

# State Policy Priorities

## 2018 DEPARTMENT AGENDAS

*State Legislation Committee*



**City and County of San Francisco**

---

---

---

# Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| State Legislation Committee _____                       | 1  |
| City Attorney _____                                     | 2  |
| Department of Emergency Management _____                | 4  |
| Department of Human Resources _____                     | 5  |
| Department of Public Health _____                       | 7  |
| Department of Technology _____                          | 13 |
| Department of the Environment _____                     | 15 |
| Department on the Status of Women _____                 | 18 |
| Human Services Agency _____                             | 20 |
| Mayor’s Office of Housing & Community Development _____ | 27 |
| Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure _____   | 29 |
| Office of the City Administrator _____                  | 30 |
| Planning Department _____                               | 33 |
| Port of San Francisco _____                             | 41 |
| Public Defender _____                                   | 44 |
| Recreation & Parks Department _____                     | 45 |
| San Francisco International Airport _____               | 47 |
| San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency _____     | 48 |
| San Francisco Public Utilities Commission _____         | 51 |
| Office of Economic and Workforce Development _____      | 53 |
| Homelessness and Supportive Housing _____               | 56 |
| Contact Information _____                               | 58 |

## **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.

2018 State Legislation Committee Membership:

- Mayor's Office (Chair) – Kathryn Angotti
- President Breed – Andrea Bruss
- Supervisor Stefani – Dyanna Quizon
- City Attorney's Office – MaryJane Winslow
- Treasurer's Office – Amanda Fried
- Assessor's Office – Vacant
- Controller's Office – Michelle Allersma (James Whitaker)

---

## City Attorney

---

These Legislative Priorities are intended to serve as a general guide to state legislative policy that impacts the mission of the City Attorney's Office.

### 1. Litigation

Monitor legislation that impacts litigation where the City and County is involved. Support or oppose as necessary.

- **Liability:** Monitor legislation that would affect the liability of the City.
- **Expert Witness Fees:** Monitor legislation related to the recovery of expert witness fees.
- **Unfair Competition and Business Practice:** Protect San Francisco's statutory authority under Section 17200. Support bills that strengthen provisions of section 17200 et seq.
- **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.
- **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 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. Merchant's Precomplaint Education Program

Monitor legislation that may authorize merchants to offer individuals suspected of shoplifting a "precomplaint education program" in lieu of making or filing a report with law enforcement. Support, oppose or amend legislation as necessary to specify minimum standards that a program must satisfy in order to receive such protection.

### 4. Public Nuisance and Code Enforcement

Monitor legislation that impacts code enforcement and nuisance actions. Support or oppose as necessary changes to the California Building Code and Health and Safety Code, relating to the enforcement of safe housing and nuisance abatement.

### 5. 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.

### 6. Public Contracts

Monitor legislation relating to public works projects. Oppose or support as necessary.

- **Burden of Proof:** Monitor amendments to the Public Contracts Code that would place the burden of proof on a public entity under Section 1104.
- **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. 911 Wireless Caller Location.

**Require Cell Phone Carriers to Provide Location Data for Wireless Callers to 911.** 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.

### 2. Earthquake Readiness

**Provide Funding for Earthquake Early Warning System.** Support legislation and regulations that implement and expand the Earthquake Early Warning system in California.

**Pass an Earthquake Insurance Affordability Act.** Experts believe that a major earthquake will occur in California within the next 30 years. Despite these risks, less than ten percent of households are covered by earthquake insurance, with most consumers citing cost as the greatest barrier. Support legislation that would increase consumer access to earthquake insurance.

### 3. Interoperable Communications

**Support Creation of a Wireless Broadband Data Network for First Responders.** The Bay Area is working with the federal First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) and the State of California to create a dedicated, hardened, interoperable data network that will allow first responders to share text, pictures, video, and other data, both day-to-day and during a major disaster. Public safety agencies in San Francisco and around the Bay Area have already made significant investments in this initiative. Support State efforts to build on these investments.

## Department of Human Resources

---

### 1. Employee Relations

Monitor and take positions as necessary on bills 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

**A. 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.

**B. 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.

**C. 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.

**D. Seek ways to ensure the disability rating system is equitable:** Employees are compensated for injuries or illnesses that 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. Rather than inserting new language into the disability rating system that erodes objectivity, the City should work with stakeholders to find other avenues to address any inequities that arise.

**3. Employee Benefits Rights**

Monitor and take positions as necessary on bills 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.

**4. Seek clean-up language for AB 1008**

A bill aimed at preventing discrimination against people with criminal convictions—which may be revealed when the person applies for a job—and signed into law by the governor on Oct. 14, 2017. The City supports this bill, as the City’s own conviction history policy and program has won national awards for its effectiveness, and a Stanford University study noted the program basically eliminates this potential impediment to gainful employment. However, some of AB 1008’s language create challenges for the City. For example, the law now requires employers to make conditional offers of employment before checking background information. The City specifically does not extend conditional offers because of what that means in the civil service process. This, combined with other minor issues, creates the need for clean-up legislation.



## Department of Public Health

---

### 1. Health Care Reform and Medi-Cal

All key provisions of the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) are in place as of October 2017 and the legislation has continued to be successful in reducing the rates of uninsured. The San Francisco Department of Public Health (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 and enhance local efforts to offer premium support. As health care coverage expands, it is imperative that the State protects existing health and human services funding to counties to cover uncompensated care for the residually uninsured and resources related to increased casework and additional mandates or requirements on local agencies aimed at protecting the environment and promoting healthy and safe communities.

SFDPH is committed to increasing access to health care for all San Franciscans and will support state legislation that combats any actions on a federal level to roll back the significant coverage gains that have been made in California. We will monitor and take positions as needed on the State's proposals in response to federal ACA changes and to the Assembly Select Committee on Health Care Delivery Systems and Universal Coverage, including coverage expansion, the individual mandate and affordability, Covered California eligibility and financing, and Medi-Cal eligibility and financing. Special attention should be paid to policies that:

- **Increase Eligibility:** 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.
- **Increase Services:** Support policies and proposals that efficiently address the health needs for populations with complex, chronic conditions in the least restrictive settings and use case management approaches, including increased access to and funding for comprehensive home and community based services. Support proposals that enable individuals to easily determine their 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.
- **Ensure maintenance and enhancement of the safety net system:** 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.
- **Support Whole Person Care Pilot:** Enhance integration of mental health and substance use treatment, primary care, and social services to create seamless care and support of social determinants of health for patients. This may include supporting capacity to appropriately share

data across systems in order to improve coordination and efficiency of care; and payment reforms.

- **Support the Expansion of the Assisted Living Waiver:** The Assisted Living Waiver (ALW) is a Home and Community-Based Services (HCBS) waiver that was created by legislation that directed the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to develop and implement the project to test the efficacy of assisted living as a Medi-Cal benefit. It is currently a pilot project in 15 counties, including San Francisco. A key goal of the pilot project was to enable low-income, Medi-Cal eligible seniors and persons with disabilities who would otherwise require nursing facility services to remain in or relocate to community based care.
- **Increase Medi-Cal provider reimbursement 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).
- **Ensure Value-Based Payment Models advance Equity:** 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

Support legislative and budget proposals that enhance local entities' ability to provide safe and healthy housing and integrated services for homeless and at-risk populations that include increased access to behavioral and chronic healthcare services.

- Support healthy, safe and high-quality housing, particularly for low-income people. Housing quality has a significant impact on people's health and well-being. Issues such as the existence of lead, water leaks, poor ventilation, mold, dirty carpets, pest infestations, and location near toxic sources can result in numerous health problems such as developmental delays in children, skin disease, headaches, asthma, and other respiratory conditions.
- Support increases to funding and coordination to address the needs of people who are currently homeless, especially those most vulnerable and living on the streets and in places unfit for human habitation. Affordable and supportive housing are critical to preventing and ending homelessness and cost the same or less than shelter, incarceration, hospitalization and other crisis response interventions.

## 3. Mental Health and Substance Use

Support legislation and policies that ensure parity applies to mental health levels of care, such as treatment received in residential or intensive outpatient settings, substance use disorders and coverage through health plans and Medi-Cal.

- **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.

