senator Anderson: NO 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local control Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority. 						
Description AB 744 prohibits a city from imposing a minimum parking requirement on a development that is within ½ mile of a major transit stop, a senior housing development, or a special needs housing development. It also requires a favorable “round up” in density for development projects.			Analysis This bill would take away local control for some aspects of the City's development and parking projects. It would prohibit the City from mandating a minimum number of parking spaces in some projects, and it may require the City to approve more units in a project on top of what is currently allowed under our current guidelines.			
Supporters: Domus Development, Circulate San Diego, California Apartment Association, Council of Infill Builders, California Housing Consortium						
Opposition: League of California Cities						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 1146	B. Jones	Skateboard parks	Watch	SUPPORT	Signed into law	June 30
Status: Passed the Senate 38-0. Re-passed by the Assembly 78-0. Signed into law by the Governor on August 17, 2015.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Assembly 78-0. (2 not voting) Passed the Senate 38-0. (2 not voting) 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Yes Assemblymember Waldron: YES 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support legislation that grants additional immunity to local agencies for recreational activities in community parks and recreation areas. 						

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

<p>Description</p> <p>Under current law, local government liability in skate parks is limited to skateboard injuries. AB 1146 extends local governmental immunity for injuries that occur in local skate parks to include other all-wheeled non-motorized recreational devices like bicycles, scooters, and wheelchairs.</p>	<p>Analysis</p> <p>The bill was proposed by the San Diego County Board because it would like to allow other wheeled devices at its new park in Lakeside. Although the City of San Marcos does not currently allow any other wheeled devices at its skate park, AB 1146 would give the City liability protection if it chooses to allow bicycles, scooters, or wheelchairs at a skate park in the future. The San Diego County Board asked the City of San Marcos and other cities in the county to support this bill.</p>
<p>Supporters: San Diego County Board</p>	
<p>Opposition: None known at this time because it is still early in the legislative process.</p>	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 1236	Chiu (D)	Local ordinances: electric vehicle charging stations	Oppose	OPPOSE	Signed into law	July 7
Status: Signed into law.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Assembly: 77 yes, 2 no, 1 not votingSenate 27 yes, 12 no, 1 not voting						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Assembly Member Waldron: NOSenator Anderson: NO						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Local controlOppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority.						
Description <p>This bill requires cities to enact an ordinance that expedites permits for electric vehicle charging stations. Amended to say cities under 200,000 people would be required to enact the ordinance by September 30, 2017.</p>			Analysis <p>Similar to a bill passed last year that expedited solar installations (and opposed by the City Council), this bill requires the city to provide a level of service to electric vehicle charging stations that is unavailable to most other individuals seeking a building permit. Since it expedites this process, it would put those applicants ahead of others. It also imposes a number of new requirements on the city in order to expedite these types of permits, regardless of the demand for such stations in the City.</p>			
Supporters: California Apartment Association, ChargePoint, Stem, Inc.						
Opposition: League of California Cities						
Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 2039	Ting (D)	Solid waste: home generated sharps	SUPPORT	SUPPORT	Assembly Cmte on Enviro Safety	Cancelled
Status: A hearing for this bill was cancelled at the request of the author due to opposition. It is unlikely to move forward this year.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No votes taken yet.						
District Voting Record						

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet • Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet 	
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support measures that provide fiscal independence to cities 	
Description AB 2039 requires pharmaceutical manufacturers that distribute self-injected medications to begin the process of developing a plan to support the safe collection and disposal of home-generated sharps. Manufacturers would be required to submit annual performance plans showing their sharps disposal plans.	Analysis There are limited places that San Marcos residents can take their sharps for disposal, and there is a growing problem of sharps being found at City facilities, which is a danger for staff. The City is required to provide household hazardous waste disposal services for its residents and spends about \$60K/year, which includes sharps disposal. Residents can bring their sharps to the facility for disposal at a cost to the city of \$34 for each visit, or \$65 if it is brought with other hazardous waste. San Marcos residents drop off approximately 300 pounds of sharps each year at the facility.
Supporters: League of California Cities	
Opposition: To be determined.	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 1934	Santiago (D)	Density bonuses	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Assembly floor	
Status: Passed Appropriations; Read a third time.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No floor votes taken yet.						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senator Anderson: Has not voted yetAssembly Member Waldron: Voted AYE in the Local Government Committee						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority.						
Description <p>AB 1934 makes significant changes to the density bonus law and would require cities to grant a density bonus to a commercial development that partners with a housing development within one mile of the commercial development. This bill takes away local control by requiring cities to grant concessions that may not be warranted and may not be consistent with a city’s plans.</p>			Analysis <p>This bill would severely restrict local land use authority. It is a blanket one-size-fits-all rule that does not allow a city to take into account its own land use criteria. Under this proposal, a developer merely has to “partner” with a commercial development, but there is no definition of a “partner” or a “commercial development.” The developer in the commercial development is giving the city nothing, but in the return, the city is giving the developer a 20% variance in regulatory requirements and fees.</p>			
Supporters: California Council for Affordable Housing, California Association of Realtors, California Apartment Association						
Opposition: League of California Cities, California Chapter of the American Planning Association						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
-------------	-----------	------------	---------------	---------------------------------	---------------	--------------

