

June 18, 2018

The following is a list of bills of interest in the U.S. Congress and California State Legislature. It provides a status update on those measures with an approved City position. **Items highlighted in yellow** indicate updated information from the last report.

Bills with an approved City position						
Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
H.R. 472	Issa (R)	The Safe Recovery and Community Empowerment Act	N/A	SUPPORT	House Judiciary Committee	TBA
Status: Referred to the House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes taken yet 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congressman Hunter: Congressman Hunter is a cosponsor Senator Feinstein: Has not voted yet Senator Harris: Has not voted yet 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support bills that allow the City to have full land use authority. 						
Description The bill amends the Fair Housing Act to allow the state and cities to enforce zoning ordinances that limit sober living facilities if it is necessary to preserve the residential character of a neighborhood. It would also require owners and operators to obtain a license or permit, meet consumer protection standards, and register with the government. The bill also requires sober homes to meet specific health standards.			Analysis One of the reasons cities are prohibited from zoning such facilities is that such regulation is prohibited by the Fair Housing Act. This bill would clarify that the Fair Housing Act does not prohibit local land use authority for the regulation of such facilities. While this would solve one problem that cities have at the federal level, there are other state laws that would likely have to be amended before full zoning authority is authorized in this area.			
Supporters: A full list of supporters besides San Marcos has not been announced yet.						
Opposition: San Marcos, other cities, most major housing organizations, non-profit organizations, and social service organizations.						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
2017 Federal budget	President	Community Development Block Grant	N/A	OPPOSE	Congress	TBA
Status: Funding for the CDBG program for the rest of FY17 was not significantly affected by the bill signed into law in May 2017.						

Attachment A

Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes have been taken yet 	
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Feinstein: Has not voted on it yet. Senator Harris: Has not voted yet Congressman Hunter: Has not voted yet 	
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose restrictions to or elimination of the CDBG program. 	
Description The President's budget proposes the elimination of the Community Development Block Grant program. Last fiscal year, the city received \$563,756.	Analysis Since 2003, when the City became an "entitlement city," San Marcos has received over \$10 million in CDBG funding. Over the last few years, the City has used this funding to make ADA improvements to facilities and sidewalks, pay for mandated fair housing services, and pay for non-profit coordination with 2-1-1. Since many of these services are required by law, it has kept the City from using General Fund money for those purposes.
Supporters: Unknown	
Opposition: San Marcos, other cities, most major housing organizations, non-profit organizations, and social service organizations.	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
FY19 Federal Budget	President Trump	HUD budget: Community Development Block Grant elimination	N/A	OPPOSE	Congress	
Status: The President submitted his proposed budget to Congress. No action has been taken yet. The FY18 budget, signed in March, had no cuts to the CDBG program.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Harris: No votes taken yet 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose restrictions to or elimination of the CDBG program. 						
Description The President's budget proposes the elimination of the Community Development Block Grant program. Last fiscal year, the city received just over \$600,000.			Analysis Since 2003, when the City became an "entitlement city," San Marcos has received over \$10 million in CDBG funding. Last year it received about \$600,000. Over the last few years, the City has used this funding to make ADA improvements to facilities and sidewalks, pay for mandated fair housing services, and pay for non-profit coordination with 2-1-1. Since many of these services are required by law, it has kept the City from using General Fund money for those purposes.			

Attachment A

Supporters: Unknown						
Opposition: Other cities nationwide, most major housing organizations, non-profit organizations, and social service organizations.						
Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
Budget Trailer Bill and SB 623	Administration	Safe and Affordable Drinking Water Act	Watch	OPPOSE	Died	
Status: The water tax provision was not included in the FY19 budget approved by the Governor and Legislature.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes have been 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 any legislation that preempts local authority. 						
Description The budget trailer bill and SB 623 would impose a tax on drinking water administered by the State Water Resources Control Board. It also includes tax revenue from fertilizers, confined animal facilities, and milk-producing facilities to address nitrate contamination.			Analysis While the money would be used to assist disadvantaged parts of the state without ready access to clean drinking water, there are likely other implementable options to providing funding without taxing all California residents.			
Supporters: Alliance of Child and Family Services, American Heart Association, American Rivers, American Stroke Association, Asian Pacific Environmental Network, California Audubon, California Bicycle Coalition, California Environmental Justice Alliance, California League of Conservation Voters, California Water Service, Center for Race Poverty and the Environment, League of Women Voters, SEIU, Western Center on Law & Poverty						
Opposition: San Diego County Water Authority, Vista Irrigation District, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District, American Water Works Association, Association of California Water Agencies, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, California Water Impact Network, Southern California Water Committee, Valley Center Water District, and other cities and water districts.						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB35	Wiener (D)	Affordable housing: streamlined approval process	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Signed into law	
Status: Signed into law.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 23-14 Assembly: 47-27 						
District Voting Record						

Attachment A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senator Anderson: YES • Assembly Member 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 SB 35 would eliminate local land use authority by making approvals of multifamily developments and accessory dwelling units "ministerial" actions if a city has not constructed the required number of dwellings by the Regional Housing Needs Allocation for that year. It would also eliminate any local or state parking requirements for those units. By removing land use authority and making the process ministerial, it would also eliminate opportunities for public review and hearings about neighborhood development impacts.	Analysis The bill is modeled after the Governor's "by right" housing proposal last year. By making approvals for these developments ministerial actions, SB 35 eliminates opportunities for public engagement about traffic, parking, and other development impacts. For example, the bill's parking prohibitions could potentially increase community opposition to affordable units. Parking problems are an issue in several San Marcos neighborhoods, especially around the university, and serious spillover effects have caused parking shortages and resentment about greater housing density in adjacent areas. Lack of available parking and increased traffic are the most frequent arguments against building affordable or other higher density housing. Decisions about development needs should be made by cities after a careful analysis of impacts and public input. Blanket standards and prohibitions that limit local control, like this bill, keep local officials from addressing community concerns and responding to important neighborhood issues.
Supporters: CA Apartment Association, CA Association of Realtors, CA League of Conservation Voters, LA Chamber of Commerce, Napa County Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, YIMBY Action, Abundant Housing LA, Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles, others	
Opposition: Cities of San Marcos, Glendale, Murrieta, Pasadena, Santa Rosa, Vallejo; Los Angeles County; Sierra Club California, California Professional Firefighters Association, League of California Cities	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 139	Wilk (R)	Harmful substances: local regulation	SUPPORT	SUPPORT	Senate	March 29, 2017
Status: Scheduled hearing cancelled at the request of the author. This bill died because it did not meet the required deadlines.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No votes have been taken yet 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senator Anderson: He has not voted on it 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 limit the ability of minors to engage in alcohol consumption and other substances like marijuana, synthetic marijuana, and spice. 						
Description This bill allows cities and counties to regulate by ordinance the sale of a substance used as a recreational drug that poses a threat to human life or health and is a particular			Analysis SB 139 would give an additional tool to cities and counties to quickly respond to the proliferation of changing synthetic narcotics. They would be able to			

Attachment A

<p>risk to minors. The bill would also allow the city council to require vendors to maintain records of sale, make inventory available to a peace officer, and store the substances in a secure place that cannot be accessed by minors.</p>	<p>pass ordinances specifically targeting these products when they have been identified as posing a health risk, rather than waiting for the State Legislature to do so.</p>
<p>Supporters: San Marcos, League of California Cities, California Police Chiefs Association</p>	
<p>Opposition: To be announced.</p>	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 166	Skinner	Residential density and affordability	Watch	OPPOSE	Signed into law	
Status: Signed into law.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 24-11 Assembly: 54-24 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: NO Assembly Member 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 This bill makes a number of changes to the No Net Loss Zoning law including requiring cities to maintain their inventory of sites designated for low/moderate income housing construction. Every city must maintain a bank of sites zoned for high density housing until it can find subsidies for construction. Cities would be required to find and up-zone other sites to make up the difference if a lower density project is approved.			Analysis SB 166 requires detailed tracking and restricts local agencies' abilities to approve lower density projects unless it can find other sites to make up the difference. For cities like San Marcos that are approaching build-out, it will soon be increasingly difficult to identify other housing sites to accommodate the loss inventory. If sites need to be rezoned, it may also result in the loss of market rate housing that is also in high demand in our community.			
Supporters: CA Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, Public Advocates, Western Center on Law and Poverty, California Community Builders, CA State Association of Electrical Workers, CA State Pipe Trades Council, SEIU, Western States Council of Sheet Metal Workers						
Opposition: San Marcos, Orange County Board of Supervisors						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 167	Skinner (D)	Housing Affordability Act	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Signed into law	7/12/2017
Status: Signed into law.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 28-9 						

