

AGENDA

Legislative Committee

The next meeting of the Legislative Committee will be as follows.

Date: Thursday, December 8, 2016 - 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
 Place: San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
 1250 San Carlos Avenue
2nd Floor Auditorium
 San Carlos, California

PLEASE CALL Jean Higaki (599-1462) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

1	Public comment on related items not on the agenda.	Presentations are limited to 3 Minutes	
2	Approval of Minutes from September 8, 2016.	Action (Gordon)	Pages 1-3
3	Update from Shaw/Yoder/Antwih	Information (Shaw/Yoder/Antwih)	
4	Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified).	Action (Gordon)	Page 4- 28
5	Review and recommend approval of the Annual C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2017	Action (Gordon)	Page 29-33
6	Review and recommend approval to the C/CAG Board to exercise the option to extend the contract with Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc. to provide state legislative advocacy service for the same annual fee of \$72,000 in an amount not to exceed \$144,000 for the 2017 and 2018 legislative session	Action (Gordon)	Page 34-37
7	Review and approval of the 2017 C/CAG Legislative Committee calendar	Action (Gordon)	Page 38-39
8	Adjournment	Action (Gordon)	

NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

¹From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 390, 391, 292, KX, PX, RX, or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue.

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES
September 8, 2016**

At 5:35 P.M. Member O’Connell called the Legislative Committee meeting to order in the 2nd Floor auditorium at the San Mateo Transit District Office.

Guests or Staff Attending:

Matt Robinson - Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih Inc.
Sandy Wong, Jean Higaki, Matt Fabry - C/CAG Staff

1. Public comment on related items not on the agenda.

None

2. Approval of Minutes from August 11, 2016.

Member Nihart moved and Member Aguirre seconded approval of the August 11, 2016 minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Update from Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih (SYA).

Matt Robinson, from Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih provided an update from Sacramento.

The State Legislature adjourned on August 31st. The Governor has till end of September to look at approximately 700 bills. If no action is taken, a bill automatically become law.

AB 2126 (Mullin) is on the Governor’s desk for signature. The bill will facilitate a procurement method to accelerate work on the US 101 Managed Lane project. No opposition is expected.

SB 1128 (Glazer), MTC’s Bay Area Commute Benefit Policy bill is on the Governor’s desk for signature and is expected to be signed.

SB 1298 (Hertzberg) Stormwater Funding bill is inactive. That would have expanded the definition of sewer to include stormwater. Due to last minute opposition the bill was pulled. The bill may be refined and reintroduced in the next session as a two year bill.

Member Carlton asked if SB 1170 (Wieckowski) Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan bill was dead. It was confirmed that the bill is done. Matt Robinson added that SB 885 (Wolk) Construction Contract Indemnity bill is also done.

Member Carton asked about the status of the Governor’s “By Right” affordable housing proposal

trailer bill. This proposal did not pass but it is expected to be reintroduced next session.

Special session closes on November 30. The two chairs of the house and senate (Frazier and Beall) have merged their proposals into a single transportation funding package. They will be introduced as ABX1 26 and SBX1 1. There is a very slim chance that anything will get passed during this time frame due to elections. The Governor's office is refusing to give up the weight fees in the next two years, which will also influenced developing a funding package. There is indication that the gas tax may be going up gradually.

Stormwater has been added as an eligible component use of transportation funding in both transportation bills under the road maintenance program.

Member Papan asked about the Office of Inspector General (OIG) who will oversee all state spending as described in the proposed funding plan. It was clarified that OIG is a watchdog for all state spending.

The last Cap and Trade auction was generated around \$8.5 million but was estimated to generate \$500 million. Only formula programs will continue to be partially funded. Currently there is approximately \$1.4 billion carry over from last year. There is agreement to spend \$900 mil of this on programs would not benefit C/CAG member agencies. Most Cap and Trade money will be directed to disadvantaged communities as defined by CalEnviroScreen where San Mateo does not fare well.

The Governor signed SB 32 (Pavley) that reducing statewide greenhouse gas emissions targets to 40% below the 1990 level by 2030. Fuels make up 95% of the Cap and Trade market and will probably not go away anytime soon.

4. Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified).

The two chairs of the house and senate (Frazier and Beall) have merged their proposals into a single transportation funding package. They will be introduced as ABX1 26 and SBX1 1. The Legislative Committee can recommend that the Board support the revised bills.

Member Nihart moved and Member Carlton seconded recommending the C/CAG Board to send a letters of support for ABX1 26 and ABX1 1. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:15 P.M.