- **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.
  - **Support Mental Health Adolescent Services:** Support funding for adolescent mental health services and promote care and payment models that better integrate behavioral health in the pediatric primary care setting.
4. **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.
  - Support legislation that would require the State to carve out the inpatient psychiatric services and reimburse California Medi-Cal Mental Health Plan's on a risk-basis.
  - Support legislation that allows for the continued expansion on medical assisted treatment and preventive harm reduction programs such as naloxone distribution.
  - Support harm reduction services and monitor legislation for supervised consumption sites that reduce the chance for HIV transmission, prevent overdose deaths, and increase access to HIV and substance use treatment.
5. **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.
  - Support legislation that allows jails and prisons to treat opioid addictions with medical assisted therapy by allowing the administration of methadone or buprenorphine.
6. **Public Health**
- **Population Health & Prevention:** 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.
  - **Health Equity**

- 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 policies that enable systems and providers to reduce health inequities. As an example, the City supports infrastructure for the collection, analysis, and utilization of race, language, and ethnicity and disability data in monitoring and planning to reduce or eliminate disparities.
- Health in All Policies: Increase opportunities to include health implications into cross-sector policies outside the health arena to promote health, equity and sustainability.
- **Chronic Disease Prevention & Health Promotion:** Support legislation to increase funding and policies that fully integrate and address population based efforts for chronic disease prevention and health promotion, including efforts to reduce cancer, diabetes, obesity, oral health, heart disease and stroke. Support efforts to increase funding for community health, nutrition and physical activity services.
- **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.
- **Emergency Medical Services:** The Emergency Medical Services Agency directs plans, evaluates and regulates the San Francisco EMS System in collaboration with other city departments, private partners and community providers. The EMS System provides critical out-of-hospital acute medical care and/or transport to definitive care for those in need. The EMS Agency also mass gathering and special events planning to ensure community safety. Support efforts to adequately fund and enhance Emergency Medical Services (EMS) response systems and EMS disaster preparedness initiatives. Support legislation that authorizes a local EMS agency to approve transport appropriate individuals to alternative destinations, including sobering centers and other behavioral health centers.
- **Public Health Preparedness:** Natural and human-made disasters including the recent fires in California, heat wave in San Francisco, earthquakes, acts of terrorism, projections of more frequent and severe extreme weather events and emerging communicable diseases demonstrate the need to ensure that there is a coordinated system in place to respond to any hazard. 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.
- **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. Advocate for adult use cannabis legislation that includes investment in adolescent health from its revenues.
- **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.
- **Food Security:** Support legislative and budget proposals to enhance local entities' ability to provide healthy food for vulnerable residents.

**7. 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.

- Support policies and increased funding for climate change adaptation and resilience programs and allocations that promote equity, health, preparedness and participation and leadership in implementing solutions.
- Support policies and funding for programs that address the disproportionate environmental and health impacts of pollution and vehicular traffic through and within low-income communities.

**8. Immigration**

Support immigration legislation that promotes health and well-being, family unity, removes barriers to access health services, fosters civic engagement, and integration for immigrants.

**9. Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health**

- 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.
- 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.
- Monitor policy and programmatic changes proposed for the Child Health and Disability Prevention Program.
- 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.
- 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.

**10. Family Planning and Contraception**

Women now face challenges to their reproductive freedom in a way that we have not seen since the initial debates that led to the passage of Roe v Wade in 1973. Ensuring access to comprehensive, low cost, reproductive, prenatal and primary care – including family planning and abortion services, and case management will continue to be critical.

- Support access to comprehensive, low cost and readily accessible reproductive health services, including family planning, emergency contraception and abortion services.
- Support legislation that combats threats to federal reproductive health funding and restriction of services. Special attention should be paid to policies that 1) do not limit the range of options available and 2) ensure access to accurate, unbiased information about reproductive and sexual health for youth and adults

**11. 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. Support funding to automate and report data to prevent decreases in rate adjustments by CMS.

**12. 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. Support funding to help younger adults that live with long-term disabilities outside inpatient care.

**13. Palliative Care**

Support efforts that increase awareness of, provide funding for, and promote access to palliative care in all settings: coordinated early access, especially for persons of color; 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.

**14. 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 care.

**15. Health Information and Technology**

- 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. Specifically, support legislation that allows for better information sharing while balancing the privacy rights for people seeking treatment for substance use issues.
- Telemedicine can provide access to care for high-risk and vulnerable individuals who cannot access traditional services. Support clear policies for the integration of telemedicine into service provision, as well as new payment and service models that allow telemedicine expansion.

## Department of Technology

---

- 1. Wireless Facility Siting.** DT anticipates that the wireless industry will continue to seek legislation to expedite the deployment of wireless facilities in the public right of way referred to as “small cells”. In 2017 Governor Brown vetoed SB 649 that would have eviscerated the City’s control over the public right of way, impede land use regulation and capped the rates that the City can charge carriers. While the City encourages the deployment of technologies that will improve service to residents, the City should advocate for 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.
- 2. Protect Municipal Options for Investment in Broadband.** The City is currently considering options to expand high-speed broadband connectivity, 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.
- 3. Digital Inclusion.** Support additional grant funding for digital inclusion programs for target underserved populations, including seniors, non-English speakers and low-income households. Existing programs should be modified to be more efficient and effective. For example, the California Advanced Services Fund’s definition of “underserved” as currently defined makes the State’s public housing broadband grant program inoperable and has impaired the program for high-cost rural areas.
- 4. 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. 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. California needs to support its PSAPs so that they can take advantage of the new Federal standards and California residents have access to robust and reliable emergency services.
- 5. Privacy** Support State efforts to promote Internet privacy and to reinstate privacy protections lost at the Federal level. In particular AB 375 proposes to reinstate privacy obligations for broadband internet access service providers. AB 375 was approved by the Assembly, but did not receive a final vote in the Senate so that it may be raised again in 2018.
- 6. Facilitate FirstNet Deployment.** The State must notify the FCC whether it intends to “Opt Out” by December 28, 2017. FirstNet has selected AT&T to provide services. Either as part of the Federal or State effort, encourage California FirstNet – public safety wireless broadband initiative – 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. Energy

- A. Distributed Energy Resources (DER):** are defined as distribution-connected energy generation and storage resources, such as energy efficiency, energy storage, electric vehicles, renewable energy, and demand response technologies, and are supported by a wide-ranging suite of California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) policies. Integration of DERs aligns with the state's policy goals and promotes grid stability, local resiliency and job creation. Additionally, DER deployment prevents unnecessary transmission system investments.

Support policies that increase the integration of DERs at both the customer and distribution levels. Continue to monitor policies that reduce the value of net metering or implements charges that would deter on-site renewable energy generation or investment in energy efficiency, energy storage, renewables, and/or electric vehicles and their supporting charging infrastructure.

- B. Appliances:** Support policies that provide expansion of efficiency, Energy Star rated appliances.
- C. Zero Emission Vehicles:** Support growth in the use of zero-emission vehicles and low carbon fuels and designate revenues generated from greenhouse gas-related fees or taxes to local or municipal government entities; extending access to HOV lanes for EV's (scheduled to sunset in 2019); ensuring sufficient and dedicated EV rebate funding for low-income Californians
- D. 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 DER related ordinances.

Allow Public Goods Charge and other sources of funds to be used for the transition from fossil fuel based technologies, including systems powered by natural gas and petroleum, to systems that enable electrification of the built environment (e.g., zero net carbon).

- E. Energy Rebates:** Oppose legislation that decreases rebates and other incentives provided to DER projects, and pre-empts local government.
- F. Air Quality and Climate:** Support policies that provide financial incentives for DER projects in private sector development, including those that reduce criteria air contaminants and high global warming potential pollutants; support incentive programs that address thermal decarbonization (e.g., electric heat pump hot water heaters).

#### *Energy Bills to Track:*

- SB 700 (Wiener) – Energy Storage Initiative
- AB 1184 (Ting) – Zero Emission Vehicles
- SB 100 (De Leon)– 100% Renewable Portfolio Standard by 2045
- SB 71 (Wiener) – Requiring solar PV and thermal on new homes

- AB 1293 (Irwin) – Access to Local Utility Data on Grid Investments

## 2. Climate Change and Emissions Reductions

- A. 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.
- B. 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.
- C. Transportation Demand Management:** Support growth in the use of sustainable modes of transportation including transit, biking and other alternatives to single-occupancy autos; designate revenues generated from greenhouse gas-related fees or taxes to local or municipal government entities.
- D. Green Building:** Support policies that encourage adaptive reuse of existing structures, provide financial incentives for green building, and Distributed Energy Resources (DER) projects in public and private sector development, and promote green building practices that reduce toxics and indoor air contaminants.

## 3. Zero Waste

- A. 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.

### *Zero Waste Bills to Track:*

- AB 1036 (McCarty) - Improve permitting for organics facilities
- AB 1147 (Salas) –Disallows waste collection by non-authorized haulers
- AB 1288 (Eggmann) – Increase landfill tip fees and create generator charge to fund organics infrastructure
- AB (705) – Expanded Polystyrene Food Service Ware Ban
- AB 1659 (Low) – Plastic Food Service Ware Stewardship Program

## 4. Toxics

- A. **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.
- B. **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.
- C. **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.

*Toxics Bills to Track:*

- AB 444 (Ting) – State program for collection and disposal of home-generated pharmaceutical waste, including sharps
- AB 958 (Ting) - Prohibits perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances in fast food or take out service ware or packaging
- AB 1575 (Kalra) – Labeling of cosmetics for professional use
- SB 212 (Jackson) – Pharmaceutical waste stewardship program

## 5. Environmental Justice

- A. **Food Access:** Support policies that increase the ability of low-income communities to access locally grown, fresh, and organic produce.
- B. **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).
- C. **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

- A. **Land Access & Funding:** 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 publicly 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. Support SCR 78 (Jackson) to enact Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).** 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, SCR 78 would implement the principles of CEDAW, the UN Women’s Rights Treaty, at the state level by committing California to identify and address discrimination against women and girls.

- 2. 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, through 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.

