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# State Legislation Committee

The State Legislation Committee is directed by the San Francisco Administrative Code (Article III, Sections 5.5 - 5.11) to make recommendations for endorsement, opposition, or neutrality with respect to legislation pending before the State Legislature that would affect the City and County.

2017 State Legislation Committee Membership:

Mayor’s Office (Chair) – Nicole Elliott (Kathryn Angotti)  
Supervisor Breed – Michael Howerton   
Supervisor Farrell – Jess Montejano  
City Attorney’s Office – MaryJane Winslow  
Treasurer’s Office – Amanda Fried  
Assessor’s Office – Edward McCaffrey  
Controller’s Office – Michelle Allersma (James Whitaker)

# City Attorney

1. **Litigation.** Monitor legislation that impacts litigation where the City and County is involved. Support or oppose as necessary.
   1. **Liability:** Monitor legislation that would affect the liability of the City.
   2. **Expert Witness Fees:** Monitor legislation related to the recovery of expert witness fees.
   3. **Unfair Competition and Business Practice:** Protect San Francisco's statutory authority under Section 17200. Support bills that strengthen provisions of section 17200 et seq.
   4. **Attorney's Fees:** Monitor legislation that affects the recovery of attorney's fees and costs. Support provisions that allow public entities that prosecute unfair competition lawsuits to recover costs of prosecution, including attorney's fees.
   5. **Medical Recovery Fees:** Monitor legislation related to parties to litigation recovering more than out of pocket costs for medical expenses.
2. **Bail Reform.** Monitor legislation that impacts the California bail system. Support or oppose legislation as necessary to eliminate a two-tiered system that forces less affluent defendants to remain in jail while defendants able to pay a set amount can buy their freedom, regardless of the safety or flight risk they pose.
3. **Code Enforcement.** Monitor legislation that impacts code enforcement and nuisance abatement actions. Support or oppose as necessary changes to the Housing Code, Health and Welfare Code, and Business and Professions Code, Sec. 17200, relating to the enforcement of safe housing and nuisance abatement laws.
4. **Land Use.** Monitor amendments to CEQA. Oppose or support as necessary. Monitor amendments that would establish time limits on the certification of an EIR and amendments that would require recertification of the environmental impact report before the public agency takes action on the project.
5. **Public Contracts.** Monitor legislation relating to public works projects. Oppose or support as necessary.
   1. **Burden of Proof:** Monitor amendments to the Public Contracts Code that would place the burden of proof on a public entity under Section 1104.
   2. **Strict Liability:** Monitor provisions that would create strict liability for the public entity for any error or omission in the plans and specifications for a public work.

# Department of Emergency Management

1. **Maximize the Use of California Disaster Assistance Act (CDAA) Funding for Locally-Declared Disasters.** Support legislation forCDAA, which authorizes the Director of the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) to administer a disaster assistance program that provides financial assistance from the state for costs incurred by local governments as a result of a disaster event.
2. **Oil Spill Response.** Support legislation and regulations that increase local capacity to respond to oil spills, both in the water and on land.
3. **Earthquake Early Warning.** Support legislation and regulations that implement and expand the Earthquake Early Warning system in California.
4. **911 Caller Location.** Support legislation and regulations that improve the delivery of location information from wireless 911 callers to Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs). In San Francisco, it is important that caller location information also include vertical location, given the number of tall residential and commercial buildings.
5. **Transparency of State Projects Funded by Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Grant Funds.** Support legislation that promotes transparency of the State’s allocation of retention funds; specifically, what projects the State intends to fund with the UASI retention funds and to which local jurisdictions will directly benefit.

# Department of Human Resources

1. **Employee Relations.** Monitor and take positions as necessary onbills that could erode the rulemaking authority granted to local agencies under the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act. As required by the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, San Francisco meets and confers in good faith with recognized employee organizations regarding wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment as required by state and local law.
2. **Workers’ Compensation.**
   1. **Monitor and take positions as necessary on bills that erode the balance between permanent disability benefits and employer cost controls:** SB 863 (De Leon, 2012) made wide-ranging changes to California’s workers’ compensation system, including increased benefits to injured workers and cost-saving measures. Both the minimum and maximum weekly permanent disability benefit amounts were increased and the way permanent disability ratings are calculated was changed. Additionally, the bill established a $120 million per year “Return-to-Work Fund,” to be administered by the Department of Industrial Relations. Payments from the fund are available to injured workers whose permanent disability ratings are disproportionately low in comparison to their wage loss.

Cost-saving measures, such as limitations on liens, fee schedules, independent bill review, and independent medical review were enacted as part of the bill to offset the increased cost to employers of improved permanent disability benefits.

* 1. **Monitor and take positions as necessary on bills that could take medical decision-making out of the hands of doctors:** As noted in section 2.A, above, independent medical review of disputed treatment requests was enacted under SB 863. This process takes the majority of disputes related to medical treatment out of the costly and time-consuming judicial process in workers’ compensation courts and resolves them through an administrative process in which an independent doctor makes the decision about whether a proposed treatment is medically necessary.
  2. **Monitor and take positions as necessary on bills that expand presumptions beyond the narrow group of peace officers to which they are currently provided, or expands the list of presumptions:** In the case of a narrow group of peace officers employed by public agencies in public safety positions, existing workers compensation law provides a presumption that the term “injury” includes heart trouble, hernia, pneumonia, meningitis, lower back impairment, cancer and other injuries and illnesses, and that those injuries or illnesses are caused by work for the purposes of providing treatment and disability payments. In workers’ compensation, diverging from the usual legal standard of actual causation by a preponderance of evidence should only be done if there are exceptionally strong policy reasons to grant a presumption of industrial causation. Unless an exceptionally strong policy reason to grant expansion of presumptions beyond the current narrow group of peace officers, or to include more injuries or illnesses in the list of presumptions is presented, workers’ compensation benefits should be determined based on factually proven industrial causation.
  3. **Seek ways to ensure the disability rating system is equitable:** Employees are compensated for injuries or illnesses causing permanent impairment. The level of impairment is evaluated by a medical doctor using the American Medical Association (AMA) Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, Fifth Edition. It is believed that using the AMA guides provides objective standards for evaluating disability, and the City supports use of this standard. In October Governor Brown vetoed AB 305 (Gonzales), and in his veto message stated: “The workers’ compensation system must be free of gender-bias. No group should receive less in benefits because of an immutable characteristic. However, this bill is based on a misunderstanding of the American Medical Association’s evidence-based standard, which is the foundation of the permanent disability ratings, and replaces it with an ill-defined and unscientific standard.”Rather than inserting language into the disability rating system that erodes objectivity, the City should work with stakeholders to find other avenues to address potential inequities.

1. **Employee Benefits Rights**. Monitor and take positions as necessary onbills that mandate specific benefits, such as 2015’s Kin Care law (SB 579) which provided time off to care for family members. Another bill, which did not pass, would have provided for double pay on holidays (AB 67). Generally, the City is exempted from the provisions of bills mandating benefits such as leave and overtime pay because the City is a unionized employer. However, in the case of sick leave, the provisions are not contained in union contracts, but in the Civil Service Commission rules. Because of this nuance and the way the bills were written, the City is now subject to the provisions of a number of bills that have created additional layers of benefit provision rules, which are sometimes in conflict with civil service rules or labor agreements.

# Department of Public Health

**Health Reform Implementation**

SFDPH continues to support all efforts for full-scale enrollment in Affordable Care Act (ACA) coverage, including measures that seek to reduce churn among Medi-Cal and Covered California enrollees or enhance local efforts to offer premium support; and measures that strengthen the safety net and ensure that counties have sufficient funding streams to cover uncompensated care for the residually uninsured. Monitor and take positions as needed on the State’s proposals in response to federal ACA changes, including coverage expansions and the individual mandate, Covered California eligibility and financing, and Medi-Cal eligibility and financing.

1. **Medi-Cal**
   1. **Eligibility:**SFDPH is committed to increasing access to health care for all San Franciscans. Support proposals that protect the coverage gains realized through the ACA’s Medi-Cal expansion. Support legislative and budget proposals that support enrollment and remove barriers to access for incarcerated individuals into Medi-Cal, prohibit automatic suspension of Medi-Cal for incarcerated individuals, extend Medi-Cal eligibility to pre-adjudicated adolescents, and extend Medi-Cal to otherwise eligible undocumented individuals. Oppose legislative or budget proposals that would attempt to limit health care services for undocumented residents or newly qualified immigrants.
   2. **Services**:Support policies and proposals that efficiently address the health needs for populations with complex, chronic conditions in the least restrictive settings and using case management approaches, including increased access to and funding for comprehensive home and community based services. Support proposals that enable individuals to easily determine eligibility for and enroll in other social services (such as WIC) once qualified for Medi-Cal. Support increased funding for special services for refugees such as patient navigators and translators to increase access to healthcare.
   3. **1115 Waiver**:Monitor and take positions as needed on waiver implementation legislation and state budget proposals to ensure adequate funding for public hospitals and health systems; protect the use of county funds as non-federal share for public providers; and ensure that counties can fully participate in the Whole Person Care pilots. Monitor changes to the Public Hospital Redesign and Incentives in Medi-Cal (PRIME) Pool and Global Payment Program (GPP). Monitor and take positions as needed on legislative and budget proposals seeking to adjust the 1115 waiver in response to federal changes to the Medicaid program.
   4. **Provider rates**:Oppose further reductions to Medi-Cal provider rates and advocate to raise rates where feasible; support efforts that supplement county Medi-Cal expenditures through increased federal financial participation; and support expansion of state pilot programs testing capitated payment mechanisms for federally qualified health centers (FQHCs).
   5. **Value-Based Payment Models:** Increasingly, health care services funding streams are tied to performance measures. Monitor changes in value-based and other alternative payment models and support proposals that advocate for locally-based socio-economic adjustments to payment models to ensure adequate funding for public hospitals and health systems that serve high-risk populations.
2. **Homelessness and Supportive Housing**
   1. Support the city’s legislative strategies for homeless and supportive housing through legislative and budget proposals that enhance local entities’ ability to provide housing and integrated services for homeless and at-risk populations that include increased access to behavioral and chronic healthcare services.
3. **Mental Health and Substance Use**
   1. **Mental Health Services Act (MHSA, Prop 63):**Support adjustment of the allocation formula for local homeless populations, and advocate for additional MHSA funds for capital expenditures, housing supports, creation of permanent funding streams for crisis services currently funded by MHSA grants, and efforts that extend the availability of alcohol and drug treatment services to adolescents. Monitor and take positions as needed on implementation of the 2016 No Place like Home Initiative, in support of San Francisco receiving at least 6% of the repurposed Prop 63 funds for housing and outreach support to assist with homelessness and mental health.
   2. **Drug-Medi-Cal**:AB 848 (2015) enhances the provision of services to residential facility clients by authorizing Medi-Cal licensing of alcohol and drug abuse residential care facilities where medical professionals provide incidental medical services to residents of the facility. Monitor and take appropriate positions on the development of AB 848 implementing regulations. Monitor proposed changes to or funding for the nascent Drug Medi-Cal Organized Delivery System, which was approved in the State’s 1115 Medi-Cal waiver.
   3. **Opioid Abuse Prevention and Treatment*:*** Limited resources are available to address the growing epidemic of opioid abuse and resulting deaths. Support proposals that fund opioid surveillance, expand emergency treatment resources, and increase capacity to provide long-term prevention and treatment services. Support legislation that would enable qualified members of a patient’s medical care team (in addition to primary care physicians) to access the CURES database to monitor drug prescriptions.
4. **Restorative Justice and Improved Jail Health**

Support efforts to limit incarceration when rehabilitation or other means are available and advocate for innovative healthcare models for behavioral health for the incarcerated. Monitor and take positions as appropriate on the development of Proposition 47 allocation formulas that reduce recidivism through mental health services, substance use services, housing assistance, and oppose efforts to change the intent of Proposition 47. Support proposals that provide funding for re-entry and transition programs that serve formerly incarcerated individuals.