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

AB 2299	Bloom (D)	Housing: second units	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Assembly floor	TBA
Status: Passed Appropriations; Awaiting a vote on the Assembly floor.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No floor votes taken yet.						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senator Anderson: Has not voted yetAssembly Member Waldron: Voted NO in the Local Government Committee						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority.						
Description AB 2299 requires cities to enact an ordinance for the creation of second housing units (granny flats) in single-family and multifamily residential zones. Current law gives cities the option to do so, and this bill makes it mandatory. It also prohibits cities from imposing parking standards if the second housing unit is located within one-half mile of transit or shopping, even if parking is an issue in the neighborhood.			Analysis This bill is a major shift from current law, which gives cities the authority to enact an ordinance, rather than making it mandatory. Enacting ordinances are expensive for cities, and this mandate is unnecessary. The bill is also problematic because it keeps cities from enacting parking standards even when there are serious community concerns about parking in a neighborhood.			
Supporters: California Apartment Association (Sponsor)						
Opposition: League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties.						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 2501	Bloom (D)	Housing: density bonuses	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate	TBA
Status: Passed the Assembly. Awaiting committee assignment in the Senate.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Assembly 50-11 with 19 not voting. 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet Assembly Member Waldron: NO 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority. 						
Description AB 2501 requires cities to take action on density bonus applications within certain timeframes and makes other significant changes to existing density bonus law. It further limits the ability of a city to interpret its own development standards and diminishes the role of planning commissions. It also limit a city's ability to reduce development standards without waiving them, prohibits cities from providing public notice or public hearings on density bonus applications, and allows developers to			Analysis This bill is a major shift from current law, and requires a city to make very quick decisions about major development projects in short periods of time. It is too short a time frame for those applications in conjunction with other land use approvals. The measure also says the statute should be "liberally construed" in favor of producing maximum number of housing units. This bill invites the court to interfere with the land use judgment of cities in violation of the constitutional separation of powers.			

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

determine whether a project modification results in costs reductions, rather than the city.	
Supporters: California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation (Sponsor), Western Center on Law and Poverty (Sponsor), California Apartment Association, California Housing Consortium	
Opposition: League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties.	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 2522	Bloom (D)	Attached housing developments	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Assembly Housing	TBA
Status: Waiting for a hearing in Assembly Housing and Community Development. This bill will not move forward this year.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No floor votes taken yet.						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senator Anderson: Has not voted yetAssembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority.						
Description AB 2522 would require any attached housing development to be a permitted use by right if it is on property that is part of city’s residential inventory of land suitable for residential development. By right approval would not allow the city to analyze whether the site can accommodate the proposed number of units.			Analysis When a city prepares its housing element, it does its best to identify sites that accommodate its share of the Regional Housing Need Allocation. However, a detailed analysis is not completed when the housing element is prepared. This means that the maximum number of units may be exceeded under this proposal by right. By right approval limits a city’s ability to determine the type of housing, and the number of units, that is best suited for a particular parcel.			
Supporters: American Planning Association-California Chapter (sponsor), California Apartment Association, California Building Industry Association, California Association of Realtors, California Housing Consortium						
Opposition: League of California Cities, Council of Community Housing Organizations						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 2697	Bonilla (D)	Disposal of assets and properties	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Assembly Approps	TBA
Status: Held under submission.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No floor votes taken yet. District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet Assembly Member Waldron: Voted NO in a previous committee vote. 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority. 						
Description		Analysis				
AB 2697 requires a successor agency, prior to the disposal of land, to send a written offer to sell the properties for the purposes of developing low and moderate-income housing		The City continues to dispose of property previously owned under Redevelopment. If passed, this bill would delay the successor agency's ability to dispose of the property in a timely manner. Additionally, it could prevent the City from getting the best price for the properties.				