Legislative Committee 2016 Attendance Record

Agency	Name	Jan 14	Feb 11	March 10	April 14	May 12	June 9	July	August 11	Sept 8	Oct	Nov	Dec 8
Menlo Park	Catherine Carlton		x	x		x			x	x			
Millbrae	Gina Papan		N/A			x				x			
Pacifica	Mary Ann Nihart	Canceled	x	x	Canceled	x	Canceled		x	x			
Pacifica	Karen Ervin			x		x							
Portola Valley	Maryann Moise Derwin (C/CAG Vice Chair)		N/A	N/A		x			x	x			
Redwood City	Alicia Aguirre (C/CAG Chair)		x	x		x			x	x			
San Bruno	Irene O'Connell		x	x		x			x	x			
Sounth San Francisco	Richard Garbarino			x		x							
Woodside	Deborah Gordon (Leg Chair)		x	x		x			x				

 no meeting

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 8, 2017

To: C/CAG Legislative Committee

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director

Subject: Review and recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified)

(For further information or questions contact Jean Higaki at 599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee recommend the C/CAG Board to take a position on any legislation or direct staff to monitor any legislation for future positions to be taken.

FISCAL IMPACT

Unknown.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

NA.

BACKGROUND

The C/CAG Legislative Committee receives monthly written reports and oral briefings from the C/CAG's State legislative advocates. Important or interesting issues that arise out of that meeting are reported to the Board.

The last day of formal session was August 31, 2016. The Governor had till end of September to sign any bill from the last day of session. Special session closed at the end of November 2016.

Attached is a general report regarding the 2016 election results.

ATTACHMENTS

1. 2016 General Election report from Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih, Inc.
2. Full Legislative information is available for specific bills at <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>



SHAW/YODER/ANTWIH, inc.
LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY • ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

November 28, 2016

To: The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County


From: Andrew Antwih, Partner
Matt Robinson, Legislative Advocate

Re: General Election 2016

California Voter Registration

There are 1.2 million more registered voters in California than there were in the landmark 2012 presidential election year. Secretary of State Alex Padilla announced that 78% of eligible voters are registered, amounting to 19,411,771 Californians.

New Voters 2016



Many of these new voters are Democrats, according to a recent survey by *CalMatters*.¹ Specifically, the percentage of voters registered with the Democratic Party increased from 43.7% to 44.9%, and the percentage of voters registered with the Republican Party decreased from 29.4% to 26%. Among Latino and Asian voters, the Democratic registration trends are higher. In the present cycle, for example, new Latino voters are, on average, registering as Democrats at nearly twice the rate of prior years combined.²

In total, 4,982,775 California voters have vote-by-mail ballots this year. Of those, 45.71% are Democrats, 31.83% are Republicans, 21.26% have No Party Preference, and 1.20% are Other. There was

been an overall 6% decrease in Republican vote-by-mail returns statewide.

Statewide, overall voter turnout was at 51.2% with 99.7% of precincts reporting.

California State Legislative Races

All California Assembly seats and half of California Senate seats were up for reelection or became vacant this year. In total, 20 state legislators termed out in 2016. Of those, 14 were Assemblymembers (9 Democrats, 5 Republicans) and 6 were Senators (5 Democrats, 1 Republican).

¹ Cal Matters, October 2016

² IBID

Sixty-five percent of the Legislature was Democratic during the 2015-16 legislative session. It was highly anticipated that the increase in voter registration would result in a Democratic two-thirds supermajority (66%) in both houses. Approximately seven seats in the Assembly and five seats in the Senate were “marginal” seats which could swing to either party, affecting the overall partisan make-up of each house. Democrats last had a supermajority in 2012, the first time any political party had done so in both houses since 1933, but lost it in 2014. To achieve a supermajority in both houses this cycle, Democrats needed to hold all of their current seats and pick up one Republican seat in the Senate and two Republican seats in the Assembly. With a two-thirds supermajority, California Democrats would be able to pass tax increases (and fees), place bonds or constitutional amendments on the ballot, enact laws immediately with an urgency clause, and override vetoes without needing to get Republicans on board.