1. **Public Health**
   1. **Population Health & Prevention**
      1. Support proposals to increase funding for fully integrated core public health activities, including epidemiology, disease surveillance, communicable disease control and prevention, immunizations, public health laboratory services, environmental health, occupational health, tobacco control, healthy eating and active living, chronic disease prevention and management, violence and injury prevention, health industry workforce development, and prevention of health care associated infections.
      2. Support legislation that would fund infrastructure enhancements for public health programs, or create dedicated funding streams for preventive services and activities that improve community health outcomes and reduce health disparities. Support efforts to issue health warning labels on sugar-sweetened beverages.
   2. **Communicable Disease Prevention & Control**:Support legislation to increase funding and policies that fully integrate and address communicable disease control and prevention, including efforts to reduce HIV and other sexually transmitted infections, viral hepatitis, tuberculosis, influenza, and food- borne diseases. Support efforts to reduce barriers to rapid testing for STDs and communicable diseases at the point of care, increase access to treatment, medication and immunization.
   3. **Tobacco control**:Support efforts to increase tobacco taxes at the state and local levels and monitor legislative proposals to ensure that state tobacco laws are consistent with often-times more stringent local laws.
   4. **Emergency Response and Disaster Preparedness**:Support efforts to adequately fund Emergency Medical Services (EMS) response systems and EMS disaster preparedness initiatives; specifically, continued maintenance of the Field Hospitals, the CHEMPACK chemical incident medication caches, and state disaster response capabilities, including the volunteer medical personnel credentialing system and state branches of the CA Disaster Medical Assistance Teams.
   5. **Public Health Preparedness**: Support efforts to adequately fund public health preparedness, including increased funding on preparing and responding to emerging infectious diseases, increased funding on preparing health care systems for disasters and stabilized funding for public health planning and response. Develop a mechanism to quickly provide resources/funding for emerging threats.
   6. **Cannabis**:Monitor and take positions as appropriate on legislative and regulatory efforts related to medical and adult use cannabis with an emphasis on supporting safe access and minimizing youth exposure. Support funding for public health surveillance, research and monitor changes in drug use patterns associated with cannabis use.
   7. **Vision Zero:** In San Francisco, speeding is the leading collision factor in fatal and severe injury collisions. There are 139 communities in the United States with automated speed enforcement programs. Support efforts to change California state law to allow automated speed enforcement to help achieve the City’s Vision Zero goal. Support legislation that expands opportunities to develop safe, high-quality environments for biking and walking.
   8. **Food Security*:*** Support legislative and budget proposals to enhance local entities’ ability to provide healthy food for vulnerable residents.
2. **Climate Change and Justice.** Support efforts to mitigate and adapt to climate change and support climate justice, including efforts to increase ability for vulnerable communities to respond to climate change and other natural disasters.
3. **Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health**
   1. Support legislation that maintains or improves counties’ ability to address the health and prevention needs of women, children, adolescents, and families, including legislation aimed at addressing childhood obesity, expanding health education for youth, and supporting sexual and reproductive health of women and adolescents.
   2. Monitor policy and programmatic changes proposed for the California Children’s Services program, and support proposals that maintain flexibility for counties to administer the benefit according to local needs.
   3. Monitor policy and programmatic changes proposed for the Child Health and Disability Prevention Program.
   4. Support legislation that decreases health disparities among children in foster care, including ensuring coordinated health care services for children in out-of-home foster care or on probation in the juvenile justice system, particularly by adequately funding the Health Care Program for Children in Foster Care.
   5. Support legislation that would expand paid parental leave policies at all business throughout the state in order to enable working families to care for their children and maintain a healthy and productive life.
4. **Hospitals and County Health Funding**

Oppose efforts to reduce funding to public hospitals, and monitor and adopt positions as appropriate on issues impacting hospital operations, including legislation related to staffing ratios, charity care, workers’ compensation, disease reporting, or reporting of quality or performance indicators. Monitor and adopt positions as appropriate on legislation that modifies the current Realignment funding system. Support additional resources for alternative care programs, such as child and adolescent psychiatric hospitals and crisis residential, hospital diversion, and partial hospitalization programs, in order to reduce the burden on public hospitals.

1. **Long-Term Care**

Support legislation that expands access to community-based services as an alternative to inpatient care. Support increased funding for public health nursing home visitation programs and pilot programs to develop residential care facilities as an alternative to psychiatric hospital and long-term care as well as to help reduce readmission rates.

1. **Palliative Care**

Support efforts that increase awareness of, provide funding for, and promote access to palliative care in all settings: acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, private residences, and other long-term care facilities and clinics. Monitor and take appropriate positions on the development of palliative care standards for Medi-Cal managed care plans. Monitor implementation of the End of Life Option Act.

1. **Workforce Development**

Support proposals that expand the utilization of nurse practitioners and other qualified medical professionals to the fullest extent of their training, and initiatives that increase the supply and diversity of primary care and mental health providers, including psychiatrists to address primary care and behavioral health provider shortages. Support efforts that evaluate the allocation of different types of health professionals in the workforce to assure access to high quality health care.

1. **Health Information and Technology**
   1. Inability to share patient information across programs and services can be a barrier to providing high-quality whole person care. Patients and providers must also be assured of data confidentiality. Support proposals that foster improved methods of sharing health care data to enhance service provision while maintaining a balance with reasonable levels of patient privacy protection.
   2. Telecare can provide access to care for high-risk and vulnerable individuals who cannot access traditional services. Support clear policies for the integration of telecare into service provision, as well as new payment and service models that allow telecare expansion.

# Department of Technology

1. **Wireless Facility Siting.** DT anticipates that the wireless industry will seek, legislation seeking to expedite the deployment of wireless facilities in the public right of way referred to as “small cells”. While the City encourages the deployment of these technologies that will improve service to residents, the City should seek a balance that protects our ability to manage the public right of way, and receive appropriate compensation for use of City assets such as street light poles. In 2016 the legislature considered legislation (AB 2788) that would have eviscerated the City’s control over the public right of way, impede land use regulation and nullified agreements with carriers to use City assets.
2. **Protect Municipal Options for Investment in Broadband.** The City is currently considering options, including public private partnerships. The City should seek to maximize the options for municipal participation in promoting broadband infrastructure. The State can protect existing opportunities by resisting the types of constraints placed on local governments in other states and by removing barriers to new investment options to promote investment in broadband, resulting in enhanced innovation and choice for consumers. For example, Community Service Districts (Government Code § 61100(af)) currently inhibits creative public private partnerships.
3. **Digital Inclusion.** Support additional grant funding for digital inclusion programs for target underserved populations, including seniors, non-English speakers and low income households.
4. **Open Universal Service Support Mechanisms to Non-Traditional Providers.** Existing support mechanisms for broadband create barriers for non-traditional providers, such as wireless internet service providers (WISPs) and municipalities. By removing restrictions on participation in the California Teleconnect Fund and the California Advanced Services Fund, California could expand broadband coverage and increase choices for consumers.
5. **Modernize 911.** The FCC has developed new regulations to modernize 911 by enabling text-to-911 service, and improving location of 911 callers using mobile phones. California needs to support its Public Service Answering Points (PSAPs) so that they can take advantage of the new Federal standards and California residents have access to robust and reliable emergency services.
6. **Facilitate FirstNet Deployment.** Encourage State FirstNet – public safety wireless broadband intiative – to work with Caltrans and other state agencies/districts to place public safety radio systems in areas those agencies would not normally allow commercial carriers (e.g. antennas attached to highway overpasses or BART bridges).
7. **Protect Local Authority to Manage the Public Right of Way, Land Use and Zoning.** Communications providers periodically seek relief from local right-of-way, land use and zoning restrictions through State legislation in the name of speeding deployment of communications infrastructure. The Department of Technology will work to ensure that preemptive state action does not harm City authority and diminish quality of life. Communications infrastructure deployment and responsible management of the ROW and land use planning can and should coexist.

# Department of the Environment

1. **Green Building/Energy.**
   1. **Public Goods Charge:** Support policies that allow regulatory agencies to assign administration of all or part of the Public Goods Charge funds to the California Energy Commission, local governments (including community choice aggregators and Regional Energy Networks), or independent administrators to cover costs for local energy efficiency ordinances. Allow funds to be used for customer switching use of natural gas appliances to other non-fossil technologies.
   2. **Building & Appliances:** Support policies that provide expansion of Energy Star rated appliances, encourage adaptive reuse of existing structures, provide financial incentives for green building, energy efficiency and renewable energy projects in private sector development, and promote green building practices that reduce toxics and indoor air contaminants.
   3. **Energy Rebates.** Oppose legislation that decreases the rebate provided to energy efficiency projects and pre-empts local government.
2. **Clean Air/Climate Change.**
   1. **Local Government Funding:** Promote policies that provide funding for local governments to enact programs and policies that measurably reduce local and global carbon emissions including switching from fossil fuel technologies.
   2. **Carbon Accounting:** Support policies that create a carbon accounting standard and designate a tracking mechanism and an entity to regulate and manage carbon accounting at the statewide level.
   3. **Distributed Energy Resources:** Support policies that increase and integrate distributed renewable generation, energy storage, demand reduction, demand response, energy efficiency, and electric vehicles at both the customer and distribution levels to also promote grid stability, local resiliency and create local jobs and avoid unnecessary transmission investments; and monitor policies that reduce net metering or implement charges that would deter on-site renewable energy generation or private sector and customer investment in renewables and efficiency.
   4. **Transportation:** Support growth in the use of electric transportation, low carbon fuels and transit, biking and other alternatives to single-occupancy autos; and designate revenues generated from greenhouse gas-related fees or taxes to local or municipal government entities.
3. **Zero Waste.**
   1. **Zero Waste:** Support policies promoting zero waste, and highest and best use of resources. This means advocating for source reduction, reuse, and recycling/composting (in that order), and buying products made with recycled materials. Key actions we would support include setting lower disposal (or conversely higher diversion, recycling and composting) goals, improving disposal information and measurement systems, and increasing producer and consumer responsibility. Mechanisms we would support include deposits, charges, fees, rebates, opt-ins, opt-outs, and problem product and disposal bans. We would also support policies that improve product labeling, with enhanced third party verification and state enforcement, for compostability, recyclability and recycled content. In addition, policies should reduce bureaucracy, and defray city and county costs. We would monitor and engage as necessary to prevent efforts to pre-empt local government action or encourage landfill and high-temperature resource destruction, such as giving diversion or carbon credits to any aspect of these technologies.
4. **Toxics.**
   1. **Data Collection:** Support policies that promote collection of data on the health and environmental impacts of chemicals from manufacturers and strengthen biomonitoring to prioritize toxic chemicals for policy or outreach action.
   2. **Regulate & Reduce Harmful Exposure:** In addition, legislation that uses available data to create policies that reduce toxic exposure to the public (especially of sensitive constituencies like pregnant women and children), prioritize the most toxic chemicals and restrict their use, and require labeling/disclosure requirements of products with toxic chemicals or mandate use of safer alternatives.
   3. **Safe Disposal:** Support policies that require producers to manage products containing toxic chemicals at the end of their useful life, to reduce government burden of management.
5. **Environmental Justice.**
   1. **Food Access:** Support policies that increase the ability of low-income communities to access locally grown, fresh, and organic produce.
   2. **Cap-and-Trade:** Allow Cap-and-Trade allowances towards community funds or municipalities for the express purpose of mitigating negative environmental impacts (including but not limited to health and education) on low income communities. Support implementation of SB 535 such that 25 percent of Cap-and-Trade funds should be used to benefit disadvantaged communities and 10 percent of funds should spent in geographically defined disadvantages communities defined more broadly than the current definition (the one that limits SF to only 2 census tracts).
   3. **Climate Change:** Support policies that provide financial and technical assistance to low-income residents and communities of color to prevent and reduce disproportionate impacts of climate change.
6. **Urban Forestry & Gardens.** Support policies that create property tax incentives that make it easier for community and commercial urban farms to access land and turn vacant and blighted urban lots into publically accessible green space and urban gardens. In addition, we would support policies that create defined and ongoing funding streams to manage urban forests and include urban forest management in bond funding more broadly across the state.