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

to any local public entity. This bill would complicate and delay the wind down process and would limit a city's ability to obtain maximum value for the properties.	
Supporters: California Housing Consortium, Non-Profit Housing Association	
Opposition: League of California Cities	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 2853	Gatto (D)	Public records	SUPPORT	SUPPORT	Senate	May 4, 2016
Status: Passed the Assembly unanimously. Awaiting a committee assignment in the Senate.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 78-0 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet Assembly Member Waldron: YES 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support local authority. Oppose any new program mandates that are unfunded and/or partially funded. 						
Description AB 2853 allows a public agency that receives a public records request for a document on its website to direct the requestor to the website for the information. Under current law, cities must print or email the document directly to the requestor, rather than directing them to the readily available information.			Analysis Currently, it is estimated that about a third of all public records requests are for documents that are readily available on the City's website. This bill would save a lot of staff time for the City Clerk's staff. It is a commonsense bill that eases a state mandate.			
Supporters: League of California Cities						
Opposition: None known						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 24	Hill	STAKE Act: electronic cigarettes	Watch	SUPPORT	Senate	5/4/15
<p>Status: The bill failed the Senate by one vote and moved to the Inactive File at the request of the author. However, nearly identical language applying the STAKE Act to electronic cigarettes was included in SB 140 (supported by the city; see next page), so this legislation will be unnecessary if SB 140 passes.</p>						
<p>Vote Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 20-12 (with 8 not voting) <p>District Voting Record</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: NO Assemblymember Waldron: N/A 						

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform:

- Support measures that limit the ability of minors to engage in alcohol consumption and other substances.

Description

SB 24 extends the Stop Tobacco Access to Kids Enforcement (STAKE) Act to help prohibit sales of electronic cigarettes to minors. Under existing law, distributors and retailers must post a notice at each point of purchase stating that the sale of tobacco products to minors is illegal. SB 24 extends the STAKE Act to e-cigarettes and extends the same penalties for violations that are currently in law for regular cigarettes. The bill also requires the distributor or retailer to obtain a license in order to sell the products and requires child-proof packaging of cartridges and solutions that are used with e-cigarettes.

Analysis

SB 24 extends the same rules on regular cigarettes to electronic cigarettes as they relate to sales to minors. It also adds penalties for noncompliance. The requirement to child-proof packages of cartridges and solutions is intended to help prevent nicotine overdoses. In 2012, there were 28 calls to the California Poison Control System for nicotine poisoning, in 2013 there were 106 calls and there were over 200 in 2014.

Supporters: CA College and University Police Chiefs, CA Poison Control System, CA Police Chiefs Association, Consumer Federation of California, Junior Leagues of California

Opposition: A few public health organizations (Cancer, Heart Associations) oppose the bill because they do not like the definition of an e-cigarette in the bill. They prefer the language included in SB 140.

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 113 SB 107	Dept of Finance & Committee on Budget	Redevelopment Dissolution modifications	OPPOSE No position	OPPOSE	Signed into law	
Status: "Gut and amend" bill passed on the last day of session and signed into law by the Governor. Its bill number changed as did much of its contents to make it not as bad. The League removed its opposition.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 24 yes, 15 no, 1 not voting Assembly: 45 yes, 31 no, 4 not voting 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: No Assemblymember Waldron: No 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support legislation that fills the revenue gap resulting from the dissolution of redevelopment in 2012. 						
Description The bill modifies the LAIF rate and changes the definition of a reimbursable agreement. It also exempts the Department of Finance from the Administrative Procedure Act and limits cities' abilities to seek redress in court—even when the Department of Finance has made an error. The bill modifies the LAIF rate, extends the life of local oversight boards until 2018, limits administrative cost allowances, and changes the ROPS schedule to an annual one.			Analysis The proposed budget language harms local agencies by retroactively changing the rules at the very end of the process. San Marcos has worked hard to carefully plan for redevelopment dissolution, and retroactively adding unexpected and unwarranted provisions at the end of the process will result in costly unbudgeted expenses. These changes will stifle cities' work as they wind down redevelopment using the existing set of guidelines under which they had planned. While the City would not be affected by the LAIF rate change, we do have reimbursable agreements that may be impacted by these changes and those modifications could have costly repercussions.			