However, with California’s “open primary” system, within the Democratic caucus, there is greater ideological diversity. The rise of the “Moderate Democrats” in the state Assembly may lessen the impact of a Democratic supermajority. Moderate Democrats have seen more political success due to California’s top-two primary system. Nearly 30% of the current Assembly Democratic caucus have moderated and cast votes which depart from traditional Democratic constituency groups. Using the recent California increase in minimum wage as one litmus test, 6% fewer Democrats supported the bill in 2016 than did in 2013, adjusted for numbers.³

Additionally, this informal caucus of business-aligned Democrats successfully watered down SB 350 and stalled SB 32 in 2015, two priority climate change bills advanced by the more liberal Democrats and Governor Brown. SB 32 passed in 2016 only with its companion bill, AB 197, required by the Moderate Democrats to earn their votes. The Moderate Democrats also blocked a bill this year that would have required companies to pay employees double for working on Thanksgiving.

The so-called “Mod Squad” fluctuates depending on the issue, but as a group they are seeking to increase their numbers and their clout.

California State Election Outcomes

The Democrats indeed regained a two-thirds supermajority in the Assembly, with a total of 55 Democrats and 25 Republicans. Incumbent Republicans Young Kim (AD 65), David Hadley (AD 66) and Eric Linder (AD 60) were defeated by their Democratic opponents. The Democrats narrowly achieved a supermajority in the State Senate as well. After a tight race, Josh Newman defeated incumbent Assembly Member Ling Ling Chang (SD 29), flipping the seat from Republican to Democratic control. There will now be 27 Democrats and 13 Republicans in the State Senate.

In the Assembly, Democratic incumbents Patty Lopez (AD 39) and Cheryl Brown (AD47) have lost their re-election bids. Three former legislators who lost their seats in 2014 have regained their seats: Raul Bocanegra in AD 39, Sharon Quirk-Silva in AD 65 and Al Muratsuchi in AD 66.

Here are some highlights of key Assembly races:

Sharon Quirk-Silva (D) ahead of Young Kim (R) by over 6 points.

Eric Linder (R) lost to Sabrina Cervantes (D) by nearly 8 points.

³ Assembly Floor votes AB 10 (2013) and SB 3 (2016)

Al Muratsuchi (D) regains seat from David Hadley (R) by over 7 points.

Cheryl Brown (D) loses her seat to Eloise Reyes (D) by over 8 points.

Catharine Baker (R) holds onto her Assembly seat against Democratic challenger Cheryl Cook-Kallio.

It is important to note that while the Democrats have regained a supermajority of seats in the Assembly, this is concurrent with the election of more moderate, business-friendly Democrats.

Here are some highlights of key Senate races:

Cathleen Galgiani (D) holds onto her seat over Alan Nakanishi (R) by more than 10 points.

Scott Wilk (R) defeats Jonathon Ervin (D) by 7 points.

Anthony Portantino (D) beats out Michael Antonovich (R) by 15 points.

Henry Stern (D) defeats Steve Fazio (R) by 11 points.

Josh Newman (D) defeats Ling-Ling Chang (R) by nearly 1,885 votes.

California Congressional Races

California Attorney General Kamala Harris and Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez are seeking Senator Barbara Boxer's open seat in the U.S. Senate. As expected, Kamala Harris won this race with 62% of the vote. All 53 California Congressional seats were on the ballot this year as well. Incumbent Representatives Ami Bera (D), Jeff Denham (R), David Valadao (R), Steve Knight (R), Pete Aguilar (D), and Darrell Issa (R) held onto their seats in hotly contested races. Congressman Mike Honda (D) was ousted in a Dem-on-Dem race by his opponent, Ro Khanna (D).

Included with this memo is a spreadsheet that tracks all State and Congressional races in California this election cycle, highlighting the key races, most of which are Republican seats that were targeted by the Democrats in their efforts to reach a supermajority. The final outcomes of all races are provided in that spreadsheet. The data is pulled from the [Secretary of State's website](#).

California Ballot Propositions

Seventeen statewide propositions were put on the November 2016 ballot, which in total have amounted to a record \$473 million in campaign spending.

Proposition 51. School Bonds, Funding for K-12 School and Community College Facilities.

Authorizes \$9 billion in general obligation bonds for new construction and modernization of K-12 public school facilities; charter schools and vocational education facilities; and California Community Colleges facilities. Fiscal Impact: State costs of about \$17.6 billion to pay off both the principal (\$9 billion) and interest (\$8.6 billion) on the bonds. Payments of about \$500 million per year for 35 years.

PASSED 54-46

Proposition 52. Medi-Cal Hospital Fee Program. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.