Attachment A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 59-18 	
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: YES Assembly Member 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 This bill would significantly alter the burden of proof for cities, including charter cities, that deny a housing project or emergency shelter. It increases the burden from "substantial evidence" to "preponderance of evidence." It also broadens the ability to sue local governments and increases the fines on cities for violations to \$1,000 per housing unit, even when a city did not act in bad faith with respect to the project denial.	Analysis The Housing Affordability Act, also known as the Anti-NIMBY Act, further limits the ability of cities to reject housing developments without a thorough analysis of the economic, social, and environmental effects of the action. By changing the substantial evidence standard to preponderance of evidence, the evidence provided has to convince the decision maker that it is "more likely than not" and is sometimes expressed as 50% plus one. This bill makes substantial changes to existing law with new terms and definitions, broadens the ability to sue local governments, and increases fines on cities.
Supporters: California Apartment Association, California Building Industry Association, California Chamber of Commerce, California Council for Affordable Housing, CA Association of Realtors, YIMBY Action, CA Business Properties Association	
Opposition: San Marcos, American Planning Association-CA Chapter, California League of Cities, California State Association of Counties, Urban Counties of California, Rural County Representatives of California	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 378	Portantino (D)	Alcoholic beverage licenses	Support	SUPPORT	Assembly	
Status: Passed the Senate; Held in Appropriations Committee under submission. This will be a 2-year bill.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 37-0 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: YES (in committee); Not voting (on the Senate floor) Assembly Member Waldron: YES (in committee) 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support measures that assist local law enforcement 						
Description SB 378 allows ABC to temporarily suspend a license when a pattern of behavior indicates that action is necessary to protect health and safety.			Analysis The purpose of the bill is to help address issues of violent crime, gang activity, and human trafficking that sometimes run in conjunction with a business holding a liquor license, since city officials often lack the necessary tools to quickly shut down an establishment. Cities would be able to petition ABC to take immediate action if egregious behavior is identified.			
Supporters: Cities of San Marcos, Vista, Beverly Hills, Indio, and Thousand Oaks; League of CA Cities, CA Police Chiefs Association, Alcohol Justice, CA Alcohol Policy Alliance, California Council on Alcohol Problems						
Opposition: None on file						

Attachment A

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 649	Hueso (D)	Wireless and small cell telecommunications facilities	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Vetoed	
Status: Vetoed by the Governor.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 22-10 Assembly: 46-16 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: YES Assembly Member Waldron: YES 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose any legislation or proposed regulation that preempts local authority or weakens the independence of charter cities. Oppose legislation that eliminates the municipal authority over the public right-of-way including fair and reasonable compensation for the use of the right-of-way. 						
Description SB 649 prohibits discretionary review of all small cell wireless antennas, including facilities collocated on existing structures, buildings, and the public right of way. It preempts local authority and requires small cell facilities to be allowed in all zones by-right. It would prohibit cities from denying a facility from being placed on a public site and would prohibit the collection of lease or licensing payments. It allows the placement of such facilities on private property with only a building permit.			Analysis By allowing these facilities with a ministerial permit, SB 649 removes consideration of aesthetic, nuisance, and environmental impacts of such facilities and eliminates all public input. The bill prohibits any City discretion or the ability to lease or license such publicly-owned property. No other industry receives such a preference.			
Supporters: All of the wireless providers, numerous local chambers of commerce, CA State Sheriff's Association,						
Opposition: San Marcos, League of California Cities, over 100 individual cities, 26 counties, American Planning Association, CA Municipal Utilities Association, CA Realtors, CA Association of Counties, Urban Counties of California						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 786	Mendoza (D)	Alcohol and drug abuse facilities	SUPPORT	SUPPORT	Senate	April 19
Status: Referred to the Committee on Health. Hearing cancelled at the request of the author. This bill died because it did not meet the required legislative deadline. Also, Senator Mendoza resigned.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes have been taken yet 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: He has not voted on it yet. 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 strengthens the concept of local control for local decision making on land use and zoning matters. 						

Attachment A

Description SB 786 would give cities and counties notification when residential-based drug and alcohol facilities (residential group homes) are located in their communities. The bill would allow cities and counties to recognize overconcentration of such facilities in one neighborhood and would allow the city or county to request denial of a facility if it results in overconcentration.	Analysis Like many other cities in California, San Marcos has seen several alcohol and drug treatment facilities open in our residential neighborhoods. SB 786 makes important changes to current law by giving cities notice about facilities that are planning to open in their communities, and helping them recognize overconcentration in specific neighborhoods. While state law imposes noticing and 300-foot distancing requirements for every existing group home in California, it fails to do so for alcohol and drug recovery facilities. SB 786 simply extends this consistency to all licensed group homes.
Supporters: San Marcos, League of California Cities, individual cities	
Opposition: To be announced	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 827	Wiener (D)	Planning and zoning: transit-rich housing bonus	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate	
Status: Referred to the Transportation and Housing Committee and the Governance and Finance Committee. This bill failed in committee It will not move forward this year.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No votes have been taken yet.						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none">Senator Anderson: No votes taken yetAssembly Member Waldron: 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.Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority, including the imposition of one-size-fits-all, land-use, parking, building and development guidelines.						
Description <p>SB 827 would override local zoning controls on height, density, parking minimums, and design review on properties within a certain distance of major public transit infrastructure. According to the author, the goal of the bill is to promote “mid-rise housing” (not single family homes and not high rises) near public transportation by prohibiting density restrictions. Developers would be able to choose to build shorter building, but cities would not be able to force a developer to build shorter through restrictive zoning. It would allow buildings up to either 55 or 85 feet, depending on a number of factors,</p>			Analysis <p>This bill is a continuation of land use legislation enacted in 2017 by the same author (SB 35) that removed local zoning authority in order to encourage additional housing development. Because this bill only applies to certain high transit areas, it is most likely to affect areas along the SPRINTER line, although since the current frequency of the train may fall below the bill’s guidelines, it may not immediately affect the areas around the line in the short term.</p> <p>By eliminating local authority for these housing developments, SB 827 removes opportunities for public engagement about traffic, parking, and other development impacts. For example, the bill’s parking prohibitions may increase community opposition to additional housing. Parking problems are an issue in several San Marcos neighborhoods, especially around the university, and serious</p>			