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. Support SB 270 (Atkins) Training for Hotel Staff on Human Trafficking Recognition and Reporting.** Human trafficking is a global criminal enterprise with profits estimated in the tens of billions of dollars annually. More cases are reported in California than any other state with 1,300 cases reported to the National Human Trafficking Hotline in 2016, and the FBI has identified the Bay Area as an area with some of the most human trafficking. Human trafficking is a hidden crime as victims rarely come forward to seek help because of language barriers, fear of the traffickers, and/or fear of law enforcement. AB 260 (Santiago, 2017) amended California law to include hotels and motels along with truck stops, bars, health facilities, massage parlors, and transit centers, to post notices encouraging victims of human trafficking and those who suspect human trafficking to contact one of several hotlines to access help and services.

The San Francisco Mayor’s Task Force on Anti-Human Trafficking has already developed online training with Stanford for employees in hospitality industry and worked in partnership with the Hotel Council to train hotel staff in the City. SB 270 would require training for staff at hotels, motels, and other lodging facilities in recognizing the signs of human trafficking and how to report those signs to the appropriate law enforcement agency.

4. **Support measures to remove firearms from domestic violence offenders.** Per the Bureau of Justice statistics, nearly three women are murdered every day in the U.S. by current or former romantic partners. Current law prohibits a person from owning a gun if they have been convicted of domestic violence or they have a permanent restraining order against them. Funding is needed for counties to better track domestic violence offenders (in criminal cases and in civil restraining order cases) who have access to weapons and remove firearms from their possession.
  
5. **Support Bill to 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. Bills have been introduced in past years, but have failed to pass both houses, that would extend the 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. We would support any measures to increase women's economic opportunity by ending gender-based pricing.

## Human Services Agency

---

### SOCIAL SAFETY NET

#### Health Care Reform and Medi-Cal

1. **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.
  - Oppose efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act, including provisions terminating eligibility and financing of Medicaid expansion and repealing insurance premium subsidies for lower to moderate income individuals.
  - Oppose Affordable Care Act “repeal and replace” provisions that would shift federal costs of ACA or other current health care financing to state and/or county governments.
2. **Protect Medicaid funding:** Work with the California Congressional Delegation and other state and national leaders to fight efforts to reduce or block grant federal funding for Medicaid administration or benefits, including efforts to place a per-capita cap on funding or limiting the ability of states to leverage funds through assessments on providers.
3. **Eligibility and Enrollment:**
  - **Medi-Cal County Administration Funding and Budget Methodology:** As a result of ACA’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. The state has promised the developed of an updated methodology for the past few years. The 2017-18 Budget Act represents the second year of a two-year agreement for increased funding for county administration of the Medi-Cal program. The agreement included trailer bill language requiring the Administration to work with the California Welfare Director’s Association (CWDA) and labor to develop a new budget methodology for county administration. As a first priority, the State must adopt a new budgeting methodology that fully funds county costs for administering Medi-Cal eligibility and enrollment.
  - **Database integration:** 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.
  - **Streamline eligibility processes:** 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.).
  - **Continue to support SB 222 (Hernandez) – Suspension of Medi-Cal Eligibility for Inmates:** Current law allows county human services agencies to suspend, rather than terminate, eligibility for inmates in public institutions for a period of up to 12 months. In order to allow for greater

continuity of care when inmates are released, and to conform with federal guidance issued since California's law was enacted, SB 222 would allow for the suspension of eligibility for an indefinite length of time.

#### 4. CalWORKs:

- **Support CWDA's Advocacy Efforts to Protect CalWORKs Single Allocation Funding:** The 2017-18 Budget Act continued a trend of declining funding for the CalWORKs Single Allocation, driven primarily by continuing caseload declines due to the improved economy. The additional caseload declines originally proposed in the 2017 May Revision would have resulted in a total estimated cut to the Single Allocation of about \$248 million. However, the Legislative budget package restored \$108.9 million to the Single Allocation, reducing the cut to about \$139 million or 7.5 percent compared to the 2016-17 allocation. The Legislature also adopted trailer bill language proposed by CWDA that requires the Administration to work with counties, and in consultation with other stakeholders, to revise the budgeting methodology for the Single Allocation to mitigate the funding swings due to caseload changes and ensure that adequate resources are provided for counties to effectively deliver services. We strongly support CWDA's advocacy for a funding methodology and assumptions that enable counties to properly administer the CalWORKs program on the state's behalf, including county administration, services and child care.
- **Co-Sponsor legislation to enable CalWORKs sponsored non-citizens to receive benefits beyond one year:** When a sponsored noncitizen applies for public benefits, the welfare agency must treat both the income and resources of their sponsor as available to them, a process known as "sponsor deeming." In cases where a sponsored noncitizen reports that their sponsor is unable to support them, we may evaluate their financial conditions and issue an indigence exemption to sponsor deeming, which allows the agency to certify the noncitizen's case even without income information from their sponsor. Determinations of indigence are valid for 12 months. In CalFresh, these determinations are renewable annually without restriction. However, in CalWORKs, there is no such provision for renewal, making sponsored non-citizens ineligible for CalWORKs after one year. This proposal would align the CalWORKs sponsor deeming provisions with those used for CalFresh so that sponsored immigrants can continue to receive CalWORKs beyond one year.
- **Expand CalWORKs Homeless Services Program.**
  - A. **Funding:** 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. We support additional funding in the Budget Year to continue growing the CalWORKs rapid rehousing program.
  - B. **Allow for shared housing in the CalWORKs Housing Support Program:** State law requires CalWORKs homeless recipients requesting CalWORKs permanent housing assistance to secure housing with a commercial establishment or a person in the business of renting. With a lack of affordable housing units for our CalWORKs recipients throughout the state of California, shared housing would be an ideal solution for many. Shared housing would allow the roughly 11,000 CalWORKs homeless households search of permanent housing a *greater opportunity to secure affordable housing for their families.*

- **Support legislation to provide graduation bonuses for teenage CalWORKs students who obtain a High School Diploma/equivalent:** In 2016, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services implemented the Education Support Payment (ESP) Program to encourage CalWORKs teens to obtain their high school diploma or equivalency. ESP provides a one-time cash bonus of \$500 for CalWORKs youth who provide proof of graduation and complete a Money Management class. Los Angeles County is sponsoring legislation to expand the pilot; under the proposal, CalWORKs youth, age 16-19 years old could receive a one-time educational achievement bonus of \$500 upon graduation to incentivize an increase in the number of CalWORKs youth who complete their high school education. The program would be a County option.
- **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.

#### 5. Workforce Development:

- **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.
- *Anything else?*

#### 6. CalFresh & Nutrition Services: Support state efforts to increase the CalFresh uptake rate. Specifically, San Francisco supports the following:

- **SB 708 (Skinner), 2-year bill CCSF supported last year:** SB 708 calls for the California Department of Social Services to seek authority from the USDA to pre-enroll eligible Californians into CalFresh prior to release from prison or jail and prescribes processes for counties to implement the waiver. The bill also enables individuals apply to get a replacement social security card and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) while awaiting release. An estimated 80 percent of Californians released from prison or jail are low-income, meaning they are likely eligible for programs such as CalFresh.
- **Efforts to improve SNAP/CalFresh Benefits Access for Former Foster Youth and Non-Minor Dependents in the foster care system.** Specifically, support legislation requiring that the California Department of Social Services request a federal waiver to allow former foster youth and current non-minor dependent foster youth to be categorically eligible for a SNAP/CalFresh. Youth that were in foster care at age 18 are eligible for federal Medicaid benefits, until age 26 regardless of income. However the same does not apply in regards to federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)/CalFresh benefits.
- **Enrollment of MAGI Medi-Cal beneficiaries into CalFresh** without a separate application.



- **Efforts to maximize the use of technology** to make the CalFresh program more efficient, accessible, and customer friendly.

## CHILD WELFARE

1. **Support any budget or legislative proposal that advances creative placement solutions for foster care children with very high needs** (e.g. severe behavioral health issues, chronic run-aways, and/or youth who are victims of Commercial Sexual Exploitation). Like counties across the state, San Francisco is challenged to find foster care placement options that will accept these youth, who represent a very small percentage of children in our foster care system but consume disproportional resources.
2. **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. For successful implementation of 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.
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.

## OLDER ADULT AND DISABILITY SERVICES

### 1. Housing

- **“Home Safe”:** **Housing Support for Seniors and Dependent adults who have been victims of abuse or neglect:** Support the Home Safe proposal which would fund a \$15m pilot program to stabilize and provide short-term housing supports to Adult Protective Services clients who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. The California Welfare Directors Association co-sponsored this legislation last year, which received widespread support but did not make it into the Senate side’s final budget.

### 2. In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS):

- **Advocate for a funding methodology and assumptions that enable counties to properly administer the IHSS program on the state’s behalf.** The 2017-18 State Budget Act contained numerous changes to the funding structure for the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program. This included significant changes to funding for both services and county administration of the program. Specifically, under the terms of the new County IHSS maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement adopted as part of the budget act, the amount of state General Fund provided for county and public authority administration will be capped at the amount appropriated each year in the Budget Act. If a county spends more than the combined administration portion of its IHSS MOE and state General Fund allocation, then the additional expenditures will be county-only funds and will not count toward the county’s IHSS MOE. As part of the preparation for the 2018-19 budget, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) was tasked with working with CSAC, the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) and the state Department of Finance (DOF) to examine the workload and budget assumptions related to IHSS administration for 2017-

18 and 2018-19. CWDA staff have participated in these discussions in the intervening months and may need county support and involvement as the discussions move forward.