Extends indefinitely an existing statute that imposes fees on hospitals to fund Medi-Cal health care services, care for uninsured patients, and children's health coverage. Fiscal Impact: Uncertain fiscal

effect, ranging from relatively little impact to annual state General Fund savings of around \$1 billion and increased funding for public hospitals in the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

PASSED 69.7-30.3

Proposition 53. Revenue Bonds. Statewide Voter Approval. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

Requires statewide voter approval before any revenue bonds can be issued or sold by the state for certain projects if the bond amount exceeds \$2 billion. Fiscal Impact: State and local fiscal effects are unknown and would depend on which projects are affected by the measure and what actions government agencies and voters take in response to the measure's voting requirement.

FAILED 48.5-51.5

Proposition 54. Legislature, Legislation and Proceedings. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.

Prohibits Legislature from passing any bill unless published on Internet for 72 hours before vote. Requires Legislature to record its proceedings and post on Internet. Authorizes use of recordings. Fiscal Impact: One-time costs of \$1 million to \$2 million and ongoing costs of about \$1 million annually to record legislative meetings and make videos of those meetings available on the Internet.

PASSED 64.5-35.5

Proposition 55. Tax Extension to Fund Education and Healthcare. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

Extends by twelve years the temporary personal income tax increases enacted in 2012 on earnings over \$250,000, with revenues allocated to K–12 schools, California Community Colleges, and, in certain years, healthcare. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues—\$4 billion to \$9 billion annually from 2019–2030—depending on economy and stock market. Increased funding for schools, community colleges, health care for low–income people, budget reserves, and debt payments.

PASSED 62.2-37.8

Proposition 56. Cigarette Tax to Fund Healthcare, Tobacco Use Prevention, Research, and Law Enforcement. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.

Increases cigarette tax by \$2.00 per pack, with equivalent increase on other tobacco products and electronic cigarettes containing nicotine. Fiscal Impact: Additional net state revenue of \$1 billion to \$1.4 billion in 2017–18, with potentially lower revenues in future years. Revenues would be used primarily to augment spending on health care for low–income Californians.

PASSED 63.2-37.8

Proposition 57. Criminal Sentences. Parole. Juvenile Criminal Proceedings and Sentencing. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.

Allows parole consideration for nonviolent felons. Authorizes sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior, and education. Provides juvenile court judge decides whether juvenile will be prosecuted as adult. Fiscal Impact: Net state savings likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually, depending on implementation. Net county costs of likely a few million dollars annually.

PASSED 63.7-36.3

Proposition 58. English Proficiency. Multilingual Education. Initiative Statute.

Preserves requirement that public schools ensure students obtain English language proficiency. Requires school districts to solicit parent/community input in developing language acquisition programs. Requires instruction to ensure English acquisition as rapidly and effectively as possible. Authorizes school districts

to establish dual–language immersion programs for both native and non–native English speakers. Fiscal Impact: No notable fiscal effect on school districts or state government.

PASSED 72.6-27.4

Proposition 59. Corporations. Political Spending. Federal Constitutional Protections. Legislative Advisory Question.

Asks whether California's elected officials should use their authority to propose and ratify an amendment to the federal Constitution overturning the United States Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*. *Citizens United* ruled that laws placing certain limits on political spending by corporations and unions are unconstitutional. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect on state or local governments.

PASSED 52.5-47.5

Proposition 60. Adult Films. Condoms. Health Requirements. Initiative Statute.

Requires adult film performers to use condoms during filming of sexual intercourse. Requires producers to pay for performer vaccinations, testing, and medical examinations. Requires producers to post condom requirement at film sites. Fiscal Impact: Likely reduction of state and local tax revenues of several million dollars annually. Increased state spending that could exceed \$1 million annually on regulation, partially offset by new fees.

FAILED 46-54

Proposition 61. State Prescription Drug Purchases. Pricing Standards. Initiative Statute.

Prohibits state from buying any prescription drug from a drug manufacturer at price over lowest price paid for the drug by United States Department of Veterans Affairs. Exempts managed care programs funded through Medi–Cal. Fiscal Impact: Potential for state savings of an unknown amount depending on (1) how the measure's implementation challenges are addressed and (2) the responses of drug manufacturers regarding the provision and pricing of their drugs.

FAILED 46.1-53.9

Proposition 62. Death Penalty. Initiative Statute.

Repeals death penalty and replaces it with life imprisonment without possibility of parole. Applies retroactively to existing death sentences. Increases the portion of life inmates' wages that may be applied to victim restitution. Fiscal Impact: Net ongoing reduction in state and county criminal justice costs of around \$150 million annually within a few years, although the impact could vary by tens of millions of dollars depending on various factors.