Attachment A

<p>including the width of the street. SB 827 would apply to all cities meeting the criteria, including charter cities.</p> <p>The bill has been amended to require any developer that displaces tenants to offer units in the new building at the same rent and pay the tenants' living expenses in the meantime. The bill also will make clear that it won't override any city or county rules that prohibit the demolition of rent-controlled buildings, or require developers to set aside units in new projects for low-income residents.</p>	<p>spillover effects have caused parking shortages and concerns about greater housing density in adjacent areas.</p>
<p>Supporters: California YIMBY (sponsor), Abundant Housing Los Angeles, California Apartment Association, California Realtors Association, Council of Infill Builders, YIMBY Action</p>	
<p>Opposition: San Marcos, League of California Cities, Sierra Club, several tenant advocacy organizations, and many California cities</p>	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 828	Wiener (D)	Housing element	Watch	OPPOSE	Assembly	June 20
Status: Passed the Senate. Referred to the Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Senate 23-10, with 6 not voting 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: No 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. Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority, including the imposition of one-size-fits-all, land-use, parking, building and development guidelines. 						
Description SB 828 would require cities to accommodate 200% 125% of the Regional Housing Number Allocation (RHNA), rather than 100% under current law. It would also require communities to demonstrate a high rate of new housing production for households of all income levels in order to alleviate increasing rent and housing sale prices.			Analysis Establishing blanket and unattainable standards local agencies will not help the state or cities achieve their mutual housing goals. Since developers are the ones that build housing, rather than cities, local agencies will be penalized when they ultimately fail to meet the unachievable RHNA standards in such a short period of time. Decisions about future housing developments should be made by cities after a careful analysis of needs and public input. Blanket standards that limit local control, like this bill, keep local officials from addressing community concerns and responding to important neighborhood issues.			
Supporters: Bay Area Council (co-sponsor), Silicon Valley Leadership Group (co-sponsor), Bridge Housing, California Alliance for						

Attachment A

Retired Americans, California Apartment Association, California Asian Pacific Islander Chamber of Commerce, California Building Industry Association, California Business Properties Association, California Chamber of Commerce, California Community Builders, California YIMBY, City of Oakland, Half Moon Bay Brewing Company, Heller Manus Architects, HKS Architects, McKinsey & Company, Non Profit Housing Association of Northern California, North Bay Leadership Council, Pacific Standard, Postmates, San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR), San Francisco Housing Action Coalition, San Mateo County Economic Development Association, Silicon Valley Community Foundation, Sustainable Silicon Valley

Opposition:

City of San Marcos, American Planning Association, California Association of Councils of Governments, Citizen Marin, City of San Bernardino, City of Mill Valley, City of Redondo Beach, City of San Rafael, Coalition to Preserve L.A., Cow Hollow Association, Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council, Livable California, Marin Community Association, Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers, Mission Economic Development Company, SF Ocean Edge, Spaulding Square Neighborhood Association Historic Preservation Overlay Zone, Stand Up for San Francisco

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 831	Wieckowski (D)	Accessory dwelling units	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Assembly	June 20
Status: Passed the Senate; Referred to the Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Senate 33-1, with 5 not voting 						
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. Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority, including the imposition of one-size-fits-all, land-use, parking, building and development guidelines. 						
Description SB 831 would allow accessory dwelling units on any lot that is zoned for home construction, require cities to act on applications within 120 days, and restrict cities and other agencies from imposing any fees on the project. It would also exempt any minimum lot requirements for the projects.		Analysis Under SB 831, ADUs cannot be considered a new residential unit for purposes of calculating fees. Eliminating all local fees could result in rate hikes to existing utility customers and force existing residents to subsidize the cost of construction. The cumulative impact of new units on a water or sewer system could create financial strains for some agencies resulting in rate hikes on existing customers who have already paid their fair share to be part of that system. Additionally, restrictions on parking requirements will cause serious spillover effects and may result in parking shortages and resentment about greater housing density in adjacent areas.				
Supporters: Bay Area Council (sponsor); Abundant Housing LA; ADU Builder, Inc.; Basis Studio; Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART); Bridge Housing; Build; California Apartment Association; California Association of Realtors; California Building Industry Association (CBIA); California Chamber of Commerce; California Community Builders; California Renters Legal Advocacy and Education Fund; California YIMBY; Coalition for Supportive Housing; Cover; Crest Backyard Homes; CSH; The Fairmont San Francisco; Half Moon Bay Brewing Co.; Heller Manus Architects; HKS Architects; Inn at Mavericks; LA Más; Los Angeles Business Council (LABC); Mavericks Event Center; McKinsey and Company; North Bay Leadership						

Attachment A

Council; Non-profit Housing Association of Northern California; Pacific Standard; Postmates; Resources for Community Development; ReVisions Resources; Rise Together; San Diego County Apartment Association; San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR); San Francisco Housing Action Coalition; San Mateo County Economic Development Association (SAMCEDA); Shorenstein Properties; SV Angel; Turner Center for Housing Innovation; Tim Lewis Communities; TMG Partners; Wareham Development; Webcor.

Opposition:

City of San Marcos; American Planning Association, California Chapter; Association of California School Administrators (ACSA); Association of California Water Agencies; California Association of Sanitation Agencies; California Association of School Building Officials; California Contract Cities Association; California Municipal Utilities Association; California School Board Association (CSBA); California Special Districts Association; California State Association of Counties; Central Contra Costa Sanitary District; City of Camarillo; City of Coronado; City of Fullerton; City of Glendora; City of Hawthorne; City of Huntington Beach; City of Lakewood; City of Lake Forest; Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH); County of Del Norte; Desert Water Agency; East Orange County Water District; El Dorado Irrigation District; League of California Cities; Leucadia Wastewater District; Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers; Novato Sanitary District; Ojai Valley Sanitary District; Orange County Sanitation District; Rural County Representatives of California; Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County; Union Sanitary District; Urban Counties of California; Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority; West Valley Sanitation District

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 912	Beall (D)	Homelessness programs and affordable housing	Watch	SUPPORT	Assembly	TBA
Status: Passed the Senate 35-0. [\$500 million for homelessness programs was included in the FY19 budget.]						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Senate 35-0. 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"> Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority. Support legislation that works to solve the state and region's problems with homelessness 						
Description This bill would use \$2 billion from the state's general fund surplus for homeless and affordable housing projects statewide. Funds would be directed to cities and counties for construction and preservation of rental housing, and half of the funds would be directed towards housing for vulnerable homeless populations.			Analysis One-quarter of the country's homeless population lives in California. The City of San Marcos, through its former redevelopment agency and its successor agency, has worked hard to help people seeking affordable housing. It has provided financial and technical assistance to build more than 3,400 affordable housing units, including many that have helped the transitionally homeless. The City is also an active participant in the Alliance for Regional Solutions, a collaborative that seeks innovative ideas to address our region's pressing human services and housing needs. This bill provides additional resources and flexibility to cities and counties that are working to provide shelter to those who need it.			

Attachment A

Supporters:

City of San Marcos, Affirmed Housing, American Planning Association, Aspiranet, Association of California Cities – Orange County, Bridge Housing, California Apartment Association, California Housing Consortium, California State Association of Counties, California Welfare Directors Association, City of Berkeley, City of El Cerrito, City of Glendale City of San Jose, Community Home Builders and Associates, Corporation for Supportive Housing, County Behavioral Health Directors Association of California, Housing Authority of the County of Santa Barbara, Life Skills Training and Education Programs, Inc. (LifeSTEPS), Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California, Pacific Companies Paulett Taggart Associates, Inc., Richmond Neighborhood Housing Services Inc., Rural County Representatives of California, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, Santa Clara County, Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, Urban Counties Caucus of California, Western Community Housing, Inc.

Opposition:

None on file.