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

It also exempts the Department of Finance from the Administrative Procedures Act.

Supporters: Department of Finance

Opposition: League of California Cities and numerous individual cities

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 139	Galgiani	Controlled substances	Watch	SUPPORT	Assembly	TBA
Status: This bill passed the Senate unanimously. It is waiting a committee assignment in the Assembly.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No votes taken yet						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senator Anderson: N/AAssemblymember Waldron: N/A						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Support measures that limit the ability of minors to engage in alcohol consumption and other substances.						
Description SB 139 expands the definition of synthetic cannabinoid (often called synthetic marijuana, Spice, and K2) and enacts penalties for the use and possession of these substances. Currently, it is only illegal to sell them. The bill also makes it illegal to change the chemical compounds to evade the law.			Analysis While most synthetic drugs are already banned, manufacturers of these products have stayed ahead of the law by tweaking the chemical formulas to keep them off of the banned list. SB 139 would make it illegal to change the formulas by better defining the compounds that make up these drugs.			
Supporters: California Police Chief’s Association, CA District Attorneys Association, CA Association of Code Enforcement Officers, CA College and University Police Chiefs Association, CA State Sheriff’s Association						
Opposition: ACLU, Legal Services for Prisoners with Children						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 140	Leno	Electronic cigarettes	Watch	SUPPORT	Assembly	July 8
Status: Passed the Senate 25 to 12 (3 not voting). Withdrawn from consideration by the author on July 8 after a hostile amendment was added in an Assembly Committee. It will not move forward this year. An identical bill (SBX2-5) by the same author has been introduced in the Special Session on healthcare. The special session bill passed the Senate and Assembly and was signed into law by the Governor in May 2016.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 25-12 (3 not voting). District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: No Assemblymember Waldron: N/A 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support measures that limit the ability of minors to engage in alcohol consumption and other substances. 						
Description		Analysis				
SB 140 defines electronic cigarettes as tobacco products so that they are covered		SB 140's provisions bring the state's e-cigarette regulations in line with other tobacco laws and match the City's current e-cigarette ordinance.				

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

under the state’s existing Smoke Free Act. Doing so would prohibit vaping at workplaces, schools, daycares, restaurants, bars, hospitals, and on public transportation. These are the same places regular cigarette smoking is currently prohibited.	Passage of this bill would help ensure better compliance with our own City ordinance, especially among visitors to San Marcos, since similar e-cigarette restrictions would be followed statewide. It also complements the efforts of Live Well San Diego, which has been working to stem the sharp increase in vaping, especially among youth.
Supporters: American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, American Lung Association, CA Police Chiefs Association, CA Peace Officers Association, and numerous cities and public health organizations	
Opposition: National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML), Smoke Free Alternatives Trade Association, Fresno Cannabis Association	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 164	Beall (D) & Anderson (R)	Serial sexual predators	Watch	SUPPORT	Approps Committee	April 20, 2015
Status: Passed the Public Safety Committee (7-0). Passed the Appropriations Committee (7-0). Held under submission.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No votes have been taken on the Assembly or Senate floors yet.						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senator Anderson is a Principal Co-Author but has not voted on it yet.Assemblymember Waldron: No votes taken yet						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Support measures that move forward the goals established by the local San Diego Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force and assist in the reduction of child pornography, child predators and sex offenders, and human sex trafficking.”						
Description SB 164 closes a loophole in state law that allows sexual predators to escape life sentences under the One Strike Law if their crimes were uncovered late. The One Strike Law, enacted in 1994, and expanded with Jessica’s Law in 2006, is designed to punish serial sexual predators who commit multiple offenses and target multiple victims. Had these crimes been charged simultaneously to another qualifying sexual offense, the One Strike Law would have been applicable. This bill simply removes the word “previously” from statute to explicitly state that the timing of the conviction is not a factor in whether the One Strike Law applies.			Analysis SB 164 is designed to keep repeat offenders of the most violent crimes off the streets. This bill would most likely apply in instances when a victim comes forward later or when DNA evidence solves a violent rape via a “cold hit” in the DNA database. It would abrogate the decision in <i>People v. Huynh</i> that the defendant was not eligible for a life sentence because he was convicted of qualifying crimes in separate prosecutions.			
Supporters: CA College & University Police Chiefs Association, CA Peace Officers Association, CA Police Chiefs Association, AFSCME, CA State Sheriffs’ Association, Crime Victims United of CA, CA Protective Parents Assoc, CA Communities United Association						
Opposition: California Public Defenders Association						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
-------------	-----------	------------	---------------	---------------------------------	---------------	--------------