FAILED 46.2-53.8

Proposition 63. Firearms. Ammunition Sales. Initiative Statute.

Requires background check and Department of Justice authorization to purchase ammunition. Prohibits possession of large–capacity ammunition magazines. Establishes procedures for enforcing laws prohibiting firearm possession by specified persons. Requires Department of Justice's participation in federal National Instant Criminal Background Check System. Fiscal Impact: Increased state and local court and law enforcement costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually, related to a new court process for removing firearms from prohibited persons after they are convicted.

PASSED 62.8-37.2

Proposition 64. Marijuana Legalization. Initiative Statute.

Legalizes marijuana under state law, for use by adults 21 or older. Imposes state taxes on sales and cultivation. Provides for industry licensing and establishes standards for marijuana products. Allows local regulation and taxation. Fiscal Impact: Additional tax revenues ranging from high hundreds of millions of dollars to over \$1 billion annually, mostly dedicated to specific purposes. Reduced criminal justice costs of tens of millions of dollars annually.

PASSED 56.1-43.9

Proposition 65. Carryout Bags. Charges. Initiative Statute.

Redirects money collected by grocery and certain other retail stores through mandated sale of carryout bags. Requires stores to deposit bag sale proceeds into a special fund to support specified environmental projects. Fiscal Impact: Potential state revenue of several tens of millions of dollars annually under certain circumstances, with the monies used to support certain environmental programs.

FAILED 44.7-55.3

Proposition 66. Death Penalty. Procedures. Initiative Statute.

Changes procedures governing state court challenges to death sentences. Designates superior court for initial petitions and limits successive petitions. Requires appointed attorneys who take noncapital appeals to accept death penalty appeals. Exempts prison officials from existing regulation process for developing execution methods. Fiscal Impact: Unknown ongoing impact on state court costs for processing legal challenges to death sentences. Potential prison savings in the tens of millions of dollars annually.

PASSED 50.9-49.1

Proposition 67. Ban on Single-Use Plastic Bags. Referendum.

A "Yes" vote approves, and a "No" vote rejects, a statute that prohibits grocery and other stores from providing customers single-use plastic or paper carryout bags but permits sale of recycled paper bags and reusable bags. Fiscal Impact: Relatively small fiscal effects on state and local governments, including a minor increase in state administrative costs and possible minor local government savings from reduced litter and waste management costs.

PASSED 52.2-47.8

California State Legislative Races - Assembly

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Brian Dahle (R)	AD 01- Bieber	N	NONE	Brian Dahle, Donn Coenen (Libertarian)	Brian Dahle 99.6%, Donn Coenen 0.4%	100%	Dahle 74.0%, Coenen 26.0%
Jim Wood (D)	AD 02- Healdsburg	N	Jim Wood	Ken Anton (Libertarian)	Jim Wood 99.9%, Ken Anton 0.1%	100%	Wood 73.5%, Anton 26.5%
James Gallagher (R)	AD 03- Plumas Lake	N	Edward Ritchie	James Gallagher	Ritchie 39.0%, Gallagher 61.0%	100%	Gallagher 63.0%, Ritchie 37.0%
Bill Dodd (D) *running for Senate	AD 04- Napa	Y	Cecilia Aguiar-Curry	Charles E. Schaupp	Cecliia Aguiar-Curry 29.19% Charles Schaupp 28.72%	100%	Aguiar-Curry 63.8%, Charlie Schaupp 36.2%
Frank Bigelow (R)	AD 05- O'Neals	N	Robert Carabas	Frank Bigelow	Carabas 22.3%, Bigelow 60.0%	100%	F. Bigelow 64.6%, R. Carabas 35.4%
Beth Gaines (R)	AD 06- El Dorado Hills	Y	Brian Caples	Kevin P. Kiley	Brian Caples 19.82%, Kevin Kiley 16.34%	100%	Kevin Kiley 64.6%, Caples 35.4%
Kevin McCarty (D)	AD 07- Sacramento	N	Kevin McCarty	Ryan K. Brown	Kevin McCarty 99.5%, Ryan Brown 0.4%	100%	McCarty 69.6%, Brown 30.4%
Ken Cooley (D)	AD 08- Rancho Cordova	N	Ken Cooley	Nick Bloise	Ken Cooley 58.3%, Nick Bloise 34.6%	100%	Cooley 56.7%, Bloise 43.3%
Jim Cooper (D)	AD 09- Elk Grove	N	Jim Cooper	Tim Gorsulowsky	Jim Cooper 69.9%, Tim Gorsulowsky 30.1%	100%	Cooper 66.4%, Gorulowsky 33.6%
Marc Levine (D)	AD 10- Marin County	N	Marc Levine, Roni Jacobi	NONE	Marc Levine 65.36%, Roni Jacobi 17.70%	100%	Levine 69.8%, Jacobi 30.2%
Jim Frazier (D)	AD 11- Oakley	N	Jim Frazier	Dave Miller	Jim Frazier 65.9%, Dave Miller 34.1%	100%	Frazier 64.0%, Miller 36.0%