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 946	Lara (D)	Sidewalk vendors	Watch	OPPOSE	Assembly	
Status: Amended and referred to the Local Government Committee.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Senate 22-10, with 7 not voting. 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: NO 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 946 would keep cities from prohibiting sidewalk vendors from selling food or merchandise from a non-motorized cart in any city park or on any city sidewalk. Cities would be prohibited from restricting the number of sidewalk vendors, limiting vendors to selling in certain areas, or requiring the vendor to obtain consent before he or she can sell food or merchandise.			Analysis This bill is seeking to remedy outdated laws and address the problems facing vendors in some communities. However, the prohibitions on all cities in SB 946 undermine efforts to address livability, health, and safety concerns. Blanket prohibitions that limit local control, like this bill, also keep local officials from addressing community concerns and responding to important neighborhood issues. Local governments are in the best position to decide what is best for their communities, and they alone should choose the most appropriate way to allow or regulate sidewalk vendors.			
Supporters: ACLU California; Bet Tzedek Legal Services; CA Labor Federation; Central American Resource Center; Centro Legal de la Raza; CLUE P♀WER (People Organizing for Women's Economic Rights); Courage Campaign; Dolores Mission; Investing in Place; Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance; LA Forward; LA Walks; LApplus; Legal Aid at Work; Legal Services for Prisoners with Children; Los Angeles Community Action Network; Los Angeles Food Policy Council; Los Angeles Street Vendor Campaign; National Lawyers Guild – Los Angeles Chapter; Opportunity Fund; Pomona Economic Opportunity Center; Public Counsel; Restaurant Opportunities Center of Los Angeles; Self Help Graphics & Art; UCLA Criminal Defense Clinic; UCLA Labor Center; Urban & Environmental Policy Institute, Occidental College; Venice Community Housing; Women Organizing Resources, Knowledge and Services (WORKS).						
Opposition: California State Association of Counties; California Swap Meet Owners Association; Central City Association of Los Angeles; City of Beverly Hills; City of El Cajon; City of Placentia; City of Stanton; Downtown Center Business						

Attachment A

Improvement District; Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; Urban Counties of California; Valley Industry and Commerce Association.

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 1031	Moorlach (R)	Public employees' retirement: COLA prohibition	Watch	SUPPORT	Senate	4/23

Status: Failed to pass committee. It will not move forward this year.

Vote Summary:

- No votes taken yet.

District Voting Record

- Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet
- Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet.

Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform:

- Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority.
- Support proposals that will help the state and cities with their unfunded pension liabilities, ensuring that cities can continue to offer meaningful benefits to employees while still providing the levels of service residents expect.

Description

SB 1031 would temporarily freeze cost of living adjustments when a public retirement plan drops below an 80% funded status. This bill would only apply to employees hired after the bill has been enacted.

Analysis

The City of San Marcos has worked hard to recruit and retain top talent in the face of increasing fiscal challenges. Many California cities have never fully recovered from the economic downturn and continue to operate with very lean staffing levels. Increasing pension costs continue to be one of the top reasons preventing cities from hiring new full-time staff. In San Marcos, CalPERS costs will exceed 33% of an employee's salary next year, and will be over 40% in just a few years. This is a growing crisis in California that will only get worse if it is not addressed very soon.

Temporarily stopping COLAs would help curb additional unfunded pension liabilities that could drive the underlying pension plan into insolvency and result in deeper cuts to employee benefits.

Supporters:

City of Mission Viejo, City of Fullerton

Opposition:

California Association of Professional Scientists, Orange County Employees Association, Retired Public Employees Association, California Alliance for Retired Americans, California Teamsters Public Affairs Council, California Conference Board of the Amalgamated Transit Union, California Conference of Machinists, AFL-CIO IFPTE Local 21

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 1032	Moorlach (R)	Terminated agency pool elimination	Watch	SUPPORT	Senate	4/23

Status: Failed to pass committee. It will not move forward this year.

Attachment A

<p>Vote Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes 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. Support proposals that will help the state and cities with their unfunded pension liabilities, ensuring that cities can continue to offer meaningful benefits to employees while still providing the levels of service residents expect. 	
<p>Description</p> <p>SB 1032 repeals the CalPERS Terminated Agency Pool (TAP) that requires agencies terminating a pension plan to pay a 107% termination fee if they are leaving the pension plan.</p>	<p>Analysis</p> <p>The City of San Marcos has worked hard to recruit and retain top talent in the face of increasing fiscal challenges. Many California cities have never fully recovered from the economic downturn and continue to operate with very lean staffing levels. Increasing pension costs continue to be one of the top reasons preventing cities from hiring new full-time staff. In San Marcos, CalPERS costs will exceed 33% of an employee's salary next year, and will be over 40% in just a few years. This is a growing crisis in California that will only get worse if it is not addressed very soon.</p> <p>Cities defaulting on their obligations and unable to pay the TAP fee have caused pension cuts of over 60% to active retirees. This bill eliminates TAP and allows cities to preserve their funds to invest in alternative pension systems, if desired.</p>
<p>Supporters:</p> <p>City of San Marcos, City of La Habra</p>	
<p>Opposition:</p> <p>California Association of Professional Scientists, Orange County Employees Association, Retired Public Employees Association, California Alliance for Retired Americans, California Teamsters Public Affairs Council, California Conference Board of the Amalgamated Transit Union, California Conference of Machinists, AFL-CIO IFPTE Local 21</p>	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 1033	Moorlach (R)	Public employees' retirement reciprocity	Watch	SUPPORT	Senate	4/23
Status: Referred to the Senate Committee on Public Employment and Retirement						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 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 any legislation that preempts local authority. Support proposals that will help the state and cities with their unfunded pension liabilities, ensuring that cities can continue to offer meaningful benefits to employees while still providing the levels of service residents expect. 						

Attachment A

Description This bill requires agencies contracted with CalPERS to bear full financial responsibility for actions that would increase actuarial liability for a member's pension contributions.	Analysis The City of San Marcos has worked hard to recruit and retain top talent in the face of increasing fiscal challenges. Many California cities have never fully recovered from the economic downturn and continue to operate with very lean staffing levels. Increasing pension costs continue to be one of the top reasons preventing cities from hiring new full-time staff. In San Marcos, CalPERS costs will exceed 33% of an employee's salary next year, and will be over 40% in just a few years. This is a growing crisis in California that will only get worse if it is not addressed very soon. If an employee works at an agency for city for many years but leaves for another jurisdiction with much higher pay for a short period of time, the new jurisdiction would be solely responsible for the individual's pension increase, rather than both agencies sharing in the cost under current law.
Supporters: A comprehensive list of supporters has not been released yet.	
Opposition: A comprehensive list of opponents has not been released yet.	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 1151	Bates (R)	Neighborhood electric vehicles	Watch	SUPPORT	Assembly	
Status: Passed the Senate; Referred to the Assembly Transportation Committee.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Senate 38-0, with 1 not voting 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: YES Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted yet. 						
Description SB 1151 will authorize the County of San Diego or any city in the county to establish a neighborhood electric vehicle plan. Purely permissive for cities and the county, the goal is to allow communities to serve the mobility needs of their communities by using small electric vehicles designed for lower-speed neighborhood use. Due to existing law, use of NEVs is limited to private roads and low speed areas. This bill would give cities and the county the opportunity to consider NEVs in other areas.			Analysis Current law limits NEVs in San Diego County to private roads and low speed areas. This bill would give the County and its cities the opportunity to better utilize and study NEVs in certain areas to better meet the needs of their residents and businesses. The San Diego Association of Governments has identified NEVs in their Regional Transportation Plan as one of several options to providing alternative and emission-free travel. These vehicles could be used in residential neighborhoods, downtown areas, corporate campuses, and other areas. Since there are very few large-scale NEV plans statewide, the reports and plans required by SB 1151 could be a model for California to help it develop better policies for NEVs.			
Supporters: SANDAG (sponsor), Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce, Carlsbad Village Association, Chestnut Properties, Chula						

Attachment A

Vista Chamber of Commerce, City of Carlsbad, City of Chula Vista, City of Oceanside, City of Santee, Cleantech San Diego, Electric Vehicle Association of San Diego, Healthy Chula Vista, Mayor Mark Arapostathis (La Mesa), Meridian Development, RIDA Chula Vista, San Diego Gas and Electric, Supervisor Bill Horn, Supervisor Ron Roberts, The Free Ride

Opposition: None on file

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 1302	Lara (D)	Cannabis: Local Jurisdiction: Prohibitions on Delivery	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate	

Status: Read a second time and ordered to third reading. Currently on the Inactive File and pending further amendments.

Vote Summary:

- No votes have been taken in the full Senate yet

District Voting Record

- Senator Anderson: He has not voted on it yet.
- Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted on it yet.

Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform:

- Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority.