- **Advocate for an increase in funding for the IHSS Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) maintenance and operations to address the change request backlog and county priorities.** Support a new governance process for change requests and how they are prioritized. Support legislation that requires all new legislatively-required CMIPS changes to be fully funded outside of the maintenance and operations budget.
  - **Oppose proposals that restrict eligibility and service levels in the IHSS program.**
  - **Support legislation to require the California Department of Social Services to translate** all state-provided materials used by IHSS independent providers into the statewide threshold languages: English, Spanish, Armenian, and Chinese.
- 3. 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:
- Support funding for Linkages, Respite, Alzheimer's Day Resource Centers, Brown Bag food program, Senior Companion and Ombudsman.
  - 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.
  - Support proposals to strengthen and increase services for persons with Alzheimer's and other dementias, and strengthen and increase services for caregivers.
  - Support efforts to develop and implement a system of Community Care Integration patient navigators to assist consumers in the process of integration.
  - Support efforts and proposals to enhance culturally sensitive services to the varied ethnic communities of CA.
  - Support efforts to acknowledge and enhance services to the LGBT seniors, people with HIV including long term survivors of HIV.

**D. Self-Sufficiency for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities:**

- **Income Support:** Support policy and/or budget proposals to permanently reinstate the cost-of-living adjustment for the Aged, Blind and Disabled recipients of State Supplementary Program (state match) and Supplemental Security Income (federal).
- **California Senior Legislature:** 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 which has not been sustainable.

- **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.

## EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION

To create and support a quality early care and education system, OECE advocates for the following issues:

- **Investments and strategies that increase the availability, accessibility and affordability of high quality early care and education services for all children. OECE supports proposals that:**
  - Increase investments for infant and toddler care and other high need populations
  - Raise reimbursement rates to levels that meet the true cost of operating quality programs by region
  - Provide adequate funding to serve all eligible children from low-income families in need of child care subsidies, regardless of immigration status
  - Ensure family eligibility that promotes continuity of care and assistance for children and families.
  - Update family entry and exit income eligibility levels annually to the most current California State Median Income (SMI) for access to subsidized early care and education programs
  - Ensure a fair and reasonable family fee schedule that is updated annually and is less than 10% of a family's annual income
- **A highly qualified professional workforce responsible for the care and education of our diverse populations of children that engages parents as partners in their children's optimal growth and development. OECE supports proposals that:**
  - Recruit, retain and support a diverse, well-trained, well-educated, and well-compensated early care and education professional workforce
  - Expand entry into higher education with the support of stipends, grant funds and loan forgiveness programs
  - Establish ECE compensation levels on parity with TK-12 educators
  - Create access to high quality, coordinated educational and professional development systems that address cultural, linguistic, and literacy needs on a continuum from entry-level through degree attainment.

- **Development of high quality learning environments and facilities that fully address the demand for early care and education services. OECE supports proposals that:**
  - Provide technical assistance, professional development, training and coaching that remove barriers and support programs in reaching higher QRIS tiers
  - Advocate for increased state funding to grow and sustain QRIS implementation
  - Promote new policies and policy amendments that support the development of early care and education facilities, including the integration of early care and education in land use, housing, transportation, and economic, workforce and community development.

## 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.
1. **Affordable Housing Production.** The 2018 state legislative priorities reflect MOHCD's commitment to meeting Mayor Lee's goal to produce at least 10,000 affordable housing units by 2020.
    - A. **Ellis Act Reform:** Amend the Ellis Act to prevent speculative evictions.
    - B. **Widening the Band of Affordability:** In conjunction with support of income averaging of federal tax credits, support expansion and income averaging for state tax credits.
    - C. **Low- and Moderate-Income Programs:** Support one-year general fund allocation for Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) until SB2 and SB3 funds become available, as well as all other funding enhancing measures.
    - D. **Innovative Housing Models:** Support efforts to create tax or other financial incentives for innovative affordable housing ownership models and for low and moderate income housing.
  2. **Workforce Housing Production.** MOHCD is committed to expanding the range of households served by our programs. In addition to seeking tax credits for housing projects that offer units for households earning up to 80% AMI, it is a priority to develop innovative models to support and finance workforce housing, including but not limited to housing for teachers on public sites and on parcels owned by the San Francisco Unified School District.
    - A. **Welfare Tax Exemption for Moderate-Income Units:** Amend the Revenue and Tax Code Section 214 to allow moderate-income units up to 120% AMI to receive welfare tax exemption.
  3. **Inclusionary Housing and Neighborhood Stabilization.**
    - A. **Reinforce San Francisco's Inclusionary Housing Policies:** Support the amendment of the California Density Bonus Law so that it reinforces San Francisco's inclusionary housing policies. Currently under state law, below market rate ownership units are structured in the Limited Equity model, and are therefore affordable only for the first sale. Affordable rental units developed under the program are limited in their term of affordability. This differs from the City's Inclusionary Housing program, in that our

local program restricts Inclusionary Housing units, both rental and ownership units, as affordable for the life of the project. This provides more certainty for the future of the City's affordable housing stock.

- B. BMR Ownership and HOA Dues:** Support legislation that mitigates risk to BMR homeowners from rising HOA dues and protect affordability at turnover.

## 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. **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.
3. **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:
  - A. Support legislation and expansion of existing grant programs that distribute state housing and infrastructure funds to local jurisdictions based upon population and poverty levels.
  - B. Support proposals that promote equity by accelerating or increasing spending on infrastructure projects in high poverty and unemployment areas and infill locations near transit.
  - C. Support measures that promote economic incentives for business creation, attraction, and retention in high poverty and unemployment areas and infill locations near transit.

## Office of the City Administrator

---

1. **Capital Plan Funding.** Identify funding opportunities for:
  - A. Transportation
  - B. Seawall
  - C. Large Scale Capital Projects
  - D. Rebuilding state courthouses, local courthouse construction or District Attorney and probation facilities.
2. **Animal Care & Control.** Track legislation that may have unforeseen impacts on sheltering practices, and support legislation that improves live release rates.
3. **Earthquake Safety.** Track legislation that would:
  - A. Create a state seismic loan fund using the San Francisco model created by the Earthquake Safety Improvement Plan;
  - B. Provide funding to cover earthquake mitigation;
  - C. Provide funding for an early earthquake warning system;
  - D. Provide tax incentives for seismic retrofits;
  - E. Establish mandatory retrofit programs; or,
  - F. Establish a statewide Lifelines Council based on the San Francisco model.
4. **Mayor's Office of Disability.** Track State response to HR 620 <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/620>. This legislation, which would place the onus for "proving" the need for disability access back on the individual with a disability, is contrary to the intent of the ADA as anti-discrimination legislation and is strongly opposed by the disability community. Track legislation that would:
  - A. Mandatory disclosure of disability data by the CPUC of Transportation Network Companies ridership. Our City Attorney's Office filed a public records request (via MTA) with refusal (and/or lack of cooperation) from CPUC to date. The argument here is that we cannot figure out how to address the accessibility needs of riders with disabilities as a city without the data first; or
  - B. Mandating accessibility of a certain percentage of TNC and or/taxi vehicles within a fleet serving an area. Although this mandate would be extremely unlikely (i.e., there is question as to whether or not TNCs and some taxis are out of compliance, since they are in most cases, technically, private vehicles), this is a huge unmet need (especially in San Francisco) and needs as much advocacy as possible.
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. **Office of Contract Administration.** Track legislation that would:
  - A. Effect government procurement generally
  - B. Impact the State's small and disadvantaged business program(s)
7. **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. Track start and growth of California Sanctuary status in connection with San Francisco's policy.
8. **Short Term Rentals.** Track legislation on the subject of short term rentals.



9. **Office of the Chief Medical Examiner.** Track legislation that adjusts fees, reporting deadlines or operational requirements for the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner.
10. **Office of the County Clerk.** Track legislation that adjusts fees, reporting deadlines or operational requirements for the Office of the County Clerk.
11. **Fleet Management.** Track legislation that impacts the City's fleet or electric vehicles generally and any legislation regarding clean diesel.
12. **Entertainment Commission.** Track legislation that would impact local nightlife control, ABC licensing, and extended nightlife hours (SB384)
13. **Treasure Island Development Program**

**A. 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.

**B. 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.

14. **Office of Cannabis.** Track legislation related to new state regulations and if it these regulations would affect local efforts.
15. **Committee on Information Technology.** Track legislation related to:
  - A. Risk Management and Privacy
  - B. Recreational & Commercial Drones
  - C. Digital Divide
16. **Transfer of Property.** Working with the State Department of Finance on the transfer of two properties (Yerba Buena Gardens and the Fillmore Heritage Center) currently under the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (successor agency to the Redevelopment Agency).

## Planning Department

---

The San Francisco Planning Department's annual legislative program guides planning-related advocacy efforts for the City and County of San Francisco, with the Bay Area regional government organizations, with the California State government, and with the federal government. This strategic document details eight broad policy goals that the Department would like to see action on at the State level in upcoming legislative session. The following priorities are based on last year's successes and our understanding of opportunities in this second year of the two-year State cycle.