California State Legislative Races - Assembly

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Kristin Olsen M. (R)	AD 12- Modesto	Y	NONE	Heath Flora, Ken Vogel	Ken Vogel 25.58% Heath Flora 23.21%	100%	Flora 52.3%, Vogel 47.7%
Susan Talamantes Eggman (D)	AD 13- Stockton	N	Susan Talamantes Eggman	Kevin J. Lincoln, II	Susan Eggman 53.4%, Kevin Lincoln 19.35	100%	Eggman 64.6%, Lincoln 35.4%
Susan Bonilla (D)	AD 14- Concord	Y	Tim Grayson, Mae Torlakson	NONE	Mae Torlarkson 32.35% Tim Grayson 31.58%,	100	Grayson 61.6%, Torlakson 38.4%
Tony Thurmond (D)	AD 15- Richmond	N	Tony Thurmond	Claire Chiara	Thurmond 91.1%, Chiara 8.9%	100%	Thurmond 89.5%, Chiara 10.5%
Catharine Baker (R)	AD 16- Dublin	N	Cheryl Cook-Kallio	Catharine Baker	Catherine Baker 55%, Cheryl Cook-Kallio 45%	100%	Baker 56.0%, Cook-Kallio 44.0%
David Chiu (D)	AD 17- San Francisco	N	David Chiu	Matthew Del Carlo	David Chiu 88.5%, Mathew Del Carlo 11.5%	100%	Chiu 86.3%, Del Caro 13.7%
Rob Bonta (D)	AD 18- Alameda	N	Rob Bonta	Roseann Slonsky-Breault	Rob Bonta 89.1%, Roseann Slonsky-Breault 10.9%	100%	Bonta 87.0%, Slonsky-Breault 13.0%
Phil Ting (D)	AD 19- San Francisco	N	Phil Ting	Carlos "Chuck" Taylor	Phil Ting 83.6%, Carlos Taylor 16.4%	100%	Ting 80.2%, Taylor 19.8%
Bill Quirk (D)	AD 20- Hayward	N	Bill Quirk	Luis A. Wong	Bill Quirk 77.7%, Luis Wong 22.3%	100%	Quirk 74.3%, Wong 25.7%
Adam Gray (D)	AD 21- Merced	N	Adam Gray	Greg Opinski	Gray 66.8%, Opinski 33.1%	100%	Gray 69.4%, Opinski 30.6%
Kevin Mullin (D)	AD 22- South San Francisco	N	Kevin Mullin	Art Kiesel	Kevin Mullin 76.2%, Art Kiesel 13.3%	100%	Mullin 74.4%, Kiesel 25.6%

California State Legislative Races - Assembly

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Jim Patterson (R)	AD 23- Fresno	N	NONE	Gwen L. Morris, Jim Patterson	Jim Patterson 77.4% Gwen Morris 22.6%	100%	Patterson 76.0%, Morris 24.0%
Richard Gordon (D)	AD 24- Menlo Park	Y	Marc Berman, Vicki Veenker	NONE	Marc Berman 28.15%, Vicki Veenker 22.23%	100%	Berman 54.4%, Veenker 45.6%
Kansen Chu (D)	AD 25- San Jose	N	Kansen Chu	Bob Brunton	Kansen Chu 75.5%, Bob Brunton 24.5%	100%	Chu 72.8%, Brunton 27.2%
Devon Mathis (R)	AD 26- Visalia	N	Ruben Macareno	Devon Mathis	Macareno 30.5%, Mathis 42.4%	100%	Mathis 64.2%, Macareno 35.8%
Nora Campos (D) *running for Senate	AD 27- San Jose	Y	Ash Kalra, Madison Nguyen	NONE	Madison Nguyen 34.35% Ash Kalra 19.82%	100%	Kalra 53.2%, Nguyen 46.8%
Evan Low (D)	AD 28- Campbell	N	Evan Low	Nicholas Sclavos	Evan Low 71.5%, Nicholas Sclavos 28.5%	100%	Low 70%, Sclavos 30%
Mark Stone (D)	AD 29- Scotts Valley	N	Mark Stone	Sierra Roberts	Mark Stone 75.0%, Sierra Roberts 25.0%	100%	Stone 72.0%, Roberts 28.0%
Luis Alejo (D)	AD 30- Salinas	Y	Anna Caballero, Karina Cerventez Alejo	NONE	Anna Caballero 46.15%, Karina Cervantez Alejo 26.03%	100%	Caballero 62.6%, Alejo 37.4%
Joaquin Arambula (D)	AD 31- Fresno	N	Joaquin Arambula	Clint Olivier	Joaquin Arambula 57.7%, Clint Olivier 35.8%	100%	Arambula 63.8%, Olivier 36.2%