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

SB 168	Gaines (R)	Unmanned aircraft systems	SUPPORT	SUPPORT	Governor (vetoed)	
Status: VETOED by the Governor.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senate: 40-0Assembly: 79-0 (1 not voting)						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senator Anderson: Yes (He is a co-author)Assemblymember Waldron: Yes						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Support legislation that provides assistance for fire prevention and response						
Description SB 168 makes it illegal to operate an unmanned aircraft (often called a “drone”) in a manner that would prevent or delay the extinguishment of a fire. This bill makes it punishable by up to six months in jail and/or a \$5,000 fine for someone to fly an unmanned aircraft system that hampers firefighting efforts. The bill also gives immunity to a public entity (including firefighters) that damages a drone if the emergency responder is performing emergency services.			Analysis This bill was sponsored by the League of CA Cities and the CA Police Chiefs Association. In several California fires this summer and others across the country, aerial firefighters had to pull back after they spotted drones that could have collided with their planes. Drones have the potential to bring down an airplane, especially if it hits the engine. If there was a fire in San Marcos that required an aerial response, firefighters would be grounded and aerial suppression efforts would be halted if there were drones in the area. Already, the western side of San Marcos is covered under FAA regulations that limit unmanned aircraft systems due to its proximity to the airport in Carlsbad.			
Supporters: League of CA Cities, CA Police Chiefs Association, CA Fire Chiefs Association, CA Ambulance Association, CA Professional Firefighters, CA State Association of Counties, San Diego County, and several local fire and police associations.						
Opposition: None recorded.						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 807	Gaines (R)	Unmanned aircraft systems	SUPPORT	SUPPORT	Assembly	April 11, 2016
Status: Passed the Senate unanimously. Awaiting a committee assignment in the Assembly.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 37-0 District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: YES Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet. 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support legislation that clarifies the use of unmanned aerial devices during emergencies (like wildfires) and provides local agencies protection if those devices are damaged in the course of responding to an emergency. 						
Description SB 807 provides immunity for first responders who damage a civilian drone that is directly interfering with emergency operations, like firefighting response, ambulance services, and			Analysis In several California fires last summer and others across the country, aerial firefighters had to pull back after they spotted drones that could have collided with their planes. Drones have the potential to bring down an airplane, especially if it hits the engine. If there was a			

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

rescue operations.	fire in San Marcos that required an aerial response, firefighters would be grounded and aerial suppression efforts would be halted if there were drones in the area. Already, the western side of San Marcos is covered under FAA regulations that limit unmanned aircraft systems due to its proximity to the airport in Carlsbad. This bill is similar to SB 168, which was supported by the City Council last year.
Supporters: League of CA Cities, Fire Chiefs' Association, Police Chiefs' Association, Code Enforcement Officers Association, and others.	
Opposition: None known.	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 876	Liu (D-La Canada Flintridge)	Homelessness	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate Transpo & Housing	March 29, 2016
Status: The bill failed in the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee by a vote of 2-7. It was granted reconsideration, but another hearing was cancelled at the request of the author.						
Vote Summary: Senate Transportation and Housing: 2 AYES, 7 NOES						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Assembly Member Waldron: No votes taken yet.Senator Anderson: No votes taken yet.						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority.Support legislation that works to solve the state and region’s problems with homelessness as long as it also protects a City’s ability to preserve public safety and livability.						
Description <p>This bill preempts local authority by giving anyone the ability to eat, sleep, or rest for any length of time in any public space and on any private property that is open to the public, including: plazas, courtyards, parking lots, sidewalks, public transportation facilities, public buildings, shopping centers, and parks.</p>			Analysis <p>Like AB 718, which is also opposed by the City Council, this bill would prohibit the City of San Marcos and other cities from enforcing ordinances that prohibit certain activities that directly affect safety and livability.</p> <p>SB 876 does nothing to solve the problem of homelessness and makes no attempt to give individuals real shelter. The bill actually says, “Passing this Act will not reduce homelessness.” It just causes additional problems with sanitation and community livability. It is also another attack on local control.</p>			
Supporters: This bill is supported a variety of homeless advocacy organizations. It is a relatively new bill and a full list of supporters is not available yet.						
Opposition: League of California Cities is actively opposed. It is a relatively new bill and a full list of opponents is not available yet.						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 885	Wolk (D)	Construction projects: indemnity	Watch	OPPOSE	Assembly	May 5, 2016