# Department on the Status of Women

1. **Enact Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) at State Level.** CEDAW was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1979. The treaty, often referred to as an international “Bill of Rights” for women, condemns all forms of discrimination against women and calls for specific government actions to ensure equality in the civil, political, economic, social and cultural arenas. In 1998, San Francisco became the first city in the world to enact a local ordinance that adopts the core elements of CEDAW and has used the law as a framework to implement policies and practices that address the needs of women and girls in the city. For example, the City took steps toward incorporating gender responsive budgeting into its budget guidelines, conducted gender analyses of city departments and implemented strategies for eliminating discrimination, and formed a task force that worked on improving intra-agency approaches to reducing domestic violence resulting in a record of 44 months without a single domestic violence homicide.

Although existing state and federal law prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex and gender in housing, education, benefits, and employment, CEDAW legislation would require the state to evaluate agencies and departments to ensure equity in the allocation of funding and delivery of services. A version of this legislation passed the Senate and Assembly in 2004, but was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger. While there is currently an effort to enact CEDAW at the local level, which has resulted in Berkeley, Los Angeles, Santa Monica, and Daly City passing CEDAW measures; a state bill is need to ensure women and girls in every corner of the state receive equal treatment.

1. **No Traffick Ahead to Address Human Trafficking Across the State.** Fourteen localities in the Bay Area have already enacted “No Traffick Ahead” resolutions, which leverage the purchasing power of government to address human trafficking. The federal government, thorough the Federal Acquisition Regulation, also prohibits trafficking in supply chains of federal contractors for supplies or services, and requires contractors to adopt trafficking compliance plans. California’s Transparency in Supply Chains law requires companies with over $100 million in global sales of goods to disclose their efforts to address trafficking, but does not address the state’s own purchasing rules.
2. We will support legislative efforts at the state level requiring that any contractors which the state engages for over a certain amount or with certain industries with high risks of trafficking in their supply chains (hotels, restaurants, construction, janitorial) be required to (1) train their staff on signs of human trafficking; and (2) conduct risk analysis for human trafficking with their suppliers.
3. **Job Protection for Parents of New Children.** Parents of children newly born, adopted, or placed for foster care are able to take off unpaid job protected leave to bond with a new child under California Family Rights Act only if they work for an employer with 50 or more employees within 75 miles. San Francisco’s Paid Parental Leave Ordinance will provide six weeks of fully paid leave to parents of new children working in San Francisco for employers with 20 or more employees. However those working for employers between the 20-49 employee threshold are not guaranteed job protection during this leave. Under recent proposals, approximately 2.7 million workers (16 percent) in California would be able to take up to six weeks of unpaid leave from their job without having to worry their job will not be there when they return. A state expansion of job-protected leave for new parents who work for smaller employers would align with the San Francisco Paid Parental Leave Ordinance to support new parents and their ability to take time to bond with their new child.

**End Gender Pricing Discrimination.** California currently prohibits businesses from gender-based pricing for services like haircuts and dry cleaning through the 1995 Gender Tax Repeal Act, legislation sponsored by then-state Sen. Jackie Speier. A recent study by the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs found that out of 800 goods with clear male and female versions from more than 90 brands studied, goods marketed toward women cost more 42 percent of the time while costing men more just 18 percent of the time. Gender-based discriminatory pricing compounds the gender wage gap to further economic inequality for women. We would support a bill to extend that law to retailers so that toys, personal care products, and clothing would be priced based on materials and labor, not the gender of the person to whom the good is marketed.

# Health Service Systems

The mission of the Health Service System of the City and County of San Francisco is to provide affordable quality benefits to the employees, retirees and dependents of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District, the City College of San Francisco and the Municipal Courts. If SFHSS is to provide sustainable, employer-sponsored health benefits for its member employees, retirees and their families over the long term and not increase the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) liability of its covered public employers, then vigilant attention to cost, price and quality transparency is essential.

Achieving this mission requires paying attention to many aspects of the health care system, including promoting transparency to maintain a competitive healthcare marketplace. This goal has become essential particularly in the San Francisco Bay Area, where there are only a few choices of medical groups, hospitals and health systems available, which limits competition. Fulfilling the mission requires attention to avoid the 40 percent federal excise tax (the “Cadillac Tax”), scheduled for 2020 on total premiums which exceed specific benchmarks. This requirement is likely to be eliminated under President Trump. SFHSS supports this elimination. It also requires opposing potential state taxes on commercial health insurance vendors, which are passed on to employers, raising premium costs.

SFHSS convened national experts to identify what kind of meaningful transparency can be implemented at the local level. Unfortunately, vendors unwilling to provide data are a barrier to transparency at all levels. Any state of federal legislation that insists on transparence in cost and quality must be supported.

Transparency and competition alone will not bend the cost curve. SFHSS believes creating and incentivizing smart upstream changes are essential to improving the well-being of our employees, retirees, and their families. Examples of this include: promoting healthy food choices; encouraging behavior to prevent and manage chronic diseases; promoting safe, walkable localities; and, encouraging the design and maintenance of healthy buildings and work environments.

1) Monitor and take a position as necessary on any state taxes on commercial health premiums

2) Support healthcare cost and quality transparency

3) Support preventing anti-competitive practices in the healthcare industry

4) Support fair hospital pricing

5) Support allowing advanced practice nurses to practice to the full extent of their licensure, for example: Certified Nurse-Midwives

6) Support regulation of pharmaceutical pricing that promotes transparency and accountability at the state and federal level, including the FAIR Drug Price Act

7) Support legislation at the local, state and federal Level that promotes well-being and care coordination

8) Support continued efforts to implement payment for quality through alternative payment models and innovation

9) Support state efforts of mandatory reporting of measures identified by the Statewide Workgroup on Eliminating Waste

# Human Services Agency

**Realignment.** Monitor and adopt positions as appropriate on legislation that modifies the current Realignment funding system or realigns responsibility for additional programs to local government or realigns local programs to the State to ensure adequate, consistent, and flexible funding for social services programs.

**Department of Human Services**

1. **Health Care Reform and Medi-Cal.**
2. **Protect the Affordable Care Act**: Work with the California Congressional Delegation and other state and national leaders to fight efforts to repeal all or any part of the Affordable Care Act. (See more on federal legislative agenda to come).
3. **Eligibility and Enrollment:** As a result of the Affordable Care Act’s Medicaid expansion, San Francisco’s Medi-Cal caseload has grown by 86% since December 2013. The larger than predicted uptake rate, combined with technological glitches in the state’s new enrollment and eligibility system, resulted in significant workload increases for county social services agencies, beyond what was anticipated. As a first priority, the State must adopt a new budgeting methodology that fully funds county costs for administering Medi-Cal eligibility and enrollment.

Secondly, the State must continue to upgrade the CalHEERs system and the CalHEERS/SAWS interface, and support horizontal integration between Medi-Cal and CalFresh by allowing information gathered to determine eligibility for one program to be used to determine and re-determine eligibility for the other.

Thirdly, the State should support efforts to streamline the collection of eligibility verification documents for CalWORKS, Medi-Cal and CalFresh by enabling HSA workers to access on-line verification documents (e.g. DMV-issued identification, birth and marriage certificates from Vital Records, etc.).

1. **Seniors and Persons With Disabilities:** Ensure that Affordable Care Act implementation issues specific to seniors and persons with disabilities are identified, analyzed and appropriately addressed by the State. Support or co-sponsor legislation to restructure existing Medi-Cal specialty programs in light of the ACA. Effective January 2014, California’s Medi-Cal expansion provides no-cost coverage to adults age 19-64 whose income is at or below 138% of the Federal Poverty Level. People age 65 and over are not eligible for the Medi-Cal expansion, and must access traditional programs in order to maintain Medi-Cal and access to in-home supportive services. Potential legislative solutions could include raising the income eligibility threshold for the Medically Needy Medi-Cal program from 100% FPL to 138% FPL to align with the Medi-Cal expansion. This would eliminate the share of cost “cliff” faced by people who must transition from the Expansion to the less generous Medically Needy program upon turning 65. Many seniors are unable to afford share of cost Medi-Cal, and will no longer be able to access long term services and supports. Another approach could involve modifying the no-cost Medi-Cal Aged and Disabled Program to allow for gradual increases in the share of cost as a beneficiary’s income rises, as opposed to the sudden and dramatic increases under current rules.
2. **Medi-Cal Section 1115 Waiver:** Work with DPH and other CCSF partners to implementCalifornia’s Medi-Cal 1115 Waiver Renewal Whole Person Care component, if the State approves CCSF’s waiver application. The Whole Person Care component of the Medi-Cal Waiver would authorize county-based voluntary pilots to provide more integrated and holistic care to high-risk vulnerable populations, including the homeless and persons with disabilities.
3. **Self-Sufficiency.**
   1. **CalWORKs:** 
      1. ***Allow CalWORKs 24-Month Clock for Participants in High School Equivalency Programs to Stop Temporarily.*** With the passage of SB 1041, the WTW 24 Month Time clock was created which limits adults eligibility for CalWORKs benefits to 24 months unless the adults are meeting CalWORKs Federal Work Participation (WPR) requirements or meet the criteria to have their time clocks extended. The implementation of the WTW 24 Month has hindered the ability of clients to participate in education and training activities without meeting Federal CalWORKs WPR requirements. We support recent state policy efforts to allow CalWORKS Welfare to Work participants who had been participating and making satisfactory progress in a high school equivalency program for six months, but who had not yet achieved the equivalency, to have their 24-month clocks “stopped” for up to 12 months in order for them to complete the program.
      2. ***Expand CalWORKs Homeless Services Program.*** In the 2014‐15 budget, the Legislature appropriated $20 million for rapid rehousing activities for homeless CalWORKs families. Counties submitted applications, which were reviewed by CDSS and funds awarded on a competitive basis. The amount of funding provided was not sufficient to allow all counties that submitted proposals to receive funds. Nor was it sufficient to fully fund those who did receive funding. The funding was increased to by $12 million in 2016-17, which still is not sufficient to meet demand. Support additional funding in the Budget Year to continue growing the CalWORKs rapid rehousing program.
      3. ***Allow for CalWORKs Funding Flexibility for Mental Health/Substance Abuse Allocation for Individuals.*** To optimize opportunities for family well‐being and successful WTW outcomes, counties should have the flexibility to utilize the Mental Health/Substance Abuse funding allocation to meet the purposes of the Family Stabilization program, including provision of services for children or other immediate family members. Without funding flexibility, many challenges and crises involving family members may be left unaddressed, which may lead to the participant’s inability to achieve Welfare‐To‐Work program goals, as well as to lower Work Participation Rates for California.