Description

SB 1302 would force local jurisdictions to allow cannabis deliveries within their jurisdictions, even if they have passed ordinances against it. Since SB 1302 would override Proposition 64's provisions allowing cities to place restrictions on cannabis sales, it requires a two-thirds vote for passage.

Analysis

SB 1302 goes against the intent of voters who passed Proposition 64 by removing a local jurisdiction's ability to allow or ban cannabis delivery and decide what is best for their communities. In doing so, this bill removes a critical part of the local enforcement model of cannabis legalization and opens up all communities in California to having cannabis delivered to any home. This concept is contrary to the framework presented to state voters when they approved Proposition 64. In addition to overriding the intent of voters and cities, there are serious health and public safety consequences to this bill. Since cannabis businesses can only use cash for transactions, delivery cars are prime targets for theft or burglary, resulting in increased crime and higher public safety costs for all jurisdictions.

Supporters: WeDrop Cannabis Delivery (sponsor); 420 Central; 420 Stock; A+ Collective; Alchemist; Americans for Safe Access; Americans for Safe Access, Oakland; Americans for Safe Access, San Diego; Americans for Safe Access, San Francisco; Around My Way Delivery; A Therapeutic Alternative; Bay Area Delivery Alliance; Blackbird; Board of Equalization Member Fiona Ma; Brownie Mary Democrats of Sacramento County; California Cannabis Courier Association; California Cannabis Delivery Alliance; California Cannabis Industry Association; California Cannabis Manufacturers Association; California High Society, Seniors Seeking Cannabis; CA Labs; California NORML; California Teamsters Public Affairs Council; Cannagram; CannaWagon; Cannabis Industry Association of Marin County; C.A.R.E.; CBD Power Bars; CMG/Caliva; Cold Creek Organics; Conference of California Bar Associations; Cosmic Courier; Courage Campaign; COVA; Covelo Cannabis Advocacy Group; Delta Roots Collective; Driven; Elite Care California; Far Out Farm, Inc.; Fiddler's Greens; Fire Farms; Fire Pharmaceuticals; Grannie Chris Edibles; Green Rush Consulting; Greenspoon Marder; Hueneme Patient Consumer Co-Op; Ijasun; International Cannabis Farmers Association; JWC Deliveries, Inc.; Kanna, Inc.; Kannibox; Karyn Cooks I Modern Marketing; Kin Slips; Kind Deliveries; Kind Farms; Los Angeles Delivery Alliance; Lucky Box Club; Marin County Courier Association; Marygold Delivery; Meadow; MendoRoyal; North Coast Cannabis Nursery Group; Nevada County Cannabis Alliance; Peace of Mind Health & Wellness; Reverence Vegan Gardens; San Diego Cannabis

Attachment A

Delivery Alliance; SAVA; Sespe Creek Collective; Shale Peak Horticulture; Sierra County Growers Association; SIVA Enterprises; Southern California Coalition; SpeedWeed; Students for Sensible Drug Policy, Golden Gate University School of Law; Sunnabis: Humboldt's Full Sun Farms; Taproot Business Consulting; The Emerald Cup; The Emerald Exchange; The Farmers Flower; The National Alliance of Mental-Illness-California; The Way Home; Thrive Society; Tõdem; Treat Yourself; TryLeaf, Inc.; Vertiza Properties; 220 individuals.

Opposition: California Police Chiefs Association; California State Association of Counties; County of Sacramento; League of California Cities; Long Beach Collectives Association; Rural County Representatives of California; Santa Ana Cannabis Association; UFCW Western States Council; United Cannabis Business Association; Urban Counties of California; Verdant Distribution.

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
SB 1469	Skinner (D)	Land Use: Accessory dwelling units	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate	
Status: Held in the Appropriations Committee under submission.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes have been taken in the full Senate yet 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: He has not voted on it yet. Assembly Member Waldron: Has not voted on it yet. 						
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 makes several changes to existing ADU law. It reverses the framework of existing law by requiring cities to change their ordinances to say where ADUs are prohibited, rather than where they are allowed. The bill also precludes the imposition of all impact fees, including school impact fees, and allows ADUs in non-residential zones. Additionally, the bill precludes restrictions on parcel size and lot coverage, and adds a preponderance of evidence standard that may increase the risk of litigation to cities.			Analysis Under SB 1469, ADUs cannot be considered a new residential unit for purposes of calculating fees. Eliminating all local fees could result in rate hikes to existing utility customers and force existing residents to subsidize the cost of construction. The cumulative impact of new units on a water or sewer system could create financial strains for some agencies resulting in rate hikes on existing customers who have already paid their fair share to be part of that system. Additionally, restrictions on parking requirements will cause serious spillover effects and may result in parking shortages and resentment about greater housing density in adjacent areas.			
Supporters: Bay Area Council; California Association of Realtors; BRIDGE Housing; California Building Industries Association; California Forward Action Fund; Greenbelt Alliance; Non-profit Housing Association of Northern California; SV@Home						
Opposition: American Planning Association, California Chapter; Association of California School Administrators (ACSA); Association of California Water Agencies; California Association of Sanitation Agencies; California Association of School Business Officials; California Association of Suburban Schools; California Contract Cities Association; California Municipal Utilities Association; California School Board Association (CSBA); California Special Districts Association; California State Association of Counties; Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH); League of California Cities; Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools; Rural County Representatives of California; San Diego Unified School District; Small School Districts' Association; Urban Counties of California.						

Attachment A

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 76	Chau (D)	Adult use of marijuana: marketing	SUPPORT	SUPPORT	Senate	7/11/2017
Status: Passed the Assembly; Passed two Senate Committees. Placed on the Appropriations Suspense File and held under submission. This will be a 2 year bill.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 77-0 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: YES (in committee) Assembly Member 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 like marijuana, synthetic marijuana, and spice. 						
Description AB 76 would prohibit websites and other online services, including apps, from marketing marijuana or its products to anyone under the age of 21.			Analysis This simple bill just adds marijuana to the list of products that cannot knowingly be advertised towards minors. That list currently includes tobacco, salvia, fireworks, spray paint and firearms. Since this bill makes changes to Proposition 64, a two-thirds vote of the legislature is required.			
Supporters: San Marcos, League of California Cities, California Police Chief's Association, California Children's Hospital Association, California State PTA						
Opposition: None on file.						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 175	Chau (D)	Adult use of marijuana: marketing	SUPPORT	SUPPORT	Senate	
Status: Passed the Assembly; Placed on the Appropriations Suspense File and held under submission. This will be a 2 year bill.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 61-13 						
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 measures that limit the ability of minors to engage in alcohol consumption and other substances like marijuana, synthetic marijuana, and spice. 						
Description AB 175 would require manufacturers of edible cannabis to submit packaging to the state for review to ensure that the package and labels are not "attractive to children."			Analysis The bill requires manufacturers to go through a standard review process with the goal to keep marijuana out of the hands of minors. This review process will look at not only how the labels look, but also whether they are child resistant.			
Supporters: San Marcos, Union of American Physicians and Dentists; League of California Cities; AFSCME; California Police Chiefs Association; American College of Emergency Physicians; California State PTA						

Attachment A

Opposition: California Cannabis Industry Association

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 190	Steinorth (R)	Development permit design reviews	Oppose	OPPOSE	Cmte on Local Government	TBA
Status: Referred to the Committee on Local Government. Hearing cancelled at the request of the author. This bill did not meet the legislative deadline and died.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No votes have been 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 any legislation that preempts local land use authority.						
Description AB 190 requires local agencies to approve or disapprove the design of a development project within 30 days of the date that the application has been determined to be complete. If a decision is not reached within that 30 day period, the project is deemed to be automatically approved on the 31 st day.			Analysis The time limit imposed by AB 190 is unreasonable and unworkable for nearly every city. If a city is currently lacking staff to conduct design review within 30 days and wants that capability, the city would need to hire additional staff and incur significant new costs.			
Supporters: Housing developers, affordable housing advocates, builders						
Opposition: San Marcos, League of California Cities, individual cities						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 285	Melendez (R)	Drug and alcohol free residences	No position yet	SUPPORT	Assembly	Scheduled for 3/21/17
Status: Passed the Health Committee unanimously. Referred to the Appropriations Committee. This bill did not meet the legislative deadline and died.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No final votes have been taken yet District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: No votes taken yet Assembly Member Waldron: YES (in committee) 						
Description This bill defines a "drug and alcohol free residence" and authorizes such facilities to demonstrate its commitment to providing a			Analysis There are currently no required state standards for sober living facilities, meaning that facilities can open in any neighborhood with poor management and bad operators. This can lead to livability issues in			