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

Status: Passed the Senate 26-4. Ordered to the Assembly.	
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 26-4 	
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: YES Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet 	
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority. 	
Description SB 885 eliminates the right of a public agency to require design professionals to provide up-front legal defense against claims related to their work.	Analysis If there was a claim against a city contractor for claims related to their work, the City would be required to fully litigate the matter and then seen reimbursement from the contractor. It would greatly limit the City's ability to contract and would place an undue financial burden on all public agencies contracting with design professionals for public works projects.
Supporters: American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC) of California, Structural Engineers Association of California and other professional contractor associations.	
Opposition: California Special Districts Association	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 1000	Leyva (D)	General plans: environmental justice	WATCH	OPPOSE	Senate floor	TBA
Status: Passed Senate Appropriations 5-2.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No floor votes taken yet. 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet. 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority. 						
Description SB 1000 requires cities to add an environmental justice element to their general plan that identifies objectives and policies to reduce health risks in disadvantaged communities. This bill could require cities to conduct expensive new environmental reviews and other studies that are expressly exempt from state reimbursement. SB 1000 could also affect where businesses locate or expand and stifle economic development by effectively redlining certain neighborhoods.			Analysis This is another unfunded mandate that could result in unintended consequences. Requiring additional conditions along geographic lines will likely affect where development and economic activity occurs, since businesses will not want to build or expand in those areas. It will also cost cities a lot of money by forcing them to undertake expensive studies to evaluate these criteria, without the opportunity to seek reimbursement from the state for this unfunded mandate.			
Supporters: Sierra Club, Trust for Public Land, Coalition for Clean Air, California League of Conservation Voters, along with many other environmental and environmental justice organizations.						
Opposition: California Chamber of Commerce, California Building Industry Association, American Planning Association-California Chapter						

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 1069	Wieckowski (D)	Land use: zoning	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Assembly	TBA
Status: Passed the Senate; Waiting for a hearing in the Assembly.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senate: 29-3 (with 8 not voting)						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senator Anderson: YESAssembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet.						
Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority.						
Description SB 1069 removes local land use authority relating to second dwelling units and requires cities to approve second units in residential areas without the imposition of any standards. It also specifically prohibits cities from imposing parking standards, even if that neighborhood has serious parking problems.			Analysis This bill is a major shift from current law, which gives cities the authority to enact an ordinance about secondary dwelling units. Instead, this completely removes local authority to prohibit them. It also requires that cities approve second units in a second family home. The elimination of parking standards is also problematic because it does not take into account the local problems that a neighborhood may be facing with parking.			
Supporters: AARP, American Planning Association, Blue Shield of California, Colliers International, Facebook, Non-Profit Housing Association of California, and the Bay Area Council (sponsor)						
Opposition: League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 1170	Wieckowski (D)	Public Contracts: water pollution prevention plans	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate floor	TBD
Status: Passed the Senate Appropriations Committee unanimously.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Senate Appropriations Committee 7-0. District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority. 						
Description		Analysis				
This bill prohibits all local agencies from requiring a contractor on a public works project to develop and assume responsibility for the completeness and accuracy of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).		This bill is a blatant attack on local control, especially for charter cities. It would force cities to assume responsibility for SWPPPs and would require them to hire an architect or engineer. Liability for SWPPPs would also fall on the cities, even when they do not have direct control or day-to-day knowledge of the project.				

Attachment A – Analysis and status update of legislation

Supporters: Association of General Contractors (sponsor), CA State Council of Laborers, California Precast Concrete Association, and about a dozen other contractor associations.

Opposition: League of CA Cities, California Special Districts Association, CA State Association of Counties, Association of California Water Agencies, Urban Counties of California, Association of Healthcare Districts, CA Municipal Utilities Association, and others.