* 1. **Workforce Development.**
     1. ***Support expansion of workforce development efforts that help move welfare-to-work participants***, other low-income individuals and transition aged youth toward self-sufficiency. Support legislative and budget proposals that further San Francisco’s efforts to build a coordinated and integrated system for the delivery of workforce services.
     2. ***Support Proposal to Provide Subsidized Employment for Non****-****Custodial Parents*** of Children on CalWORKS and increase the “pass through” amount of child support payment provided to the custodial parent. Most CalWORKS cases are headed by a single parent in California; in many cases the non-custodial parents are poor themselves, unable to contribute to their children’s finances regardless of desire. Subsidized employment is an evidence-based practice that increases earnings and opportunities for vulnerable populations; using the State Subsidized Employment allocation, we support efforts to help non-custodial parents get back on their feet and contribute the family’s economic well-being. Related, we support efforts to increase the amount of child support income that is passed through to families who receive CalWORKs up the maximum allowable without having to pay additional money back to the federal government.
  2. **CalFresh & Nutrition Services.** Support state efforts to increase the CalFresh uptake rate. Specifically, San Francisco supports the following:
     1. Pursuit of a federal waiver to allow the use of SNAP Employment and Training funds for wage subsidies for CalFresh Able Bodied Adults Without Dependent Children (ABAWDs).
     2. Legislation to allow a new State GF allocation to support subsidized employment for CalFresh Able Bodied Adults Without Dependent Children.
     3. Efforts to allow county social services agencies to (1) process CalFresh Efforts to increase food security among seniors through strategies such as increasing the state “cash out” for SSI/SSP recipients who are ineligible for CalFresh.
     4. Legislation to use state funds to pay for CalFresh benefits for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACAs) who would otherwise be eligible for CalFresh.
     5. Enrollment of MAGI Medi-Cal beneficiaries into CalFresh without a separate application.
     6. Efforts to maximize the use of technology to make the CalFresh program more efficient, accessible, and customer friendly.
     7. applications for jail inmates and (2) suspend rather than terminate CalFresh eligibility when a recipient is detained in county jail for a period of less than a year.

1. **Child Welfare System.**
   1. **Foster Parent Recruitment and Retention of Foster and Adoptive Homes:** the most significant changes in child welfare in decades, the Continuum of Care Reform (AB 403) requires fundamental changes to the placement and care provided to children in foster care. In order to ensure counties are ready to implement these changes, counties need additional resources to recruit and retain foster parents and relative caregivers to care for abused and neglected children, as well as to provide the appropriate level of services to these youth and foster parent recruitment strategies.
   2. **Development of “Employed Foster Parent Child Care Program:** One of the biggest impediments to recruiting and retaining foster parents is the inadequacy of the foster care rate. This is particularly true for foster parents whose employment requires that foster children in their care receive child care. The cost of child care typically exceeds the entirety of the foster care payment received by foster parents for a child. Failure to subsidize the cost of care limits the pool of available foster parents to households in which at least one foster parent is unemployed or where the household’s independent income is sufficient to cover the costs of day care. The Continuum of Care Reform envisions a greater reliance on family care—particularly kinship care— and far less reliance on institutional care. If counties are to be successful in recruiting and retaining sufficient foster family homes to meet the increased demand, it will be necessary to offer child care subsidies to those eligible low-income foster family homes that demonstrate the need for care.
   3. ***Katie A* Implementation:** California is in the process of implementing the *Katie A. v. Bonta* settlement, which requires that intensive mental health services be made available to children who are in or at imminent risk of placement into foster care. State and local child welfare and mental health leaders are working to establish a sustainable framework to provide an array of coordinated, community-based services, but we need expanded capacity of the mental health services delivery system to meet the intensive needs of the *Katie A.* population.

**Department of Aging and Adult Services**

* 1. **In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS):** Support legislation and other efforts to clarify and simplify the calculation of IHSS monthly hours in light of the Federal Final Rule regarding personal care workers. Conforming California law to the Final Rule has been cumbersome and confusing to IHSS recipients and providers. Secondly, monitor implementation of the Coordinated Care Initiative, particularly as relates to the shift of IHSS into managed care, and engage in state-level discussions regarding expansion to additional counties. Monitor the timing of San Francisco’s transition to statewide bargaining and advocate as needed to mitigate the potential negative fiscal impact of this shift on the City’s General Fund. Oppose proposals that restrict eligibility and service levels in the IHSS program.
  2. **Housing for Seniors and Dependent adults who have been victims of abuse or neglect:** Support budget or legislative proposals to make funding to be made available for Adult Protective Services (APS) pilot programs to be used to develop and test innovative housing preservation and eviction prevention services among seniors and dependent adults who have been victims of abuse or neglect, or self-neglect. California counties are facing an extreme housing crisis and some of the state’s most vulnerable citizens are increasingly at risk for experiencing homelessness. Studies have shown that homelessness among older adults is rising, and they are experiencing negative health impacts as a result. The Board of Supervisors Budget & Legislative Analyst has found that a chronically homeless person costs their county an average of $61,000 per year in emergency services alone. Addressing this crisis is not only a morally important but also fiscally responsible.
  3. **Income Support**: Support policy and/or budget proposals to reinstate the cost-of-living adjustment for the Aged, Blind and Disabled recipients of State Supplementary Program (state match) and Supplemental Security Income (federal).
  4. **Long Term Care:** Support increased funding for the entire spectrum of community-based long term care programs serving seniors and adults with disabilities. Expand access to community-based living options and services that allow seniors and people with disabilities to avoid institutionalization and receive appropriate levels of care and support in the community. Request the restoration of funds for the Older Californians Act. Examples include:
     1. Support funding for Linkages, Respite, Alzheimer’s Day Resource Centers, Brown Bag food program, Senior Companion and Ombudsman.
     2. Support legislation, budgetary proposals and regulatory changes that provide increased funding for Para-transit and funding of alternative transportation options for seniors and adults with disabilities.
     3. Support proposals to strengthen and increase services for persons with Alzheimer’s and other dementias, and strengthen and increase services for caregivers.
     4. Support efforts to develop and implement a system of Community Care Integration patient navigators to assist consumers in the process of integration.
     5. Support efforts and proposals to enhance culturally sensitive services to the varied ethnic communities of CA.
     6. Support efforts to acknowledge and enhance services to the LGBT seniors, people with HIV including long term survivors of HIV.
  5. **Self-Sufficiency for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities:** Support legislative and budget proposals offered through the California Senior Legislature (CSL) and advocate for permanent funding for the CSL. The efforts of the CSL have brought improved services for seniors in California. Over its 35 years in existence, the CSL has seen 208 bill proposals chaptered on behalf of California seniors. However, CSL is required at this time to raise their own budget through donations and tax form designations. These strategies have not provided sufficient funds for the CSL to continue their work as in the past. The State needs to acknowledge the importance of the Senior Legislature by permanently offering funds.
  6. **Computer Literacy:** Support proposals that provide funding for computer literacy training for seniors, adults with disabilities and caretakers to enable use of new technologies for online enrollment and other E-Government, and health supports.

**Office of Early Care and Education**

1. **Reform Reimbursement Rates: Regionalize Child Care Standard Reimbursement Rates and Update to Regional Market Rates:** Based on lessons learned from the San Francisco Individualized Child Care Subsidy Pilot, advocate for changes to the state’s framework for regulating and financing subsidized child care programs. Specifically, push for a continued update to child care provider reimbursement rates, and to implement a regional approach to market rate setting in Title 5 center Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR), similar to what is in place for the Alternative Payments/voucher system. Despite recent increases to the SRR of 10% over two years, the current State Reimbursement Rate (SRR) for state contracted centers in California is so far below 85% of the current market rate that in higher cost counties, such as San Francisco, it is difficult for state subsidized providers to retain their contracts and provide quality early and education programs. In San Francisco the current SRR monthly amount for a preschooler is $743.00, which provides less than 50% of $1574.00 (85% of the current market rate). Because rates have not kept up with the market cost of providing care, families with vouchers have a difficult time accessing the market. As a result, City investments in child care quality have eroded to basic operating support, and licensed capacity is being lost. Support proposals that maintain or increase funding for child care and expand access to subsidized child care for working families and families on welfare.
2. **Develop Twelve-Month Continuity of Child Care Services Eligibility for CalWORKS Families:** Support proposals to establish the re-determination of a child’s eligibility for child care services no sooner than 12 months following the initial eligibility determination or most recent re-determination. The issue of continuity of care for the children who need it most is severely impacted by the churning in and out of families due to employment eligibility and ineligibility. The many negative impacts on children, families and program administrative staff, and the associated costs, of constant eligibility re-determinations have been identified. The Federal government recognizes the benefits of a 12-month re-determination. Support proposals that a child will be considered eligible for the entire 12 months regardless of changes to family’s circumstances as long as the family met eligibility requirements on the date of eligibility determination or re-determination. Currently families churn in and out of eligibility due to rigid expectations of constant monitoring and requirements for families to constantly report changes, thus creating burden on families and the child care settings. Minimizing reporting requirements would also greatly benefit county welfare departments and their child care partners, mitigating an already administratively cumbersome and overwhelmed system. Minimizing compliance burdens, supporting continuity of care for children, and encouraging family self-sufficiency are important goals that would be supported with this change.
3. **Encourage Quality Care:** Support state effort to seek a TANF waiver for limiting parental choice to quality options under certain circumstances. Support proposals that promote high-quality child care programs through investments in the early education workforce, facilities, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) for all categories of care and other quality improvement activities. Support proposals that promote higher reimbursement rates being paid for higher quality care. Components of quality care cost more to provide and increased compensation can serve as an incentive for providers to increase the quality of care and meet specified quality indicators. Base reimbursement rates should not be reduced but rather retained and built upon as quality improves, and different measures of quality are met.
4. **Support License-Exempt Providers:** Ensure quality supports and training for license-exempt child providers (“Family and Friends”) who receive payment to care for children on CalWORKs.
5. **Ensure Access to Quality Care for Certain At-Risk Children:** State law requires the prioritized enrollment of foster children, child protective service referred children and children at-risk. However, in reality, these children are unable to access care due to “waiting list” and lack of openings. Homeless families in need of care and categorically eligible for care often refuse to have their children labeled “at-risk” in order to be prioritized to be eligible. San Francisco has created locally funded program to respond, but would support statewide solutions that would help more communities and reduce local costs.