California State Legislative Races - Assembly

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Rudy Salas (D)	AD 32- Bakersfield	N	Rudy Salas	Manuel Ramirez	Rudy Salas 99.7%, Manuel Ramirez 1.1%	100%	Salas 65.0%, Ramirez 35.0%
Jay Obernolte (R)	AD 33- Big Bear Lake	N	Scott Markovich	Jay Obernolte	Markovich 39.3%, Obernolte 60.7%	100%	Obernolte 60.3%, Markovich 39.7%
Shannon Grove (R)	AD 34- Bakersfield	Y	Perrin A. Swanlund	Vince K. Fong	Vince Fong 60.32%, Perrin Swanlund 24.40%	100%	Fong 73.3%, Swanlund 26.7%
Katcho Achadjian (R)	AD 35- San Luis Obispo	Y	Dawn Ortiz-Legg	Jordan Cunningham	Dawn Ortiz-Legg 44.95% Jordan Cunningham 37.00%,	100%	Cunningham 54.9%, Ortiz-Legg 45.1%
Tom Lackey (R)	AD 36- Palmdale	N	Steve Fox	Tom Lackey	Tom Lackey 48.2% Steve Fox 29.6%,	100%	Lackey 54.6%, Fox 45.4%
Das Williams G. (D)	AD 37- Santa Barbara	Y	S. Monique Limon	Edward L. Fuller (Independent)	S. Monique Limon 65.4% Fuller 34.6%,	100%	Limon 63.8%, Fuller 36.2%
Scott T. Wilk (R) *running for Senate	AD 38- Santa Clarita	Y	Christy Smith	Dante Acosta	Christy Smith 44.66% Dante Acosta 36.16%,	100%	Acosta 53.1% Smith 46.9%
Patty Lopez (D)	AD 39- San Fernando	N	Patty Lopez, Raul Bocanegra	NONE	Raul Bocanegra 44.38% Patty Lopez 27.2%,	100%	Bocanegra 60.5% Lopez 39.5%
Marc Steinorth (R)	AD 40- Rancho Cucamonga	N	Abigail Medina	Marc Steinorth	Abigail Medina 51.5% Marc Steinorth 48.5%,	100%	Steinorth 51.1%, Medina 48.9%

California State Legislative Races - Assembly

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Chris Holden (D)	AD 41-Pasadena	N	Chris Holden	Casey C. Higgins	Chris Holden 59.2%, Casey C. Higgins 26.6%	100%	Holden 60.3%, Higgins 39.7%
Chad J. Mayes (R)	AD 42 - Yucca Valley	N	Greg Rodriguez	Chad J. Mayes	Chad Mayes 50.8%, Greg Rodriguez 41.4%	100%	Mayes 57.8%, Rodriguez 42.2%
Mike Gatto (D)	AD 43- Glendale	Y	Laura Friedman / Ardy Kassakhian	NONE	Laura Friedman 31.89%, Ardy Kassakhian 24.30%	100%	Friedman 64.6%, Kassakhian 35.4%
Jacqui V. Irwin (D)	AD 44 - Thousand Oaks	N	Jacqui V. Irwin	Kerry J. Nelson	Jacqui Irwin 60.9%, Kerry J. Nelson 39.1%	100%	Irwin 58.7%, Nelson 41.3%
Matthew M. Dababneh (D)	AD 45- Encino	N	Matthew M. Dababneh	Jerry Kowal	Matt Dababneh 49.3%, Jerry Kowal 26.8%	100%	Dababneh 66.2% Kowal 33.8%
Adrin Nazarian (D)	AD 46 - Sherman Oaks	N	Adrin Nazarian / Angela Rupert	NONE	Adrin Nazarian 99.6%, Angela Rupert 0.3%	100%	Nazarian 56.5%, Rupert 43.5%
Cheryl Brown (D)	AD 47 - San Bernardino	N	Cheryl Brown / Eloise Reyes	NONE	Cheryl Brown 44.06%, Eloise Reyes 35.61%	100%	Reyes 54.4%, Brown 45.6%
Roger Hernandez (D)	AD 48- West Covina	Y	Blanca Rubio	Cory H. Ellenson	Cory Ellenson 26.38%, Blanca Rubio 25.52%	100%	Rubio 63.9%, Ellenson 36.1%