### Immediate Legislative Priorities

1. Suggest technical clarifications to SB 35.
2. Support regional coordination
3. Update the RHNA formula and process
4. Eliminate the requirement for a public hearing by the legislative body to qualify for the Sustainable Communities Strategy statutory exemption under CEQA
5. Increase child care opportunities in urban areas

### Longer-Term Legislative Priorities

1. Build more affordable housing
2. Improve access to transportation data and support multi-modal streets
3. Improve local control over public realm and street design
4. Support regional coordination and funding to respond to climate change and sea level rise
5. Simplify and modernize the CEQA review process

These legislative actions align with the Department's vision and mission, and support the overall goals and objectives of the General Plan.

**Planning Department Vision:** Making San Francisco the world's most livable urban place—environmentally, economically, socially, and culturally.

**Planning Department 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.

### Immediate Legislative Priorities for 2017-2018

#### 1. Work on technical clarifications to SB 35

SB35 includes vague parking language that needs to be clarified. The Department will work with the Mayor's Office, City Attorney, OCII and MOHCD on a list of other desired clarifications.

2. **Support meaningful, coordinated regional planning that links housing/jobs growth in transit rich areas.** Under the Bay Area's Sustainable Growth Strategy (Plan Bay Area), there are few rewards or consequences for local compliance. This undermines the Plan's efficacy and any hope of ameliorating regional affordability. Improving local affordability depends on region-wide housing production. Jurisdictions that act in good faith to produce their fair share of housing are undermined by other cities' inaction or outright defiance without consequence. Passage of Assembly member David Chiu's AB 73 resulted in new funds that may support regional coordination. Still, there are additional opportunities.
  - A. **Remove disincentives for communities to increase zoning capacity and raise height limits for housing.** Allow cities to exempt specific areas or parcels from the State Density Bonus law if a rezoning adopted after Jan 1, 2018 increases housing capacity by greater than 35%, includes inclusionary housing requirements, and offers streamlined entitlement approvals (e.g., via AB 73). The existing SDB law grants up to 35% bonus above height and bulk limits, which undermines the appetite and trust of communities to increase density and raise height limits. Under current SDB, the newly-granted higher height could become the new "base" by which developers get still *additional* 35% volume.
  - B. **Create an appeals body to enforce RHNA compliance.** Cities that do not update their Housing Element and zoning to comply with RHNA should face consequences. A developer should be able to appeal to a regional or state body (such as the State's Department of Housing and Community Development). Noncompliance could result in the loss of funding sources such as the local portion of the gas tax, 1% portion of the sales and use tax, or other revenue sources that are not explicitly local. In Washington state, the severe consequences of noncompliance has moved local governments to meet targets. In several decades, only one community in has actually been sanctioned with loss of revenues.
  - C. **Strengthen SB 375 by creating state-level financial consequences** for local non-compliance with the local SCS, similar to the structure of Washington State's Growth Management system.
  - D. **Allow local jurisdictions to tier environmental review of SCS-compliant plans** and rezoning under EIRs for the regional SCS's.
  - E. **Allow the determination of environmental superiority under CEQA for local plans that conform to the regional SCS.** Rezoning and plans that align with the regional SCS by increasing development capacity in transit-served urban infill locations are the environmentally superior alternative to No Project or Reduced Project alternatives. Yet under CEQA, less development is always environmentally superior. CEQA does not consider the regional consequences of shifting development pressures to less transit-served and non-infill locations.
  - F. **Increase the pool of available transportation funding that can be regionally conditioned on housing performance at the local level.** Support efforts for increasing long-term funding for infrastructure, especially infrastructure that supports sustainable and equitable growth.
  - G. **Give transit agencies zoning and entitlement authority over development adjacent to transit stations when cities under-zone.** Local jurisdictions routinely under-zone and reject or downsize appropriate development near transit stations, including on land owned by transit agencies. Where local jurisdictions don't meet state-established minimum density, use, and parking standards adjacent to transit stations for fixed rail and Bus Rapid Transit, transit agencies

should be able to override local zoning on agency-owned land, and potentially on other land as well.

- H. Maintain Existing Capacity for Taxes and Impact Fees.** Oppose legislation that eliminates or restricts cities' taxing authority over development; weakens existing Government Code section 66000 fee authority; or redefines any development tax, condition or other monetary change as development fees.
- 3. Fix the methodology for the State mandated RHNA calculations.** This year both Assembly Member Chiu and Senator Wiener have expressed interest in revising the dated RHNA methodology. While many fixes are possible, we suggest three.
- A. Include existing housing shortages.** The existing RHNA methodology requires that regional governments develop targets for *new* growth. However, these targets 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 paying more than half their income towards rent. In addition, the current RHNA formula fails to fully account for high wage job growth in places like the Bay Area. **Change State law to require that unmet portions of targets rollover into the next period, and specifically that any unmet moderate income units (80-120) rollover into the moderate target.**
- B. Increase sophistication of calculation and reduce political influence.** RHNA involves significant iterative changes between local governments and COGs. While some adjustments reflect the local jurisdiction's zoning, other changes reflect political desires to reduce jurisdictions' future housing allotment. **Change State law to enable reductions in RHNA allocations when the regional body finds them to be objective and quantifiable.**
- C. Address the impacts of high income growth on housing prices.** RHNA currently sets future housing needs based on past trends in population growth and household formation. When high income households grow significantly, their incomes drive up housing prices faster than inflation and limit opportunities for lower income households. Under RHNA, housing prices driven up by higher incomes reduces population growth and household formation and actually results in lower projected future need. An alternative developed by San Francisco's Chief Economist would **set RHNA goals to account for income growth.** The result in higher income regions like the Bay Area would be more stable housing prices and larger RHNA goals.
- 4. Modify the Sustainable Communities Strategy statutory exemption under CEQA to eliminate the requirement for conducting a public hearing by the legislative body.** Public Resources Code Section 21155.1 provides for a statutory exemption for residential transit priority projects that are consistent with a Sustainable Communities Strategy. To qualify for the exemption, projects must meet affordability criteria, density, proximity to transit, and other factors. The legislative body must conduct a public hearing and find that the project satisfies the exemption criteria. This hearing requirement is a significant procedural burden for projects that otherwise would not require approval by the legislative body, in addition to lengthening the CEQA review process. The hearing would not change the physical environmental effects of a transit priority project analyzed under CEQA. Further, statutory exemptions can be appealed to the legislative body, so members of the public who object to the application of this statutory exemption to a particular project would have an opportunity to raise their concerns to the legislative body on appeal.
- 5. Increase child care opportunities in urban areas.** Amend the State child care licensing requirements to allow facilities to more easily operate in an urban context. In San Francisco,

compliance with State outdoor activity space requirements is the largest single impediment to meeting the demand for child care in San Francisco. Changes to State law would: allow the open space requirements for dense, urban cities to be satisfied through nearby, existing open spaces such as parks and playground; allow administrative, rather than discretionary, approval for a waiver for outdoor space requirements; decrease required outdoor square footage for infants.

### Long-Range Legislative Priorities

#### 1. Build more affordable housing.

**A. Fund affordable housing.** The State and Federal government are obligated to assist localities with funding for critical needs.

1. **Reform Prop. 13 for Luxury Residential Properties.** High value properties should not be subject to Prop. 13 limitations. Ideally, the value would be locally specific and fluctuate with economic trends. For example, properties valued at four times the local median home value would be exempt from Prop 13 limitations.
2. **Reform Prop. 13 to lower the bar for new taxes.** Lower the requirement from a 2/3 vote of the legislature to 55%.
3. **Reduce the vote threshold for local bonds to 55% for affordable housing, transportation, and parks.** Recognize the importance of these
4. **Eliminate the mortgage interest deduction for second homes and higher value homes.** Use tax revenue saved from elimination of the mortgage interest deduction for second homes and on values above a reasonable threshold to fund affordable housing and/or to provide a renter tax credit. This would help to direct tax benefits away from higher income home owners to low income renters most in need.
5. **Enact a replacement for redevelopment focused on housing production** by providing a tax increment funding source for new residential development and allow cities to assemble sites for infill housing.
6. **Create a tax to reduce speculation and vacancy 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.