**Promote System Improvements:** Support legislation and regulatory changes that address technology and workload efficiencies, investment in the workforce registry with CCDBG quality dollars, and modifying regulation to reduce demand on families and Alternative Payment agencies for onerous dynamic and ongoing eligibility redetermination. The Federal government encourages the use of electronic tools (such as automated billing, direct deposit payments to providers for services, recordkeeping and tracking the eligibility of families and the attendance of children) yet utilizing these methods have not readily been approved by California. The use of technology would maximize service to families, expedite processes, reduce administrative burden and increase efficiency in monitoring. This will allow agencies and providers to focus valuable resources on the direct services impacting children and families. Support legislation and regulatory changes that improve continuity in eligibility for child care subsidy programs.

# Mayor’s Office of Housing & Community Development

The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) offers a legislative program to guide advocacy efforts at the local, regional, statewide, and federal level. While this is not a comprehensive list of legislative activity, it serves as a policy guide that aligns with the mission of the office, as well as the San Francisco General Plan.

MOHCD’s mission is three-fold:

* To coordinate the City’s housing policy;
* To provide financing and to support the development, rehabilitation, and purchase of affordable housing in San Francisco;
* To strengthen the social, physical, and economic infrastructure of San Francisco's low-income neighborhoods and communities in need.

The 2017 state legislative priorities listed below will facilitate MOHCD’s commitment to build and preserve as much affordable housing as possible, as quickly and efficiently as possible. We also seek to achieve the specific goal set by Mayor Lee in 2014 of producing at least 10,000 affordable housing units by 2020.

1. **Affordable Housing Production**
   1. **Expand the State Low-Income Housing Tax Credit:** Passage of Assemblymember Chiu’s AB 2817, which would have increased the state’s low-income housing tax credit pool by $300 million per year, would significantly assist our affordable housing production program.
   2. **Provide Additional State Resources for Affordable Housing Development:** Resources such as the proposed state general fund allocation of $400 million for affordable housing production are desperately needed. More collaborative efforts to tie this fund to the goal of certainty for code-compliant housing projects should be pursued.
   3. **Provide New Funding Sources for Infrastructure.** Support efforts for increasing long-term funding for infrastructure, especially infrastructure that supports sustainable and equitable growth.
2. **Support Meaningful, Coordinated Regional Planning. Strengthen linkages between housing/jobs growth in transit rich areas and transportation funding.** The Bay Area’s Regional Plan does not reward local jurisdictions which address growth nor does it provide disincentives for those which eschew their responsibilities. This undermines the effectiveness of PBA at its root and any hope of meeting the challenges of affordability in the region. This matters substantially to San Francisco for at least two key reasons: (1) because the housing market is regional and the ability to improve affordability locally is heavily dependent on overall housing production region-wide, particularly in nearby jurisdictions linked closely to the City via transit, such that greater burdens are put on San Francisco to make up for shortfalls elsewhere; (2) the public and political reception locally in SF for needed planning, production and legislative action on housing to meet statewide and regional goals or requirements is undermined by other cities’ demonstrated inaction or outright defiance without consequence.
   * + **Seek Enhancement of SB 375 to strengthen the RHNA process.** This could be modeled on the Growth Management Act in Washington State, whereby counties and local jurisdictions are *required* to adopt local plans that accommodate projected household growth across the income spectrum in a way consistent with the goals of SB 375, with meaningful state sanctions for non-compliance including withholding state tax revenues for a variety of uses. Region determines how much growth, localities determine form of growth.
     + **Fix the existing methodology for the state mandated RHNA calculations to address housing affordability.** The existing RHNA allocation methodology requires that regional governments develop targets for accommodating *new* growth. However, these target numbers do nothing to address existing housing shortages, overcrowding or the high numbers of residents who are “housing-burdened”. Currently, 44% of San Francisco households are extremely rent-burdened by paying more than ½ of their income towards rent. **Seek changes to state law to either adjust the RHNA allocation or the planning process so that housing production numbers are targets to both accommodate new growth and to address existing housing shortages.**
3. **Tax reform and other legislative measures supportive of affordable housing development/preservation**
4. **Reform Prop. 13 for Commercial Properties.** State legislation to enact property tax "split roll" between residential/commercial, such that residential property tax rates would still be limited by Prop. 13 but commercial rates would not. The estimate is that this would infuse billions annually into state/local coffers that could be directed to affordable housing and transportation. Recent estimates of this potential is that the region's share would be potentially $6b annually.
   1. **Reform Prop. 13 for Luxury Residential Properties.** Properties over $5million should not be subject to Prop. 13 limitations.
   2. **Reform Prop. 13 to lower the bar for new taxes.** Eliminate the requirement for a 2/3 vote of the legislature to raise taxes.
5. **Create a tax to reduce speculation in the housing market and to fund housing creation.** If housing is primarily regulated as a commodity, then a larger pool of investors competing for a limited resource increases the value of that commodity. This is good news for localities as it increases value. However, if local governments then have to subsidize workers and residents to continue to compete for that commodity to use as a home, it creates more of a public cost than is worth the added value. Vancouver recently enacted a 1% tax on empty units. A 2% or higher tax may be more appropriate for California.
6. **Pursue a more collaborative version of “by-right” legislation.** The goal of certainty for code-compliant projects that provide affordable housing is laudable. **Seek consensus with other local jurisdictions and regional agencies on a different version of legislation**. The Terner Center at UC Berkeley released a paper this summer titled, “Borrowing Innovation, Achieving Affordability” which described options to balance the need for increasing affordable housing with other local concerns. This law provides for an expedited process but unlike the Governor’s By-Right Legislation which applied to every locality, only underperforming cities are subject to the Massachusetts law. Cities that are deemed as underperforming can improve affordable housing production and then earn the right to reinstitute their standard local processes.

1. **Support Legislation That Returns Regulatory Authority of Existing Housing Stock to Local Governments.** The Ellis Act (1985) precludes the city from restricting the removal of rental housing from the housing stock. Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (1995) prevents the city from placing rent control on new construction, condos, TICs, or single family homes. The Palmer decision (2009) expanded the applicability of Costa Hawkins to apply to rents on new affordable units. A 2004 Court of Appeal decision struck down an amendment to the City’s Subdivision Code regulating the conversion of apartments to tenancies in common (which the City argued were de facto subdivisions) and found that the legislation violated the constitutional right to privacy of owners of tenancies in common by limited their right to enter into exclusive rights of occupancies with their co-owners. Taken together, Costa Hawkins and the Palmer decision presents a significant challenge to San Francisco’s ability to create new affordable housing; while the Ellis Act and the unlimited conversion of apartments to TICs facilitate the removal of existing affordable housing. Some relief from the existing state structure may facilitate San Francisco’s ability to regulate at the local level, especially during a significant upturn in the real estate market.
   1. **Work with state legislators to craft more options to the State Density Bonus Law for local jurisdictions with higher affordability goals.** The State should allow local jurisdictions to offer a variegated density bonus program when these cities strive for higher affordability rates through inclusionary programs. San Francisco has a current affordability goal of 33% (Prop K, 2014). San Francisco is currently undergoing a feasibility study to ensure that the City can maximize the production of affordable housing through the inclusionary housing program. This effort is complicated due to the high variety of land use districts and land values in the city. Our efforts could be better supported by more fine-tuned tools that allow local control. As the City develops a cutting-edge Inclusionary program that incorporates feasibility analysis, the State should offer more local control as an incentive for this City and others to maximize the production of affordable housing.
2. **BMR Ownership and HOA Dues:** Support legislation that facilitates below market rate ownership (BMR) and addresses prohibitively high homeowners association (HOA) dues**.** Currently, rapidly rising HOA dues in new condominium developments hinder the success of mixed-income inclusionary ownership programs. A condo may be purchased at an affordable price, but without a means to limit HOA increases the dues can quickly become a serious cost burden. Establishing a two-tiered HOA fee would facilitate mixed-income ownership opportunities within new developments.

# Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure

1. **Tax Exempt Status of Municipal Bonds.** Oppose legislation that eliminates, or places a cap on, tax-exempt municipal bonds.
2. **Support Local Control of Caltrans Underpasses in San Francisco.**
3. **Sustainable Development.** Support legislation that provides financial and technical support to local government in implementing sustainable development practices such as transit-friendly development, green building, consideration of existing and future development impacted by sea level rise, plant-based methods for managing stormwater, distributed generation and microgrid strategies, and other sustainable practices.
4. **Infill Development.** The OCII “major approved projects” – Mission Bay, Transbay and Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point – are national models for smart growth and urban infill. Robust developer agreements enable the City to develop abandoned and underutilized lands that leverage existing urban infrastructure and fulfill regional and state goals for jobs-housing balance. While these projects require private developers to construct public infrastructure, state funds can significantly impact implementation by accelerating extension of City services such as roadways, transit, bike facilities, and underground utilities. Early funding of these priorities advances economic benefits to the City and improves the City’s ability to fulfill policy goals such as transit-first, advanced stormwater management, high-quality parks, and community facilities. Strategies for supporting San Francisco’s major approved development projects include:
5. Support measures that promote economic incentives for business creation, attraction, and retention in high poverty and unemployment areas and infill locations near transit.
6. Support proposals which would stimulate the local economy by accelerating or increasing spending on infrastructure projects in urban infill locations.
7. Support legislation and expansion of existing grant programs that distribute state housing and infrastructure funds to local jurisdictions based upon population and poverty levels.