Attachment A

supportive recovery environment by applying and becoming certified by an organization approved by the state. Additionally, it would require the courts to only place individuals in certified facilities beginning in 2020.	neighborhoods. By encouraging facilities to become certified, and by requiring the courts to only place people in certified facilities, it will hopefully remove the bad actors from the system. That will help with livability issues in neighborhoods and provide better protection to residents of such facilities.
Supporters: San Marcos, Murrieta, League of CA Cities, CA Police Chiefs Association, others.	
Opposition: None on file.	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 345	Ridley-Thomas (D)	Municipal code violations	Support	SUPPORT No position	Senate	
<p>Status: This bill became a “gut an amend” bill. The entire bill was deleted and a new bill about an entirely different topic (disaster victim assistance voluntary tax contributions) was inserted. It no longer relates to the original bill. It did not pass the legislature last session.</p>						
<p>Vote Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 47-29 						
<p>District Voting Record</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet Assembly Member Waldron: No (on the previous version) 						
<p>Issue areas associated with the City’s Legislative Platform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support legislation that gives cities more local control 						
<p>Description</p> <p>AB 345 increases the fines for the violation of local building and safety codes to keep up with inflation to \$134 for the first violation, \$668 for the second violation, and \$1,336 for each additional violation of the same ordinance within the year. The bill was also recently amended to allow cities to recover such fines through special assessment and abatement liens. This bill now provides for a voluntary check off on California income tax returns for disaster assistance.</p>			<p>Analysis</p> <p>AB 345 is nearly identical to a bill sponsored by the City of San Marcos in 2010 (AB 2317) that was passed by the legislature but vetoed by the Governor due to concerns about due process. In addition to adjusting fines, AB 345 simply allows cities to recover outstanding fines in the same manner that they are allowed to recover administrative costs with nuisance enforcement. The purpose is to collect fines from owners who choose to ignore the imposition of the penalties. Respondents will still be afforded administrative due process, and will additionally have the opportunity for a hardship waiver if the fine is an undue financial burden.</p>			
<p>Supporters: League of California Cities</p>						
<p>Opposition: None on file</p>						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 678	Bocanegra (D)	Housing Affordability Act	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Signed into law	

Status: Signed into law

Attachment A

Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 70-7 Senate: 27-10 District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: NO Assembly Member 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 678 would significantly alter the burden of proof for cities, including charter cities, that deny a housing project or emergency shelter. It increases the burden from "substantial evidence" to "preponderance of evidence." It also broadens the ability to sue local governments and increases the fines on cities for violations to \$10,000 per housing unit, even when a city did not act in bad faith with respect to the project denial.	Analysis The Housing Affordability Act, also known as the Anti-NIMBY Act, further limits the ability of cities to reject housing developments without a thorough analysis of the economic, social, and environmental effects of the action. By changing the substantial evidence standard to preponderance of evidence, the evidence provided has to convince the decision maker that it is "more likely than not" and is sometimes expressed as 50% plus one. This bill makes substantial changes to existing law with new terms and definitions, broadens the ability to sue local governments, and increases fines on cities.
Supporters: California Apartment Association, California Building Industry Association, California Chamber of Commerce, California Council for Affordable Housing	
Opposition: San Marcos, American Planning Association-CA Chapter, California League of Cities, California State Association of Counties, Urban Counties of California, Rural County Representatives of California	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 805	Gonzalez-Fletcher (D)	County of San Diego transportation agencies	Watch	OPPOSE	Signed into law	
Status: Signed into law						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate: 25-13 Assembly: 46-28 District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: NO Assembly Member 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 The bill would make significant changes to the boards of SANDAG, the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the North County Transit District (NCTD) by establishing a weighted vote process for all actions by those boards. It would also create an audit process at			Analysis While AB 805 makes good governance changes through its audit and financing provisions, the bill would significantly decrease the voice of San Marcos on both the SANDAG and NCTD boards by giving the greatest voting power to the largest cities and the county. The changes to SANDAG would shift the agency from one that requires mutual cooperation from all cities to one that concentrates the power in the southern part of the			

Attachment A

SANDAG, and require the agency to include specific provisions on greenhouse gas emissions and disadvantaged communities in its regional comprehensive plan. The bill also authorizes MTS and NCTD to individually impose taxes in their specific regions for transit, with voter authorization. The voting process would be switched to a proportional one based on population, meaning the biggest cities would have the most votes out of the 100 votes allotted. When a weighted vote is requested, a vote of at least 4 jurisdictions representing at least 51 percent of the County is required for passage. A recent amendment would also prohibit any ballot measures that conflict in any way from AB 805.

county. Since those cities may vote their best interests and will not need to seek cooperation from other parts of the county, San Marcos and other North County cities could easily be left out of important transportation and other regional planning decisions. This legislation also takes power away from San Diego County residents by prohibiting them from exercising their democratic right to change the SANDAG governance structure at the ballot box.

Supporters: MTS, Climate Action Campaign, IBEW, Sierra Club, California Nurses Association, Bike San Diego, Amalgamated Transit Union, American Federation of Teachers, CA Bicycle Coalition, CA Labor Federation, UNITE-HERE, AFL-CIO, Center on Policy Initiatives, Escondido Chamber of Citizens, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, San Diego County Building and Construction Trades Council, others.

Opposition: Cities of San Marcos, Del Mar, El Cajon, Escondido, La Mesa, National City, Oceanside, Poway, Solana Beach, and Vista; SANDAG, County of San Diego, Associated Builders and Contractors, Building Industry Association, California Taxpayers Association, City of Ontario, Riverside County Transportation Commission, Southern California Association of Governments, Metrolink, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce.

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 1120	Cooper (D)	Controlled substances: butane	SUPPORT	SUPPORT	Vetoed	
Status: Vetoed by the Governor due to potential costs and because it was “narrowly tailored.”						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate 33-3 Assembly: 76-0 District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: NO Assembly Member 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 like marijuana, synthetic marijuana, and spice. 						
Description AB 1120 would further regulate butane, a key ingredient in the “honey oil” extraction process to produce concentrated marijuana. This bill would prohibit any person from purchasing			Analysis These illegal honey oil marijuana labs, which can cause gas build-up and explosions, have injured or killed adults, children, and first responders. 600 milliliters per month is more than enough for commercial uses, including restaurants. Butane is used because unlike other liquids/gases it is not			