#### B. Return regulatory authority of existing housing stock to local governments.

1. The Ellis Act (1985) prevents the City from restricting the removal of rentals from the city's housing stock. With a growing housing affordability crisis statewide it is hard to justify a law that allows owners to "go out of business" of renting property. Owners already have a path to leave the rental business: sale of the rental property. **Ending Ellis provisions would discourage speculative purchase and conversion of rental housing to TICs, condos, or short-term rentals.**

2. The Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (1995) prevents the City from placing rent control on new construction, condos, TICs, or single family homes. While the recently adopted “Palmer Fix” re-affirmed the ability of local government to create new inclusionary units, other forms of rent-control housing are still limited by Costa Hawkins. **The State should give cities local control over regulation of rents in vacant units and the ability to regulate TICs in the same manner that condo conversions are regulated.** Such regulation should always be paired with the provision that does not preclude the financial feasibility of residential development or necessary upkeep of residential properties.
  3. **Create a right of first refusal for rent-controlled or rent stabilized rental housing.** This would allow local governments and qualified nonprofit entities to match a purchase price.
- C. Provides financial support and incentives for affordable housing for low- and moderate-income residents.**
1. Expand the welfare property tax exemption to units deed-restricted to 80-120% of AMI. Currently, units for low income households earning up to 80% of AMI in buildings managed by nonprofits qualify for the welfare exemption from property taxes. This is similar to other nonprofit, community serving uses such as educational institutions or hospitals. Applying the welfare property tax exemption to units for 120% of AMI would make the provision of moderate income units more financially feasible.
  2. **Create incentives or penalties to encourage properties owners of underutilized parcels to redevelop as housing.** This could consist of Prop 13 reform to tax commercial land based on value rather than assessed improvements or a capital gains tax break if land or commercial properties are sold to create housing.
- 2. Improve access to transportation data and support multi-modal streets.**
- A. Seek sponsor for Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) 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 continue to advance AB 342 (Chiu), which would authorize a pilot program to test ASE on San Francisco’s most dangerous streets in support of the City’s Vision Zero goal.
  - B. Improve conditions for multi-modal users.** The SFMTA and the Planning Department will 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.
  - C. Allow access to TNC data.** Without accurate data on the ride share services, the City cannot plan for traffic management or understand the impacts of new jobs and housing. Enactment of SB 182 removes one tool the City had to gather data. The City will continue pursuing the data via CPUC filings and other opportunities that arise.
  - D. Change State law to allow local jurisdictions to charge TNC user fees.** Per rider fees for TNC users would generate revenue to mitigate the impacts that TNCs have on our roads and transit systems.

- E. Support High Speed Rail while encouraging livable communities.** The City supports High Speed Rail in San Francisco, but it must be compatible with high-density urban living. The State should mandate that the California High Speed Rail Authority modify the proposed design to:
- Accommodate a below-grade crossing at the intersections of 16<sup>th</sup> Street and Mission Bay Drive to maintain neighborhood access and complete street design.
  - Locate the maintenance facility so that it does not preclude much needed existing and future transit service and infrastructure.
- 3. Improve local control over public realm and street design**
- A. Change State Public Utilities Code to grant municipalities discretion over the location and urban design of surface mounted facilities (SMF) in the right of way (ROW).** State law (California Public Utilities Code Sections 5885 and 7901) 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. The state law does not explicitly give municipalities the authority 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 standards.
- B. Local government jurisdiction over well-designed Small Cells (wireless facilities) within ROWs should not be preempted by State law.** As wireless carriers expand high-speed data with more cell antennas in residential neighborhoods and as wireline (landline) carriers replace copper wire telephone systems, any changes to State law should ensure local government ability to review design and placement. Cities want to protect aesthetics, pedestrian safety, neighborhood character, and noise. For the past several years, carriers have supported legislation limiting local control—AB 2788 and AB 2395 during the 2014-15 State legislative session, and SB 649 during the 2016-17 State legislative session. We anticipate that wireless providers will try to revive these bills soon.
- C. Change State Public Utilities Code to require utilities to replace streetscape materials and design in-kind when constructing or repairing their facilities in the ROW.** Utilities are not required to replace sidewalks and roadways with existing materials. Where sidewalks and public plazas are built with special pavement and landscaping, utilities can tear up these improvements and replace their disrupted areas with materials that do not match. This practice degrades investment made by the community and the City.
- 4. Support regional coordination, streamlined permitting for sea level rise protection projects, and increased funding to increase resiliency in response 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 unanimously adopted 2015 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. Ensuring vital assets are protected requires increased coordination and investment.
- 5. Simplify and modernize CEQA.** Support legislative efforts to simplify and modernize the CEQA review process for projects and plans that are consistent with the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy, including transit-oriented development, infill development, and affordable housing. Support efforts to include the addition of public transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit-oriented development (TOD) projects to the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy as appropriate



- A. 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 decades ago when Neg Decs were often little more than “bare checklists” with limited evidentiary support. Today, Neg Decs are 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.
- B. 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 for additional comment. This leads to recirculation cycles and 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, improve the final document, and keep projects on schedule. Specifically, opportunities to adjust or add alternatives without recirculation would improve the ability of lead agencies to respond to input received during the comment period.
- C. 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 repeatedly and unsuccessfully sued with each update to our Housing Element; updates that are required by State law. The City spends substantial resources defending these lawsuits for non-physical policy plans. Any subsequent physical project would result in CEQA review, so the State should offer a specific exemption for these policy plans.
- D. 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 the 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 articulated bus), etc. An exemption could adopt the definition of minor transit service changes in the SFMTA Title VI document.
- E. Modify the Class 32 infill exemption to make it applicable in limited circumstances for projects that do not comply with the existing zoning.** 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 10,000 square feet of space; when the project is consistent with the use allowed in the applicable zoning district (but may be denser or taller than the zoning allows).
- F. Oppose Efforts to Undermine Senate Bill 743 Provisions.** California Senate Bill 743, effective September 2013, directed the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) 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 2013, OPR has conducted outreach and refined its proposal. 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. State IFD Funding for the Seawall Resiliency Project and Sea Level Rise

Port staff, in consultation with staff from the Office of Mayor Edwin Lee and the City's state advocate (Shaw/Yoder/Antwih), is investigating potential amendments to state law that would allow the Port to capture the State of California's share of tax increment growth generated from Port property ("State's Share of Tax Increment") to fund the Seawall Resiliency Project and other improvements to Port property to address sea level rise.

The Seawall Finance Working Group recommended that the Port seek legislation to capture the State's Share of Tax Increment to fund the Seawall Resiliency Project in its July 2017 report<sup>1</sup>. The Seawall Finance Working Group estimated that the legislation would generate approximately \$50 million within the next 10 years for Phase I of the project, with an additional \$50 million estimated for Phase II.

Staff will investigate two potential avenues to obtain the State's Share of Tax Increment, as follows:

- **Pursue Statewide legislation** allowing all developed communities facing flood risk from sea level rise or seismically-vulnerable liquefaction zones to capture the State's Share of Tax Increment to fund seismic and sea level rise improvements.
- **Amend the Port's Infrastructure Financing District legislation** (SB 1085, 2005, Senator Migden<sup>2</sup>) to enable the Port to use the State's Share of Tax Increment from new development on Port property to fund the Seawall Resiliency Project or other sea level rise improvements to Port property. This legislation would be a **District bill** very similar to AB 1199 (Chapter 664 of the Statutes of 2010, Assemblymember Ammiano), which allows the Port to capture the State's Share of Tax Increment to fund improvements to Pier 70.

### 2. Cap and Trade appropriations for the Seawall Resiliency Project and Sea Level Rise

The City's state advocate has begun to explore an alternative, supplementary funding source; namely, that some amount of one-time or ongoing Cap and Trade funds be dedicated to climate resiliency projects. Passage of AB 398 (E. Garcia) in 2017 not only extended the State's Cap and Trade regulation to 2031, it also broadened the eligible expenditures of auction proceeds generated under the Cap and Trade program. Most importantly for the Port, Cap and Trade funds can now be spent on climate change adaptation and resiliency projects (formerly limited to mitigation projects). California most recent Cap and Trade auction resulted in \$800 million in revenue; even a small percentage allocation to shoreline resiliency could create a significant funding stream for projects like the Seawall Resiliency Project.

### 3. SB5

Senate Bill 5 (Senate Pro-Tem De Leon) was proposed in the 2017 legislative session to create a \$4 billion dollar funding source for state and local parks, clean water and drought relief projects, coastal protection and flood protection and will be submitted to California voters in June of 2018. The measure includes \$14 million for the San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program. Should the bond succeed at the ballot in June of 2018, the Port would work with the City to consider an application for funding for the flood protection along the San Francisco waterfront.

**4. Regional Measure 3 Funds (“RM3”) – Mission Bay Ferry Landing**

Port staff is working with the Water Emergency Transportation Agency (WETA) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to support \$25 million in funding from the proposed Regional Measure 3 (“RM3”) for the Mission Bay Ferry Landing - a funding measure expected to be put before voters in June of 2018. If approved by voters in the nine Bay Area counties raise tolls on state-owned bridges would be increased to fund transportation improvements in bridge corridors. Port staff was successful in elevating the profile of the Mission Bay Ferry Landing, offering amended language to ensure the Mission Bay Ferry Landing would be eligible for WETA funds and ensuring that funding is included for the Project.



## Public Defender

---

1. Pass Bail Reform in California without expanding preventive detention. Support SB 10 (Hertzberg) and AB 42 (Bonta) and oppose amendments that would keep more people in jail prior to a trial.
2. Reduce the burden of fines and fees on Californians with limited means:
  - A. Pass SB 185 (Hertzberg) that would require traffic court debt to be subject to “ability to pay” standards and reduce the incidence of license suspensions.
  - B. Pass SB 237 (Hertzberg), or any successor legislation, that would clarify that AB 103 (budget trailer), that passed in 2017 and stopped license suspensions for inability to pay tickets, applied to all licenses previously suspended for that reason.
  - C. Amend PC 1214.1 to require that the imposition of civil assessment penalties be subject to rigorous ability to pay criteria and expanded due process considering “good cause” for late payment of fines and fees.
  - D. Curb abusive automobile towing practices by strengthening regulations to limit the circumstances under which cars can be towed and making it easier for drivers to reclaim towed cars.
3. Further eliminate mandatory sentencing in the criminal justice system by repealing other sentence enhancements (as was done in SB 180 (Mitchell)) or subjecting them to judicial discretion (as was done in SB 620 (Bradford)).
4. Reform the jury selection process to combat implicit bias:
  - A. Require the courts to collect and make public demographic data on jury selection in order to combat racial bias in criminal trials.
  - B. Require the courts to address the issue of implicit bias for jurors, including showing jurors an educational video on implicit bias, as is already done in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington and other jurisdictions
  - C. Liberalize the rules for jury selection (voir dire) in criminal trials to mirror those in civil cases.
5. Regulate the use of facial recognition technology by law enforcement in order to protect civil liberties and prevent racial profiling.