# Office of the City Administrator

1. **Capital Plan Funding.** Identify transportation and other capital funding opportunities early in the legislative session to develop funding sources for key San Francisco infrastructure projects. Also, track funding opportunities for rebuilding state courthouses, local courthouse construction or District Attorney and probation facilities.
2. **Surplus State Property for City Use.** Through legislative or administrative action, identify surplus state property that could serve City or City-supported public uses and establish a process to acquire property where appropriate.
3. **Animal Care & Control.** Track legislation that may have unforeseen impacts on sheltering practices, and support legislation that improves live release rates.
4. **Earthquake Safety.** Track legislation that would:
   1. Create a state seismic loan fund using the San Francisco model created by the Earthquake Safety Improvement Plan;
   2. Provide funding to cover earthquake mitigation;
   3. Provide funding for an early earthquake warning system;
   4. Provide tax incentives for seismic retrofits;
   5. Establish mandatory retrofit programs; or,
   6. Establish a statewide Lifelines Council based on the San Francisco model.
5. **Workers’ Compensation.** Track Workers’ Compensation legislation that could impact the City, or increase liability or costs, and any legislation that would impact public agency employee costs or management rights.
6. **Immigrant Rights.** Track any legislation impacting the rights of immigrants. Support legislation that expands and/or preserves immigrant rights and oppose legislation that weakens immigrant rights.
7. **Short Term Rentals.** Track legislation on the subject of short term rentals.
8. **Office of the Chief Medical Examiner.** Track legislation that adjusts fees, reporting deadlines or operational requirements for the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner.
9. **Office of the County Clerk.** Track legislation that adjusts fees, reporting deadlines or operational requirements for the Office of the County Clerk.
10. **Fleet Management.** Track legislation that impacts the City’s fleet or electric vehicles generally.
11. **Treasure Island Development Program**
12. **Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing District Changes**

Under the Disposition and Development Agreements with Treasure Island Community Development (“TICD”), the master developer for the Treasure Island Development Program), the City and the Treasure Island Development Authority (“TIDA”) committed to pledge the City and County share of property tax increment through an Infrastructure Financing District.

State Law currently provides three alternative frameworks for the formation of an Infrastructure Financing District, and the City and TIDA, in consultation with TICD, have elected to move forward with an Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing District (“IRFD”) as authorized under AB 229. This formation could be enhanced, however, if the IRFD code could be modified to mirror two provisions available under the formation of an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (“EIFD”) as authorized under SB 628. Specifically, we would like to pursue modifying the Government Code Section 53369.10-53369.26 to provide that an IRFD:

* 1. May be formed and collect revenues for a period of 45 years rather than 40 (conforming to the authority under an EIFD or a Community Revitalization and Investment Authority (AB 2; a “CRIA”)
  2. Section 53398.75(e)(1) provides that local jurisdictions may also dedicate through an EIRD property tax revenues transferred to the jurisdiction to compensate for lost local revenues when the motor vehicle license fee was suspended.

1. **Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund**

When the State rescinded redevelopment in 2011 the Treasure Island Program lost access to the share of property taxes dedicated to regional agencies (BART and BAAQMD) and the State Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (“ERAF”). Collectively, these represent more than 35% of the total ad valorem property tax.

Prior communications have indicated that the Governor’s Office does not support the commitment of State tax increment to development programs on the same terms and breadth of application as existed under redevelopment law, but we would like to explore with the Governor’s Office whether there would be limited circumstances under which he might be supportive of that commitment by the State. Examples of narrowly defined qualifying parameters for commitment that would benefit the Treasure Island Program could include the redevelopment of former military bases and/or for use exclusively to finance the construction of affordable housing.

There is some precedent for a State commitment of tax increment in the post-redevelopment era. Former Assemblyman Ammiano successfully sponsored legislation allowing the development project at Pier 70 to access State tax increment generated within that project area.

# Planning Department

The San Francisco Planning Department offers a legislative program to guide advocacy efforts in the City and County of San Francisco, with the Bay Area regional government organizations, the state government in Sacramento and the federal government in Washington, D.C. It is a strategic document that is not meant to be comprehensive of all issues but rather to provide general direction on issues relevant to the planning and land use in the coming year.  This program is also intended to align with the department’s Mission Statement and supports the overall goals and objectives of the General Plan including:

**Our Vision:** Making San Francisco the world’s most livable urban place – environmentally, economically, socially, and culturally*.*

**Our Mission:** The San Francisco Planning Department, under the direction of the Planning Commission, shapes the future of San Francisco and the region by:

* Generating an extraordinary vision for the General Plan and in neighborhood plans;
* Fostering exemplary design through planning controls;
* Improving our surroundings through environmental analysis;
* Preserving our unique heritage;
* Encouraging a broad range of housing and a diverse job base; and
* Enforcing the Planning Code.

1. **Smart Growth & General Plan Requirements.**
   1. **Support Meaningful, Coordinated Regional Planning. Strengthen linkages between housing/jobs growth in transit rich areas and transportation funding.** The Bay Area’s Regional Plan does not reward local jurisdictions which address growth nor does it provide disincentives for those which eschew their responsibilities. This undermines the effectiveness of PBA at its root and any hope of meeting the challenges of affordability in the region. This matters substantially to San Francisco for at least two key reasons: (1) because the housing market is regional and the ability to improve affordability locally is heavily dependent on overall housing production region-wide, particularly in nearby jurisdictions linked closely to the City via transit, such that greater burdens are put on San Francisco to make up for shortfalls elsewhere; (2) the public and political reception locally in SF for needed planning, production and legislative action on housing to meet statewide and regional goals or requirements is undermined by other cities’ demonstrated inaction or outright defiance without consequence.
      * **Seek Enhancement of SB 375 to strengthen the RHNA process.** This could be modeled on the Growth Management Act in Washington State, whereby counties and local jurisdictions are *required* to adopt local plans that accommodate projected household growth across the income spectrum in a way consistent with the goals of SB 375, with meaningful state sanctions for non-compliance including withholding state tax revenues for a variety of uses. Region determines how much growth, localities determine form of growth.
      * **Fix the existing methodology for the state mandated RHNA calculations to address housing affordability.** The existing RHNA allocation methodology requires that regional governments develop targets for accommodating *new* growth. However, these target numbers do nothing to address existing housing shortages, overcrowding or the high numbers of residents who are “housing-burdened”. Currently, 44% of San Francisco households are extremely rent-burdened by paying more than ½ of their income towards rent. **Seek changes to state law to either adjust the RHNA allocation or the planning process so that housing production numbers are targets to both accommodate new growth and to address existing housing shortages.**
   2. **Watch for the Creation of New Hurdles to the Certification of Housing Elements.** A recent court case has imposed a 90-day appeal window where there had been an unlimited window.  Past years, have seen efforts by state legislators to lengthen this appeal window. San Francisco has an obligation to ensure that housing can and will be built, increasing the appeal window for the Housing Element jeopardizes our ability to meet such obligations.
2. **Affordable Housing.** 
   1. **Find new means to fund affordable housing.** The state and federal government are obligated to assist localities with funding for critical needs.
      * **Reform Prop. 13 for Commercial Properties.** State legislation to enact property tax "split roll" between residential/commercial, such that residential property tax rates would still be limited by Prop. 13 but commercial rates would not. The estimate is that this would infuse billions annually into state/local coffers that could be directed to affordable housing and transportation. Recent estimates of this potential is that the region's share would be potentially $6b annually.
      * **Reform Prop. 13 for Luxury Residential Properties.** Properties over $5million should not be subject to Prop. 13 limitations.
      * **Reform Prop. 13 to lower the bar for new taxes.** Eliminate the requirement for a 2/3 vote of the legislature to raise taxes.
      * **Create a tax to reduce speculation in the housing market and to fund housing creation.** If housing is primarily regulated as a commodity, then a larger pool of investors competing for a limited resource increases the value of that commodity. This is good news for localities as it increases value. However, if local governments then have to subsidize workers and residents to continue to compete for that commodity to use as a home, it creates more of a public cost than is worth the added value. Vancouver recently enacted a 1% tax on empty units . A 2% or higher tax may be more appropriate for California.
   2. **Pursue a more collaborative version of “by-right” legislation.** The goal of certainty for code-compliant projects that provide affordable housing is laudable. **Seek consensus with other local jurisdictions and regional agencies on a different version of legislation**. The Terner Center at UC Berkeley released a paper this summer titled, “Borrowing Innovation, Achieving Affordability” which described options to balance the need for increasing affordable housing with other local concerns. This law provides for an expedited process but unlike the Governor’s By-Right Legislation which applied to every locality, only underperforming cities are subject to the Massachusetts law. Cities that are deemed as underperforming can improve affordable housing production and then earn the right to reinstitute their standard local processes.
   3. **Support Legislation That Returns Regulatory Authority of Existing Housing Stock to Local Governments.** The Ellis Act (1985) precludes the city from restricting the removal of rental housing from the housing stock. Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (1995) prevents the city from placing rent control on new construction, condos, TICs, or single family homes. The Palmer decision (2009) expanded the applicability of Costa Hawkins to apply to rents on new affordable units. A 2004 Court of Appeal decision struck down an amendment to the City’s Subdivision Code regulating the conversion of apartments to tenancies in common (which the City argued were de facto subdivisions) and found that the legislation violated the constitutional right to privacy of owners of tenancies in common by limited their right to enter into exclusive rights of occupancies with their co-owners. Taken together, Costa Hawkins and the Palmer decision presents a significant challenge to San Francisco’s ability to create new affordable housing; while the Ellis Act and the unlimited conversion of apartments to TICs facilitate the removal of existing affordable housing. Some relief from the existing state structure may facilitate San Francisco’s ability to regulate at the local level, especially during a significant upturn in the real estate market.
   4. **Support Legislation That Provides Financial Support and Incentives for Programs That Provide Affordable Housing for Low- and Moderate-Income Residents.**
   5. **Support Efforts to Create Tax or Other Financial Incentives for Innovative Affordable Housing Ownership Models and For Low- and Moderate-Income Housing.**
   6. **Work with state legislators to craft more options to the State Density Bonus Law for local jurisdictions with higher affordability goals.** The State should allow local jurisdictions to offer a variegated density bonus program when these cities strive for higher affordability rates through inclusionary programs. San Francisco has a current affordability goal of 33% (Prop K, 2014). San Francisco is currently undergoing a feasibility study to ensure that the City can maximize the production of affordable housing through the inclusionary housing program. This effort is complicated due to the high variety of land use districts and land values in the city. Our efforts could be better supported by more fine-tuned tools that allow local control. As the City develops a cutting-edge Inclusionary program that incorporates feasibility analysis, the State should offer more local control as an incentive for this City and others to maximize the production of affordable housing.
3. **Family-Friendly Legislation.**
   1. **Amend the State Child-Care Requirements.** Amend the state childcare licensing requirements to allow them to be more easily built in an urban context (open space and vertical circulation, for example).
      * **Open Space.** According to San Francisco’s Office of Early Care & Education (OECE), the difficulty of providing dedicated open space in new or expanding facilities is the largest single impediment to increasing child care services in San Francisco. **Seek a change to state law to allow the open space requirements for dense, urban cities to be satisfied through nearby, existing open spaces.**