Attachment A

more than 600 milliliters of butane per month.	detectable by sight or smell. This makes it desirable because it doesn't taint the final product and it is undetectable to law enforcement.
Supporters: San Marcos, California Professional Firefighters (sponsor), League of California Cities, California Police Chief's Association, California District Attorneys Association, California Association of Code Enforcement Officers	
Opposition: ACLU, California Retailer's Association, California Specialty Products Association, Lighter Association	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 1250	Jones-Sawyer (D)	Contracts for personal services	Opposition removed	OPPOSE	Senate	TBA
Status: Passed the Assembly and in the committee process in the Senate. Amended to only affect counties, rather than cities. Referred to the Rules Committee. This will be a 2 year bill.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 45-30 						
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 any legislation that preempts local authority. 						
Description AB 1250 requires that before a city county enters into a services contract that it clearly demonstrates that the contract will result in actual cost savings to the city county and that the contract does not cause the displacement of city workers.			Analysis This bill eliminates cities' counties' hiring discretion by limiting their ability to utilize a contract for the sole purpose of cost savings through salaries and benefits. With pensions costs increasing significantly, cities frequently look to outside contractors to fill in the gaps and save taxpayer dollars. The bill also raises privacy concerns by requiring that the new online searchable database of contractors include data of non-city employees. Additionally, AB 1250 creates a series of new and burdensome reporting requirements prior to entering or renewing a contract. It also provides an unfair advantage to union contractors by potentially providing them with an exemption from liability employment law violations.			
Supporters: Unions and other labor groups. It is sponsored by the AFL-CIO and SEIU.						
Opposition: San Marcos, numerous counties, numerous taxpayer organizations, business groups, and social service organizations						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 1350	Friedman (D)	Regional Housing Need Allocation penalty	Oppose	OPPOSE	Cmte on Local Government	TBA
Status: Referred to the Committee on Local Government. Hearing cancelled at the request of the author. This bill did not meet the legislative deadline and died.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes have been taken yet 						
District Voting Record						

Attachment A

<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 AB 1350 would fine a city that has not met at least one-third of its share of the regional housing need for low-income and very low income housing during its current Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA). The fine would be deposited into fund and distributed to compliant cities. It would also prohibit a non-compliant city from collecting fees as a condition of a development project and from requiring the payment of building permit fees.	Analysis This bill penalizes cities for situations that are generally outside the control of those local agencies. Very few cities meet their RHNA levels, even when it has taken steps to encourage development. Since cities do not build the housing themselves, it is up to developers and builders to come and do it. AB 1350 fines cities when those developments do not occur, and gives that money to cities that have done that building. It makes it harder for cities to create development in the future by taking away financial resources and giving it to cities that may not need it.
Supporters: To be announced	
Opposition: League of California Cities, individual cities	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 1585	Bloom (D)	Affordable housing single application	Oppose	OPPOSE	Assembly	April 19
Status: Passed the Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee 4-2. Referred to the Local Government Committee where a hearing was cancelled at the request of the author. This bill did not meet the legislative deadline and died.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No floor votes have been 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 any legislation that preempts local authority. 						
Description AB 1585 establishes in each city and county an affordable housing zoning board and procedures that would review every affordable housing development. The new board would issue a conditional use or other discretionary permit, conduct public hearings, and approve or deny applications. Planning Commissioners and City Council Members would be ex-officio members of the new board, and the current reviews by the Planning Commission and the City Council would be eliminated.			Analysis This bill would take oversight jurisdiction away from Planning Commissions and City Councils by creating a new board in the city. Any affordable housing development would go through that single board for approval, and any further reviews by the Planning Commission or the City Council would be removed.			

Attachment A

Supporters: Affordable housing advocates, developers, builders
Opposition: League of California Cities, individual cities

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 1912	Rodriguez (D)	Joint Powers Agreements: Liability for retirement	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate	TBA
Status: Passed the Assembly 49-27. Pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes taken yet. 						
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 any legislation that preempts local authority. Support proposals that will help the state and cities with their unfunded pension liabilities, ensuring that cities can continue to offer meaningful benefits to employees while still providing the levels of service residents expect. 						
Description This bill requires agencies that are part of a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) to be jointly and severally liable for the retirement obligations of the JPA. CalPERS would be required to bring a civil action against member agencies of a terminated JPA to recover the JPA's retirement obligations.			Analysis This bill means that means that the City of San Marcos would be legally responsible for any unfunded pension liabilities for North County Dispatch or other JPAs it is a member of, and the City would be required to list those liabilities on its books in addition to its own CalPERS liabilities. Increasing pension costs continue to be one of the top reasons preventing cities from hiring new full-time staff. In San Marcos, CalPERS costs will exceed 33% of an employee's salary next year, and will be over 40% in just a few years. Making local agencies responsible for the pension obligations of JPAs would create extreme and unsustainable financial obligations for member agencies.			
Supporters: Association of California State Supervisors, California Association of Professional Scientists, California State Retirees, LIUNA Local 792, Orange County Professional Firefighters Association, IAFF Local 3631, Professional Engineers in California Government, Retired Public Employees Association						
Opposition: City of San Marcos and other cities/counties, California Association of Joint Powers Authority, California Contract Cities Association, California Special Districts Association, California State Association of Counties, League of California Cities, Urban Counties of California						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 1943	Waldron (R)	Manufactured homes	Watch	Support	Senate	TBD
Status: Passed the Assembly 78-0; Pending in a Senate committee.						

Attachment A

Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Assembly unanimously. 	
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly Member Waldron: YES Senator Anderson: No votes taken yet. 	
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is not specific provision relating to this bill in the legislative platform; however, it would directly help low and moderate income residents with housing issues. 	
Description This bill would specify that for the purposes of the Health and Safety Code, "real property" is redefined to include a common interest development, including separate interest in a common interest development.	Analysis In the recent Lilac Fire, 75 manufactured home owners discovered they were unable to rebuild their home or obtain a standardized loan because they did not have a 433A permit recorded with the Department of Housing and Community Development showing their home was permanently affixed to the foundation. Only at that point is it considered "real property" by the state. AB 1943 will help manufactured homeowners in the event they ever need to rebuild or obtain financing after a disaster. This simple change will allow home owners to obtain FHA, VA, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac loans.
Supporters: The Loftin Law Firm, Huntington Beach Home Investments LLC, Capistrano Shore, numerous homeowners and individuals	
Opposition: None known.	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 2214	Rodriguez (D)	Recovery residences	Watch	SUPPORT	Assembly	3/22/18
Status: Held under submission. This bill will not move forward this year.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No votes have been taken in the full Assembly or Senate yet. 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet Assembly Member Waldron: YES (in committee) 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support legislation that strengthens the concept of local control for local decision making on land use and zoning matters. 						
Description This bill authorizes an alcohol and drug abuse recovery treatment facility to demonstrate its commitment to a supportive recovery environment by voluntarily applying for certification from a state-approved organization. The legislation stipulates that starting in 2020, state agencies, county agencies, judges, and parole boards would only be allowed to place individuals in certified			Analysis There are currently no required state standards for sober living facilities, meaning that facilities can open in any neighborhood with poor management and bad operators. This can lead to livability issues in neighborhoods. By encouraging facilities to become certified, and by requiring the courts to only place people in certified facilities, it will hopefully remove the bad actors from the system. That will help with livability issues in neighborhoods and provide better protection to residents of such facilities.			

Attachment A

facilities.	
Supporters: California Behavioral Health Directors Association, California Consortium of Addicted Programs and Professionals, City of Murrieta, Community Recovery Resources, Soroptomist House of Hope, Inc.	
Opposition: Disability Rights California, Western Center on Law and Poverty	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 2631	Allen (R)	Streamlined approval process	Watch	OPPOSE	Assembly	TBA
Status: Hearing cancelled at the request of the author.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No 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 any legislation that preempts local authority.Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority, including the imposition of one-size-fits-all, land-use, parking, building and development guidelines.						
Description <p>This bill would streamline the affordable housing process by requiring cities to approve projects for low and moderate income individuals “by right” if they have 25 units or fewer. The projects would have limited design review and cities would be prohibited from imposing any parking requirements.</p>			Analysis <p>Eliminating local authority for these developments removes opportunities for public engagement about traffic, parking, and other development impacts. For example, the bill’s parking prohibitions will increase community opposition to additional housing. Parking problems are an issue in several San Marcos neighborhoods, and serious spillover effects have caused parking shortages and resentment about affordable housing in adjacent areas. Lack of available parking and increased traffic are the most frequent local arguments against higher density housing. Decisions about development needs should be made by cities after a careful analysis of impacts and public input.</p>			
Supporters: <p>A comprehensive list of supporters has not been released yet.</p>						
Opposition: <p>A comprehensive list of opponents has not been released yet. It is likely to be opposed by many cities.</p>						