## Recreation & Parks Department

---

### 1. Top Priority Issues:

- A. Open Space/India Basin Shoreline** – RPD acquired 900 Innes property for future open space. This waterfront land sits between the existing India Basin Shoreline Park and India Basin Shoreline Open Space. It will be an opportunity to establish open space, begin brownfield remediation, while simultaneously supporting wetlands restoration.
- B. Identifying funding for park acquisition.** Additional funding will provide support and promote equitable recreational and open space opportunities through our city.
- C. Identifying funding to provide development and rehab of parks in underserved neighborhoods.** RPD to continues to strive in improving and routinely maintaining all lower quality parks and playgrounds in each equity zone. It will also provide opportunities to acquire and develop parks & playgrounds in equity zone where too few exist.
- D. Increased impact of housing density and transportation infrastructure on our urban parks and recreation.** Finding opportunities for RPD to be part of the legislative conversation and policy changes around transportation infrastructure and housing development in a dense urban landscape. Urban park and recreation can provide an enhanced working partnership and potential legislative solutions to reach a broader goal of a livable city for all.
- E. Water conservation bills with a focus on recycled water or innovative technology.**
  - a. Funding opportunities to allow RPD to strive on recycled water usage or innovative technology in the coming decades as water becomes an integral focus point in California.

### 2. Emerging Issues:

Opportunities to insert language into bills that can help provide more funding for parks.

### 3. Existing State Legislation:

- A. California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access for All Act of 2018** – Enacts the California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access for All Act of 2018, which places a \$3 billion bond before voters at the June, 2018 statewide direct primary election.
- B. AB 342 (Chiu) Vehicles: automated speed enforcement: five-year pilot program** – Establishes a five-year pilot program to give local transportation authorities in the City of San Jose and the City and County of San Francisco the authority to install automated speed enforcement (ASE) systems in the two municipalities.
- C. AB 756 (Ting) Prima facie speed limits: Golden Gate Park** – Establishes a prima facie speed limit of 15 miles per hour (mph) on the majority of roadways in San Francisco's Golden Gate Park.
- D. AB 907 (Garcia) Support Letter for Establishing Office of Outdoor Recreation and Public Lands Enhancement** – Creates an Office of Outdoor Recreation and Public Lands within the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development.

- E. AB 1103 (Oberholte) Bicycle: yielding** - Allows a person operating a bicycle make a turn or proceed through an intersection without stopping if no vehicle or pedestrian is in the intersection or constitutes an immediate hazard to the cyclist while they are in the intersection.



## San Francisco International Airport

---

### **Shoreline Protection Program**

SFO will work with the Bay Conservation Development Commission (BCDC) on public safety exception to the San Francisco Bay Plan or other regulations to the preferred “natural” solutions, such as wetland reclamation, in shoreline protection projects. SFO cannot have natural habitats that attract birds around runways.

### **Bio-Fuel promotion**

SFO is promoting the use and development of bio-fuels in aviation as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. SFO would like bio-fuels to be specifically designated as an alternative “green” fuel in California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) Low Carbon Fuel Standard that would help it to qualify for funding. Also, SFO would like bio-fuel to qualify for Cap and Trade funding.

## San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Each year, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) prepares 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 legislative issues but rather to provide general direction on issues relevant to the SFMTA and transportation partners in the coming year. This program is also intended to align with the SFMTA's **2013-2018 Strategic Plan** and supports the overall goals and objectives as developed in the Plan including:

GOAL 1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone.

GOAL 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing and carsharing the preferred means of travel.

GOAL 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco.

GOAL 4: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service.

This document includes a summary of the priority issues for the SFMTA as well as measures the Agency will seek to sponsor in the 2018 legislative sessions.

### State Legislative Priorities

The proposed 2018 State Legislative Program builds on efforts from the first year of the current two-year Legislative session and includes prioritization of Vision Zero initiatives such as AB 342 (Chiu) authorizing a pilot program for automated speed enforcement

#### 1. Transportation Funding

- A. Protect Statewide Transportation Funding:** Following enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Beall/Frazier), a \$5.24 billion/year, 10 year funding package, support efforts to protect this funding program in the face of threats to repeal the gas tax and registration fee increases. Support efforts to advance grant applications for SB 1 competitive programs.
- B. 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.
- C. 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.

#### 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. 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. Equity is a core principle of Vision Zero SF and the SFMTA will continue to work with city leaders to advance equity in all related policy initiatives.

- A. Advance Assembly Bill (AB) 342 (Chiu) 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 continue to advance state legislation, AB 342 (Chiu), 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.
- B.** 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. Emerging Mobility and Innovation

Managing the adoption and integration of new and emerging mobility innovations is a fundamental issue for San Francisco and other cities. The SFMTA has adopted a shared mobility framework aimed at ensuring these transportation options are integrated to manage a network that is efficient, equitable and sustainable. The SFMTA will monitor and engage, as appropriate, in state legislative measures in 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 with a working group, representing the eight largest cities in California.

- 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.
- Autonomous Vehicles: continue to participate in State efforts to develop policy framework for testing and deployment of autonomous vehicles and ensure cities are included in process.
- Commuter Shuttles: monitor legislation that supports these programs within the context of SFMTA's Commuter Shuttles Program and encouraging shared trips.
- CPUC and Transportation Functions: Monitor and engage in shift of transportation oversight responsibilities from the CPUC to the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA).
- Support efforts to authorize three-rack bicycle racks on 60-foot motor coaches and trolley buses.

### 4. Parking Policy

- The SFMTA will continue to coordinate parking advocacy efforts with public parking interests including the California Public Parking Association, other cities and stakeholders. 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 the recent engagement by other cities, including Los Angeles and Sacramento, on this important issue.

### 5. Support Shared Policy Priorities of City Departments.

Support as appropriate the policy priorities of other City departments including Planning, Department of the Environment, Public Health and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development that advance mutual policy objectives including transportation and livable street design, pedestrian safety, transit-oriented development, CEQA reform policy and infrastructure investment.

### **Federal Legislative Priorities**

#### **1. Federal Funding and Appropriations:**

**A. Maximize federal transportation appropriations for Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act programs:** Partner with local, regional and statewide transportation agencies as well as national stakeholders to ensure that Congress appropriates funding in fiscal year 2019 consistent with amounts authorized in FAST Act.

**B. Advocate for Capital Investment Grant funding for San Francisco's Resolution 3434/ Plan Bay Area Projects:** Support annual Capital Investment Grant appropriations to help implement the Regional Transit Expansion Program, Resolution 3434, consistent with the full funding grant agreements approved for the San Francisco Third Street Light Rail/Central Subway project. Support regional efforts to seek New Starts/Small Starts/Core Capacity commitments for the next generation of transit expansion projects, consistent with Plan Bay Area, namely: San Francisco Transbay Transit Center (Phase 2)/Downtown Extension (DTX), Better Market Street, and Geary BRT.

**2. Infrastructure:** Monitor any new opportunities created by the Trump administration's \$1 trillion infrastructure initiative. The \$1 trillion figure is calculated by expected value created from \$200B in new direct federal funding, which the administration believes will incentivize and leverage private investment of \$1 trillion in total infrastructure spending.

**3. Autonomous Vehicles:** Continue to track and engage in development of federal legislation around autonomous vehicles, following the passage of the House SELF DRIVE Act and Senate START Act in 2017. Coordinate efforts and participate in strategy development with the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) and Transportation for America to ensure city interests are heard.

**4. Emerging Mobility and Innovation:** Monitor and engage in federal efforts around shared mobility and other emerging mobility issues that arise. Monitor ongoing competitive grant opportunities for advanced transportation technologies.

## San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

---

- 1. Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and Voluntary Settlements.** 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. We are engaged in voluntary settlement discussions to protect San Francisco's water rights and 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 and proposals for taxes or fees to pay for water supply and water quality needs for disadvantaged communities.
- 3. Water Conservation and Supply Diversification.** During one of the worst droughts in California history, the SFPUC implemented short and long-term strategies to conserve water and diversify our supply. We are a state leader in conservation, and we support legislation that will maintain our ability to implement our conservation programs in a strategic and cost effective way. We also 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 continue to work to ensure that San Francisco's existing conservation and water resources programs are not negatively impacted by cumbersome state regulation and that we maintain local authority to advance our priorities.
- 4. Protecting Enterprise Revenues and Maintaining Local Control.** The SFPUC will engage on legislation and regulations that undermine local control over public and real assets. We will work to protect Enterprise revenues and local regulatory authority over equipment placed on SFPUC infrastructure.
- 5. Renewable Portfolio Standards and Greenhouse Gas Reporting.** The SFPUC will work to protect our low-emission electricity supplies and renewable energy resources by engaging on legislation and regulations that propose to change the State Renewables Portfolio Standard or greenhouse gas reporting.
- 6. 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.