1. **Transportation & Livable Street Design.**
   1. Vision Zero: Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE), Lower Speed Limits and Measures that Improve Traffic Safety. San Francisco adopted Vision Zero as a citywide policy in 2014, committing to eliminate all traffic deaths in San Francisco by 2024. While the current two-year Vision Zero Action Strategy is being updated, the City's approach to Vision Zero focuses on engineering safer streets, encouraging safer speeds, investing in safer vehicles and supporting the safe use of streets by everyone on the road, regardless of mode.
      * Seek Sponsor for Automated Speed Enforcement Pilot Program: With the full support of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and other city departments, SFMTA staff will work to advance state legislation that would authorize a pilot program to test ASE on San Francisco's most dangerous streets in support of the City's Vision Zero goal.
      * The SFMTA & the Planning Department will also support efforts to improve the overall safety for all road users, including bicycle and pedestrian related measures, bills that provide municipalities the flexibility to reduce speed limits, measures that discourage dangerous driving, cycling or walking behavior, and proposals that seek to increase investment in infrastructure improvements and education that advances the goal of Vision Zero.
   2. Monitor Changes Concerning Shared Mobility. Managing the adoption and integration of new and emerging mobility innovations is a fundamental issue for San Francisco and other cities. The SFMTA is developing a shared mobility framework aimed at ensuring these transportation options are integrated to manage a network that is efficient, equitable and sustainable. With this as background, SFMTA and Planning Department will monitor and engage, as appropriate, in state legislative measures in all of the areas listed below to ensure that mobility benefits are maximized, and access to critical data for transportation and land-use purposes is assured. The Planning Department will also monitor efforts in this broad arena with special emphasis upon CEQA changes or other changes that may involve the planning Department.
   3. Support Changes to the State Public Utilities Code to Grant Municipalities Discretion Over the Location and Urban Design of Surface Mounted Facilities (SMF) in Public ROWs: Current state law is vague or deferential in granting utilities (e.g., telecom providers) latitude to force cities to accept unsightly and improperly sited SMFs in large quantities (hundreds or thousands per city) on sidewalks without accounting for local design standards. Current state law provides little explicit ability for the municipality to require appropriate urban design treatments (e.g. landscaping, art/painting, seating, other amenities) and sidewalk treatments (e.g. sidewalk extensions/bulb-outs) to make the SMFs consistent with adopted local streetscape, design and pedestrian movement standards, or, in some cases, to require underground installation of the SMFs if certain criteria are met. The pertinent Code provision is California Public Utilities Code Sections 5885 and 7901.
   4. Support Changes to the State Public Utilities Code to Require Utilities to Replace Streetscape Materials and Design In-Kind When They Do Construction or Repair Work on Their Facilities in the ROW: At present utilities are only required to replace sidewalks and roadways with materials (asphalt, plain concrete) different than those present. In an increasing number of sidewalks and public plazas, special pavement and landscape treatments are being installed. Utilities can unilaterally tear up these improvements and replace their disrupted areas with materials that do not match the level of improvements in the area. The current practice is unsightly, degrades investment made by the City, and is disrespectful of the efforts of the community.
   5. Support the Adoption of and Provide Clarity Regarding Indirect Source Review. Since at least 2005, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, a regional agency formed by state law, has proposed studying the feasibility of an Indirect Source Review Program. The term "indirect source" refers to development that attracts or generates motor vehicle trips. The adoption of this measure at the regional level will help region and city plan development and transportation projects more responsibly and mitigate impacts from these projects more effectively. For example, the Indirect Source Review Program may be able serve as mitigation for projects that need to offset Vehicle Miles Traveled impacts pursuant to California Senate Bill 743 (see later discussion under CEQA Reform heading for further discussion regarding that legislation). The City should seek clarity from the state legislature or California Air Resources Board to air districts if an Indirect Source Review Program is an exception from Proposition 26 requirements, and that Indirect Source Review can be imposed as a condition of property development.
2. **Equitable Growth & Infrastructure Investment.**
   1. **Seek New Funding Sources for Infrastructure.** Support efforts for increasing long-term funding for infrastructure, especially infrastructure that supports sustainable and equitable growth.
   2. **Maintain Existing Capacity for Taxes and Impact Fees:** Oppose legislation that eliminates or restricts the taxing authority of cities over development; weakens existing Government Code section 66000 fee authority; or redefines any development tax, condition or other monetary change as development fees.
3. **Sustainability & Resiliency.**
   1. **Support Regional Coordination and Increased Funding for Responding to Climate Change and Sea Level Rise:** The Golden Gate tidal gauge has recorded an 8 inch rise in sea level in the Bay over the past one hundred years. The draft 2013 State Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Policy Document recommends planning for up to an additional 9 inches by 2030, 19 inches by 2050, and 56 inches by 2100. Even if aggressive action to mitigate climate change begins immediately, significant levels of sea level rise will occur all along the California coast and San Francisco Bay. Ensuring vital assets are protected requires increased coordination and investment.
4. **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Reform:** Support legislative efforts to simplify and modernize the CEQA review process in relation to transit-oriented development, infill development, affordable housing the TEP and other projects and plans that are consistent with the goals and objectives of an adopted sustainable communities strategy. Support efforts to include the addition of public transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit-oriented development (TOD) projects as appropriate.  Oppose measures that would impose new requirements beyond CEQA which would expand those requirements to additionally require organizations conducting an EIR to evaluate the impacts of environmental factors on a proposed project and on people who might be attracted to the new development.
   1. **Modify the “Fair Argument” Standard of Review for Negative Declarations.** The court-created standard of review for Neg Decs considers only whether project opponents have raised a “fair argument” that the project may have significant impacts.  But this standard dates from a time when Neg Decs were often little more than “bare checklists” with limited evidentiary support.  Today, most Neg Decs have grown into substantial documents with extensive supporting technical reports, which courts should be required to take into account in determining whether or not there is substantial evidence of potentially significant impacts.
   2. **Eliminate “Data Dumping.”** Under current law, project opponents can challenge an EIR on any grounds that were raised prior to the final hearing to adopt a project.  This allows them to hold their fire during the comment period and then “dump" thousands of pages of comments on the lead agency at the last minute.  The agency must either postpone project adoption in order to respond, or risk litigation without the support of responses in the record to the late comments.   Senate Bill 292 (Padilla) included a data-dumping prohibition, but only for the Farmers Field football stadium project.  This prohibition should be extended to all projects.  Another option would be to define the statutory comment periods as the only times in which comments will be accepted for consideration, which would improve the lead agency’s ability to respond to comments in the preparation of CEQA documents.
   3. **Eliminate Recirculation Based on Revisions in Response to Comments.** Under current law, if EIRs and Negative Declarations are substantially changed in response to public comments, the lead agency may be required to recirculate them for additional comment.  This leads to repeated recirculation cycles and also provides an unintended incentive for agencies to reject useful public comments, simply to avoid delay.  Precluding recirculation when an EIR or Neg Dec is revised in accordance with comments would remove this incentive, improving the final document and enabling projects to remain on schedule.   Specifically, giving more opportunity to adjust or add alternatives without recirculation would enhance the ability of lead agencies to respond to input received during the DEIR comment period.
   4. **Advocate For a Specific CEQA Exemption for General Plan Elements or City Policy Documents That Do Not In and Of Themselves Result in Physical Changes.** San Francisco has been subjected to repeated and unsuccessful lawsuits with each attempt to update our Housing Element—updates which are required by state law.  Even though the appellants have not been successful, the city must spend vast resources in defense of these lawsuits for non-physical policy plans. Because the non-physical policy documents cannot have physical changes and any physical project would result in subsequent CEQA review, the state should offer a specific exemption for these policy plans.
   5. **Add a Statutory Exemption for Minor Changes to Transit Service.** Under current law, even minor changes to transit service must undergo environmental review because they are acted on by an appointed board (i.e., discretionary action).  The only transit service changes that are statutorily exempt are in response to transit agency revenue shortfalls (CEQA Guidelines Section 15285).  However, transit service providers need flexibility to make minor adjustments to transit service in response to changes in passenger demand and on-street congestion.  Examples of minor transit service changes include, but are not limited to, moving transit stops, modifying a route between stops, increasing/decreasing frequency and hours of operation, changing vehicle types (from trolley to an articulated bus), etc.  Minor transit service changes are defined in the SFMTA Title VI document and this exemption could adopt this definition.
   6. **Modify the Class 32 Infill Exemption to Make it Applicable in Limited Circumstances for Projects That Do Not Comply With the Existing Zoning on the Site.** Such circumstances could include one or more of the following: when the project is determined consistent with the General Plan; when the project involves reuse of an existing structure and does not add more than X square feet of space; when the project is consistent with the use allowed in the applicable zoning directs (but may be denser or taller than the zoning allows).
   7. **Oppose Efforts to Undermine Senate Bill 743 Provisions.** California Senate Bill 743, effective September 2013, directed the California Office of Planning and Research to prepare, develop, and transmit to the California Natural Resources Agency for certification and adoption proposed revisions to the CEQA Guidelines to establish criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts that “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” Since that time, the California Office of Planning and Research has conducted a tremendous outreach and refined its proposal, based upon that outreach and the purpose of Senate Bill 743. The latest proposal, if adopted, will have substantial benefits for state, region, and city in meeting numerous transportation, air quality, and greenhouse gas policies. **The City should lobby against any legislative efforts intended to weaken the original provisions of Senate Bill 743 or stall adoption of the CEQA Guidelines any further.**

# Port of San Francisco

1. **Seawall Funding.** Pursue legislative efforts to allow capture of the State’s share of property tax increment along the Port to fund the seawall based on an economic analysis that the cost of inaction is higher than a State contribution to the seawall under this proposal. This would be mirror the IFD powers in place at Pier 70.
2. **California Seismic Safety Bond. Seawall.** Explore inclusion of the seawall in projects eligible for funding under a state-wide seismic safety bond.
3. **Mission Bay Ferry Landing Funding.** Work with WETA and MTC to support funding from Regional Measure 3 (RM3), and to support funding for the project as it is ultimately approved by the legislature.
4. **Mission Bay Ferry Landing.** Explore possible funding from Cap and Trade funds for the aspects of this project that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
5. **AB 2659 Affordable Housing – Technical Amendments.** Last minute changes to AB 2659 in the 2016 legislative session yielded a number of changes that are not beneficial to the Port. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development has also requested a change to the definition of affordable housing in the bill. Support additions to a 2017 omnibus technical clean-up bill to correct these changes.

# Recreation & Parks Department

1. **Park Improvements & Rehabilitation.** Support efforts to provide statewide funding for rehabilitation, development and capital improvements for local and state park and recreation agencies.
2. **Support Sustainability.** Support the enactment of policies and encourage state funding opportunities to assist agencies in meeting sustainability objectives including energy and water efficiencies, non-motorized trail development and connectivity, carbon sequestration through natural environment management, protection and enhancement.
3. **Protect Existing Open Space & Recreation:** Support legislation that ensures adequate open space and recreation opportunities to address impacts of urban growth.
4. **Protect Existing Open Space.** Oppose legislation that has a negative impact on park and recreation agencies including the sale of parks and open space.
5. **Connecting Children & Young Adults to Nature**: Support legislation that promotes and funds opportunities for children and young adults to connect with nature and the environment. Increase the ability of underserved and at-risk populations to participate in outdoor recreation and educational activities.
6. **Promote Equity & Access.** Support access for all Californians to physical activity and nutrition through parks and open space, active transportation (bicycles and pedestrians, trails, complete streets, use of easements), healthy foods, youth programs, and joint use of schools.
7. **Cap and Trade Funding for Parks:** Support efforts to have the Air Resources Board include parks in Cap and Trade Funding. Currently, the focus has been the criteria for the Transit Oriented Development (TOD +housing near transit stations).
8. **Green Infrastructure Projects:** Support funding for and promote efforts to incorporate green infrastructure solutions into parks and playground projects. These include practices that help absorb, delay, and treat stormwater, like permeable pavement, green roofs, trees, bioswales, and rainwater catchment systems. These efforts improve air quality, cools the city, and provides green spaces that make our cities more livable, beautiful, and climate-resilient.