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 2890	Ting (D)	Land Use: Accessory dwelling units	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate	

Attachment A

Status: Passed the Senate 53-17, with 8 not voting; Pending in a Senate committee.	
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly: 53-17 	
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: He has not voted on it yet. Assembly Member 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 This bill makes several changes to existing ADU law. It reverses the framework of existing law by requiring cities to change their ordinances to say where ADUs are prohibited, rather than where they are allowed. The bill also precludes the imposition of all impact fees, including school impact fees, and allows ADUs in non-residential zones. Additionally, the bill precludes restrictions on parcel size and lot coverage, and adds a preponderance of evidence standard that may increase the risk of litigation to cities.	Analysis Under AB 2890, ADUs cannot be considered a new residential unit for purposes of calculating fees. Eliminating all local fees could result in rate hikes to existing utility customers and force existing residents to subsidize the cost of construction. The cumulative impact of new units on a water or sewer system could create financial strains for some agencies resulting in rate hikes on existing customers who have already paid their fair share to be part of that system. Additionally, restrictions on parking requirements will cause serious spillover effects and may result in parking shortages and resentment about greater housing density in adjacent areas.
Supporters: Bay Area Council; Bridge Housing; California Association of REALTORS; California Forward Action Fund; Greenbelt Alliance; LeadingAge California; Lilypad Homes; Mas; Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California; North Bay Leadership Council; SPUR; SV@Home; Terner Center for Housing Innovation; The Two Hundred	
Opposition: American Planning Association, California Chapter; California Municipal Utilities Association (unless amended); California Special Districts Association; California State Association of Counties; League of California Cities; Rural County Representatives of California; Urban Counties of California	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 2939	Ting (D)	Accessory dwelling units	Watch	OPPOSE	Assembly	TBA
Status: Referred to two Assembly committees						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 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 any legislation that preempts local authority. Oppose legislation that would limit or restrict local land use decision-making authority, including the imposition of one-size-fits-all, land-use, parking, building and development guidelines. 						
Description AB 2939 requires cities to approve building			Analysis Under current law, cities are not allowed to impose parking standards			

Attachment A

permits “by-right” for accessory dwelling units in a multifamily zone if the multifamily structure has at least five residential units.	for ADUs within one-half mile of a transit stop, and this bill would extend those restrictions to ADUs in those new zones. By requiring ADUs in additional zones, cities like are likely to see growing opposition to ADUs due to issues like parking. Parking problems are an issue in several San Marcos neighborhoods, especially around California State University San Marcos, and serious spillover effects have caused parking shortages and resentment about greater housing density in adjacent areas. Lack of available parking is one of the most frequent arguments against building affordable or other higher density housing.
Supporters: A comprehensive list of supporters has not been released yet.	
Opposition: A comprehensive list of opponents has not been released yet.	

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 3162	Friedman (D)	Alcoholism or drug abuse recovery treatment facilities	Support	SUPPORT	Senate	
Status: Passed the Assembly 31-0. Pending in a Senate committee.						
Vote Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed the Assembly 31-0, with 7 not voting. 						
District Voting Record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet Assembly Member Waldron: Did not vote 						
Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support legislation that strengthens the concept of local control for local decision making on land use and zoning matters. 						
Description This bill requires the state to deny an application for a residential treatment facility if it will result in overconcentration of treatment facilities. It would also prohibit the expansion and intensification of facilities. Additionally, it would make facility licenses conditional for one year and revocable for good cause.			Analysis Like many other cities in California, San Marcos has seen several alcohol and drug treatment facilities open in our residential neighborhoods, with no concern for neighborhood character and unknown health and safety standards for the facilities' residents. AB 3162 makes important changes to the law by recognizing overconcentration in specific neighborhoods. While state law imposes noticing and 300-foot distancing requirements for every existing group home in California, it fails to do so for alcohol and drug recovery facilities. AB 3162 simply extends this consistency to all licensed group homes. It also protects patients by establishing a one-year provisional license to allow the state to determine compliance with regulations.			
Supporters: City of San Marcos, City of Vista, City of Oceanside, City of La Mesa, League of California Cities, Association of						

Attachment A

California Cities – Orange County, Advocates for Responsible Treatment, California Contract Cities Association, City of Agoura Hills, City of Calabasas, City of Costa Mesa, City of Diamond Bar, City of Dana Point, City of Garden Grove, City of Laguna Beach, City of Malibu, City of Moorpark, City of Palos Verdes Estates, City of Sunnyvale, City of Thousand Oaks

Opposition:

California Access Coalition, Depression and Bipolar Support Alliance

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 3178	Rubio (D)	Integrated waste management plans	Support if amended	Support	Senate	

Status: Passed the Assembly 70-0; Pending in a Senate committee.

Vote Summary:

- Assembly: 70-0, with 8 not voting

District Voting Record

- Senator Anderson: Has not voted yet.
- Assembly Member Waldron: Did not vote

Description

AB 3178 would require CalRecycle to consider the loss of recycling markets in determining whether to issue a costly compliance order against a jurisdiction, since cities and counties are required to reduce their waste diversion by 50%. This bill simply allows CalRecycle to consider the impact of recycling markets, and any unexpected increase in landfilling or storage for a temporary time, if it is beyond the control of a jurisdiction that cannot sell its recyclables.

Analysis

Due to China's new "National Sword Policy" that is imposing strict contamination limits on imported recycling, much smaller amounts of California's recyclables (including recyclables from San Marcos) are being accepted by China since before the policy was enacted.

Supporters: California Refuse Recycling Council (sponsor), Burrtec Waste Industries, California State Association of Counties, Cal-Waste Recovery Systems, and many other waste haulers and cities.

Opposition: California Coastkeeper Alliance, California League of Conservation Voters, Californians Against Waste, Center for Oceanic Awareness, Research, and Education, Clean Water Action, Heal the Bay
Natural Resources Defense Council, Plastic Pollution Coalition, Seventh Generation Advisors, Surfrider Foundation
UPSTREAM Policy, WILDCOAST, Wishtoyo Chumash Foundation

Bill Number	Author(s)	Bill Title	LOCC Position	Recommended San Marcos Position	Bill Location	Hearing Date
AB 3194	Daly (D)	Housing Accountability Act: project approval	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	Senate	

Status: Passed the Assembly 70-4; with 4 not voting. Pending in the Senate

Vote Summary:

- Assembly: 70-4 with 4 not voting

District Voting Record

Attachment A

- Senator Anderson: He has not voted on it yet.
- **Assembly Member Waldron: NO**

Issue areas associated with the City's Legislative Platform:

- Oppose any legislation that preempts local authority.

Description

This bill prohibits local agencies from disapproving a project or requiring a rezoning of the project site if the existing zoning ordinance does not allow the maximum residential use and density by the General Plan. It also states the intent of the Legislature to establish a high threshold for cities to justify denying or conditioning a project for health and safety reasons, like a lack of infrastructure, increasing traffic, or a shortage of parks in a neighborhood.

Analysis

A coalition of opponents, including the League of California Cities, believe this change will take away the purpose of General Plans being "general," and may result in high-density sprawl into areas, or induce local agencies to remove flexibility from General Plans entirely. Decisions about development should be made by cities after a careful analysis of needs and public input. Blanket standards that limit local control, like this bill, keep local officials from addressing community concerns and responding to important neighborhood issues.

Supporters: California Building Industry Association [SPONSOR]; Bay Area Council; California Apartment Association; California Association of Winegrape Growers; California Business Properties Association; California Chamber of Commerce; California Construction and Industrial Materials Association; National Federation of Independent Business; Non-profit Housing Association of Northern California

Opposition: American Planning Association, California Chapter; California State Association of Counties; League of California Cities; Rural County Representatives of California; Urban Counties of California