7. **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.
8. **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.
9. **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.
10. **State Funding for Utility Operations, Infrastructure, and Environmental Restoration and Enhancement.** 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. Over the next year, we anticipate new opportunities for funding environmental restoration and enhancement and will engage around these as they arise.
11. **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

### Real Estate Development

#### 1. Old Mint Restoration Project

The Old Mint Restoration Project seeks to fully rehabilitate the 1874 structure and rededicate the building as a multi-use cultural center in the City, anchored by the new home of the California Historical Society. Listing the Old Mint's rehabilitation as an official state priority project will enable the Project Team to stay abreast of possible State funding opportunities related to the capital phase of the project, including competitive grant programs, budget line items, and General Obligation bonds. With a potentially significant budget gap yet to address, some level of State (and Federal) participation may be critical to the success of the Project.

The OEWD development team also continues to engage a number of potential programming partners about future opportunities at the Mint, including a number of state and federal agencies such as the US Treasury Department, National Parks Service/GGNRA, State Library, and State Parks Department. Being able to refer to the Old Mint as an official priority project will boost the effort's stature in these ongoing conversations.

#### Old Mint Context

The Old United States Mint ("Old Mint" or "Mint") is a City-owned, neoclassical stone building located at the intersection of Fifth and Mission Streets. Completed in 1874, it served as an official US Mint until 1937, when the federal government moved minting operations to another facility in the City. The building played a critical role in the rebirth of San Francisco, and the recovery of the region's economy, after the earthquake and fire of 1906. After 1937, the Old Mint served a variety of federal functions - mostly office and light industrial in nature - until 1994. The Department of Treasury operated a museum in the building from 1973-1994. The property was transferred to the City and County of San Francisco in 2003.

The Old Mint is listed on virtually every landmark registry in the land – local, state, and federal – and is a designated National Historic Landmark (NHL) in recognition of its unique architecture and history, and special place in the story of California's rise to prominence. Some historians view the Old Mint as the most significant building in the West.

#### Old Mint Restoration Project

Working closely with partner City agencies, including the asset manager Real Estate Division, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) facilitated a competitive RFP process to identify a lead community partner to collaborate with the City on the project, which resulted in the selection of the California Historical Society (CHS). Although it receives no regular/ongoing state funding, CHS is the official historical society for the State of California. CHS has deep roots in San Francisco, being founded in the City in 1871 and still headquartered here today. CHS owns one of the world's preeminent collections of California history, much of it San Francisco focused.

*Phase I – Due Diligence:* With critical support from the State of California, the City and CHS are engaged in a two-year due diligence and planning phase of the project – expected to be completed in spring of 2019. One key aspects of this assessment period is the completion of a Campaign Feasibility Study, which will examine the feasibility of the City and CHS raising \$30-50M for the Project from private and philanthropic sources.

The team uses a cost estimate figure of **\$100M** for the rehabilitation project, although we will be updating that number as part of our assessment phase. The City's current proposed Central SoMa Plan includes a **\$20M** dedication to the Project from the proposed new Community Facilities District. OEWD continues to work with the Capital Planning Group to ensure the project is included in the City's Capital Plan. It is expected that the Project will eventually seek some type of General Fund debt financing scheme – in the form of Certificates of Participation or a General Obligation Bond.

## 2. Pro Housing Development Policies

OEWD's joint development division will actively engage in creating and supporting policies that find innovative solutions for the development of new housing units at all levels of affordability to serve our existing and new residents. Policies OEWD seeks to work on will support Mayor Lee's 2020 housing goals for the development of 30,000 new housing units, of which at least 30% will be permanently affordable, and 50% affordable to middle income residents.

As part of this work OEWD will explore the feasibility of possible amendments to the 2017 legislation under AB246 Public Improvements and Public Works Environmental Protection Standards.

3. Re-Alignment of Caltrain to Transbay Transit Center, and relocation of the Caltrain rail yard.
4. Extend AB 900 to certain housing projects - Assembly Bill ("AB") 900 would expedite judicial review of certain "leadership projects" with hope that the streamlining efforts will improve the job market for Californians. The bills provide an incentive for applicants to move forward with their projects because any challenge to a leadership project Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") will be venued immediately in the Court of Appeal. The court will then have a maximum of 175 days to issue its decision on the challenged EIR.

To qualify as a leadership project, the project must exceed \$100 million and not result in any net additional emissions of greenhouse gases. The project also must create high-wage, highly skilled jobs that pay prevailing and living wages and provide construction jobs and permanent jobs for Californians. As a prerequisite to receiving certification approval from the Governor, the applicant also must enter an agreement with the lead agency that all mitigation measures will be enforced and monitored. Additionally, the applicant bears the burden of costs for any hearing or decision before the Court of Appeal.

## Workforce Development

1. OEWD will explore opportunities to raise apprenticeship and training funds for the formerly incarcerated and other jobseekers facing barriers to employment
2. Identify and support state funding sources to support the implementation of the 2017 legislation AB 1111, Removing Barriers to Employment Act. This bill allows for new opportunities for collaboration between community based organizations, education providers, and local workforce development boards, in order to serve the most difficult to reach populations in the state. Over the past 15 years, the federal funding provided to the state of California for workforce development services has been cut by over 50%. This has created increasing challenges in helping unskilled and under-skilled workers improve their skills and be prepared to meet business and industry needs. Although AB 1111 was passed into law in 2017, how this bill will be funded is still a question. Through OEWD, the City and County of San Francisco serves



thousands of low-income jobseekers with multiple barriers to employment every year. Additional funding is needed to support the goals of AB 1111 for community based organizations and local workforce development boards to partner in a competitive grant program for activities that address the needs of individuals who face multiple barriers to prepare for training, apprenticeship, or employment opportunities, which will lead to self-sufficiency and economic stability.

**Business Development**

1. Neighborhood Restaurant Liquor License – OEWD will explore any clean up legislation as needed to correct the administrative census code typos in the 2017 AB 471
2. Freelance/Independent Contractor (Gig Economy) Worker’s rights and Benefits – OEWD will explore support for policies that will assist our freelance sector with worker/entrepreneur protections
3. Target Industry Sector Supportive Policies for Small Business Sector, Production Distribution Repair, Life Sciences, Health Care, Construction, Hospitality/Nightlife/Restaurants, Technology, International Trade, Non Profits, Retail

## Homelessness and Supportive Housing

---

### Homelessness in California

There is a homelessness crisis in California. Homelessness is challenge impacting urban and rural communities throughout the state and one that needs increased attention from state government.

According to the 2016 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR):

- California had the highest estimates of homeless people in the nation (118,142)
- California is home to 22% of the nation's homeless population
- California had the highest rate of unsheltered homelessness in the nation (66.4%)
- California accounts for nearly half of the nations' unsheltered population
- Every California city shelters less than half of its total homeless population
- 78,000 Californians sleeping in tents, under bridges, and in doorways on any given night

According to the 2014 America's Youngest Outcasts: A Report Card on Child Homelessness, California ranks 48th out of 50 states in our response to child homelessness. Factors contributing to this score include extent of homelessness, risk factors for homelessness, levels of state funding, and state planning efforts.

### Goals

- Goal 1: Increase funding for supportive housing, homeless services, and shelters across the state
- Goal 2: Increase regional coordination and data sharing

### LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

**Creation of a New Block Grant Program:** The state of California underspends on the crisis of homelessness. HSH supports the creation of a state-funded block grant program to fund homeless services based on need. New York, Pennsylvania, and other states have such programs. A program like this could allow resources to follow a client to promote regional collaboration and discourage homeless people from traveling between counties. Possible funding sources include taxation of vacant rental properties, elimination of mortgage interest tax deduction, and tax on incomes over \$1mm, etc.

Chronically homeless adults who are high users of emergency health care systems would be an ideal target population for this program. This program does not currently exist but would bring much-needed resources into communities with high need. Funds could be allocated based on the percentage of the state's homeless population in each community.

A \$330mm allocation for a pilot program would allow the state to test the block grant statewide.

Regional collaboration is an ongoing challenge. The block grant could include incentives for regional collaboration or could call for the creation of regional entities to coordinate homeless services and strategies across jurisdictions.

**Homelessness Services Funding:** HSH supports legislation or budget efforts to increase state spending on homeless services and emergency shelters.

**Housing Funding:** HSH supports legislation or budget efforts to increase state spending on housing for people with extremely low incomes including capital costs, operating costs, and services.

**Regional Collaboration:** Homelessness but is a social emergency that impacts all of the Bay Area and many regions within California. We know that approximately 30% (2,400) of the homeless people identified in our 2017 Point-in-Time Count from other communities, mostly other Bay Area Counties. Regional collaboration is necessary to address this challenge and ensure that all Bay Area communities can respond to homelessness on their streets. HSH supports efforts to incentivize or pilot regional collaboration and data sharing.

## **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>