# San Francisco International Airport

1. **Transportation Network Companies.** Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) and Taxis: evaluate legislative proposals consistent with California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) filings regarding ride-hailing services and the following core principles: public safety, outstanding customer service, accessibility, and economic and environmental sustainability.

2. **Aviation Sales Tax.** Along with the CAC, SFO is monitoring ongoing communication between the California Department of Finance and the FAA on how California allocates its share of the aviation fuel sales tax.

* 1. **Sea Level Rise and Future Water and Wave Inundation.** SFO continues to work toward making its perimeter safe from any flood, storm inundation, or from potential sea level rise. SFO is working with the Army Corps of Engineers in order to pursue funding and other Sea Level Rise and Future Water and Wave Inundation.

# San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

**1. Transportation Funding**

1. **New Statewide Transportation Funding**: As a follow up to the 2016 Special Session, continue to support efforts to identify new long-term, sustainable funding program that includes all modes. Advocate that all transportation modes should benefit from increased transportation funding.
2. **Cap and Trade Funding**: Maintain the existing transportation and housing programs funded by cap and trade and seek opportunities to direct additional cap and trade funds towards these purposes. Key programs for San Francisco include the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital (TIRC) Program, which has provided $95 million in funding thus far for SFMTA’s light rail vehicle replacement program. Monitor legislation to modify the programs and support administrative or legislative efforts to streamline applications and simplify program administration.
3. **Definition of Disadvantaged Communities**: Monitor legislation related to the definition of disadvantaged communities (DACs) as it relates to cap and trade or other relevant funding programs. Seek opportunities to broaden the definition in statute so that it includes all socio-economically disadvantaged communities. Monitor and engage in administrative efforts related to updating the CalEnviroScreen, the State’s current DAC screening tool developed by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) to ensure as many San Francisco communities of concern as possible are included.
4. **Regional Measure 3**: Participate in any efforts by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to seek legislation that would authorize a ballot measure asking Bay Area voters to approve a bridge toll increase to support transportation improvements in bridge corridors.
5. **High Speed Rail**: Consistent with San Francisco’s on-going support for high speed rail to the Transbay Terminal, support efforts aimed at advancing the high speed rail program.
6. **Re-Authorize Public Private Partnerships in California:** As a follow-up to the 2016 Special Session, reauthorize SBX2 4, Chapter 2, Statutes of 2009, which established the legislative authority until January 1, 2017, allowing regional transportation agencies and Caltrans to enter into an unlimited number of P3s, and deleted the restrictions on the number and type of projects that may be undertaken. While SFMTA has the authority on its own to enter into P3s, the future of our freeway and regional projects with our state partners could benefit from this project delivery method.

**2. Vision Zero: Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE), Lower Speed Limits and Measures that Improve Traffic Safety.** San Francisco adopted Vision Zero as a citywide policy in 2014, committing to eliminate all traffic deaths in San Francisco by 2024. While the current two-year Vision Zero Action Strategy is being updated, the City’s approach to Vision Zero focuses on engineering safer streets, encouraging safer speeds, investing in safer vehicles and supporting the safe use of streets by everyone on the road, regardless of mode.

1. **Seek Sponsor for Automated Speed Enforcement Pilot Program**: With the full support of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and other city departments, SFMTA will work to advance state legislation that would authorize a pilot program to test ASE on San Francisco’s most dangerous streets in support of the City’s Vision Zero goal.
2. The SFMTA will also support efforts to improve the overall safety for all road users, including bicycle and pedestrian related measures, bills that provide municipalities the flexibility to reduce speed limits, measures that discourage dangerous driving, cycling or walking behavior, and proposals that seek to increase investment in infrastructure improvements and education that advances the goal of Vision Zero.

**3. Shared Mobility.** Managing the adoption and integration of new and emerging mobility innovations is a fundamental issue for San Francisco and other cities. The SFMTA is developing a shared mobility framework aimed at ensuring these transportation options are integrated to manage a network that is efficient, equitable and sustainable. With this as background, SFMTA will monitor and engage, as appropriate, in state legislative measures in all of the areas listed below to ensure that mobility benefits are maximized, and access to critical data for transportation and land-use purposes is assured. The SFMTA will also coordinate work in this broad arena with other large city transportation departments pursuant to on-going collaboration initiated through the Big City DOT working group, representing the 8 largest cities in California.

1. Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) and Taxis: evaluate legislative proposals consistent with California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) filings regarding ride-hailing services and the following core principles: public safety, outstanding customer service, accessibility, and economic and environmental sustainability.
2. Autonomous Vehicles: participate in State efforts to develop policy framework for testing and deployment of autonomous vehicles and ensure cities are included in process.
3. Commuter Shuttles: monitor legislation that supports these programs within the context of SFMTA’s Commuter Shuttles Program and encouraging shared trips.
4. Bicycle-related legislation as it relates to facilitating bike share programs and bicycle safety.
5. CPUC and Transportation Functions: Monitor and engage in shift of transportation oversight responsibilities from the CPUC to the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA).

**4. Parking Policy** The SFMTA will continue to coordinate parking advocacy efforts with public parking interests including the California Public Parking Association and local government interests throughout the State. The SFMTA will continue to work with interested stakeholders statewide on accessible parking policy reform based the past work of the Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee and on recommendations of the State Auditor report on DMV placard program anticipated in March 2017.

# San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

1. **Water Rights**. San Francisco’s water rights are designated in the Raker Act and through California law. The SFPUC will work to protect those rights and oppose any efforts that may erode those rights. There are a number of pending state policy decisions that could impact the water supply, cost and reliability for the 2.6 million residents and businesses in the San Francisco Bay Area that rely on the SFPUC for water. In particular, the State Water Resources Control Board’s proposed changes to the Bay-Delta Plan will result in severe reduction of available water supply causing water supply shortages across SFPUC’s regional service territory during times of drought. The SFPUC will continue to protect San Francisco’s water rights and work to maintain local autonomy and control of San Francisco’s water supply.
2. **Water Affordability.** The SFPUC will stay engaged in legislative and regulatory actions that may impact water rates, including efforts to reform Proposition 218.
3. **Water Conservation and Supply Diversification.** In the face of one of the worst droughts in California history, the SFPUC is implementing short and long-term strategies to conserve water and diversify our supply. We support the expanded use of alternate water sources (recycled water, rainwater, stormwater, graywater, etc.) for non-potable purposes as well as supplementing our existing potable water supplies with additional potable sources, such as groundwater. Through legislative and regulatory action, the SFPUC will work to ensure that San Francisco’s existing non-potable and groundwater programs are not negatively impacted by cumbersome state regulation and that local authority is maintained to advance non-potable water use.
4. **Renewable Portfolio Standards.** The SFPUC will work to ensure that legislation or regulation that implements the State Renewables Portfolio Standard for electric utilities takes account of the SFPUC’s low-emission electricity supplies and permits the use of appropriate renewable energy resources and renewable energy credits.
5. **Community Choice Aggregation.** The SFPUC monitors legislation and regulations that impact the viability and success of Community Choice Aggregators (CCAs), including CleanPowerSF, to ensure that CCAs have equal treatment under the law and are not subject to undue cost-sharing. We will work to ensure that CleanPowerSF’s local procurement autonomy and authority remains intact.
6. **Exit Fees and Non-Bypassable Charges.** The SFPUC will monitor and advocate for fair and equitable treatment of utilities’ exit fees and other non-bypassable charges to ensure that utility procurement and distribution costs are not inappropriately shifted onto SFPUC Hetch Hetchy power customers or CleanPowerSF customers.
7. **Distribution Interconnection.** A number of state initiatives require interconnection by third parties to the incumbent’s utility distribution network in a fair and transparent manner. The SFPUC is in a unique situation that requires distribution interconnection to serve its customers. We will work to ensure that open, transparent and fair treatment is applied to distribution interconnections for wholesale customers like SFPUC.
8. **Climate Adaptation.** We will continue to monitor and engage in legislation impacting local climate adaptation and sea level rise planning efforts. The SFPUC will also continue to work with the California Coastal Commission to implement solutions that address the erosion at Ocean Beach that is threatening critical wastewater infrastructure.
9. **State Funding for Utility Operations and Infrastructure.** We will engage on the State budget to advocate for funding to support the work of the SFPUC’s Water, Wastewater, and Power Enterprises. The SFPUC will identify specific state funding opportunities and work to shape funding criteria in a manner that benefits utilities like the SFPUC.
10. **State Funding for Disadvantaged Communities.** The SFPUC will work in coordination with the Mayor’s Office to ensure projects located in or serving disadvantaged communities in San Francisco are eligible for state funding, such as Cap-and-Trade investments based on the CalEnviroScreen methodology.

# Office of Economic and Workforce Development

1. **Real Estate Development:**
   1. Support Local Control of Caltrans Underpasses in San Francisco.
   2. In concert with the Planning Department and MOHCD, support efforts to increase housing production.
2. **Business Development:**
   1. Support efforts to expand the number of neighborhood restaurant liquor licenses to activate neighborhood by reducing storefront vacancies, boosting foot traffic, adding to the variety of neighborhood-serving small businesses, creating new jobs for residents, and providing important spaces for neighbors to meet and socialize.
3. **Workforce Development:**
   1. Track and support legislative efforts related to funding and program design for a workforce training resulting from the AUMA.
   2. Track and support legislation related to Driver License amnesty programs.

# Homelessness and Supportive Housing

1. **Zoning**
   1. Support legislation that authorizes San Francisco or other cities with a large homeless population to alter building codes to make it easier to site homeless shelters, supportive housing and alternative housing such as tiny homes.
   2. Support legislation that encourage investments in homeless shelters and makes existing facilities available to homeless.
2. **Homeless Youth**
   1. Support state funding for transitional housing for youth ages 18-24.
3. **State Interagency Council on Homelessness** 
   1. Advocate for the inclusion of local officials from counties that have the largest homeless populations to serve on the council.
   2. Support efforts at state-level to fund a challenge grant to promote regional collaboration
4. **Funding and Finance**
   1. Support funding expansions for homeless services and affordable housing.
   2. Through administrative action, work with other stakeholders to streamline affordable housing financing to make housing easier, thus cheaper, to build.
   3. Explore whether nonprofits who are master leasing buildings for supportive housing can receive the California Tele-connect Fund and support legislation accordingly.

# Contact Information

**City and County of San Francisco**

**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
City Hall, Rm. 200  
San Francisco, CA 94102**

**Tel:** (415) 554-6141

http://sfgov.org/slc