California State Legislative Races - Assembly

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Ed Chau (D)	AD 49 - Arcadia	N	Ed Chau D	Peter Amundson	Ed Chau 99.5%, Peter Amundson 0.4%	100%	Chau 69.6%, Amundson 30.4%
Richard H. Bloom (D)	AD 50 -Santa Monica	N	Richard H. Bloom	Matthew Gene Craffey	Richard Bloom 79.6%, Matthew Gene Craffey 20.4%	100%	Bloom 74.8%, Craffey 25.2%
Jimmy Gomez (D)	AD 51 Los Angeles	N	Jimmy Gomez	Mike Everling (W/I), LIB	Jimmy Gomez 100%, Mike Everling 0%	100%	Gomez 86.3%, Everling 13.7%
Freddie Rodriguez (D)	AD 52 - Pomona	N	Freddie Rodriguez / Paul Avila	NONE	Freddie Rodriguez 64.4%, Paul Avila 35.6%	100%	Rodriguez 59.3%, Avila 40.7%
Miguel Santiago (D)	AD 53 - Los Angeles	N	Miguel Santiago / Sandra Menoza	NONE	Miguel Santiago 45.11%, Sandra Mendoza 41.33%	100%	Santiago 58.8%, Mendoza 41.2%
Sebastian Ridley-Thomas (D)	AD 54 - Los Angeles	N	Sebastian Ridley-Thomas	Glen Ratcliff, REP	Sebastian Ridley-Thomas 83.2%, Glen Ratcliff 16.8%	100%	Ridley-Thomas 81.8%, Ratliff 18.2%
Ling-Ling Chang (D) *running for Senate	AD 55- Diamond Bar	Y	Gregg D. Fritchle	Phillip Chen	Gregg Fritchle 35.91%, Phillip Chen 21.79%,	100%	Chen 58%, Fritchle 42%
Eduardo Garcia (D)	AD 56 -Coachella	N	Eduardo Garcia	NONE	Eduardo Garcia 100%	100%	Eduardo Garcia 100%
Ian C. Calderon (D)	AD 57 - Whittier	N	Ian C. Calderon	Rita Topalian,	Ian C. Calderon 65.7% Rita Topalian 34.3%	100%	Calderon 62.4%, Topalian 37.6%

California State Legislative Races - Assembly

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Cristina Garcia (D)	AD 58 - Bell Gardens	N	Cristina Garcia	Ramiro Alvarado	Cristina Garcia 100% Ramiro Alvarado 0%	100%	C. Garcia 75.1%, Alvarado 24.9%
Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer Sr. (D)	AD 59 - Los Angeles	N	Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer Sr.	NONE	Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer 100%	100%	Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer 100%
Eric Linder (R)	AD 60- Corona	N	Sabrina Cervantes	Eric Linder	Linder 45.62% Cervantes 41.51%	100%	Cervantes 53.8%, Linder 46.2%
Jose Medina (D)	AD 61 -Riverside	N	Jose Medina	Hector Diaz	Jose Medina 67.3% Hector Diaz 32.7%	100%	Medina 65.3%, Diaz 34.7%
Autumn R. Burke (D)	AD 62 -Inglewood	N	Autumn R. Burke	Marco Antonio "Tony"; Baron Bruno (Lib)	Autumn Burke 99.9% Marco Antonio "Tony" Leal 0%	100%	Burke 77.3%, Leal 17.3%, Baron Bruno 5.4%
Anthony Rendon Ph.D. (D)	AD63 -Lakewood	N	Anthony Rendon Ph.D.	Adam Joshua Miller	Anthony Rendon 78.5% Adam Joshua Miller 21.5%	100%	Rendon 77.4%, Miller 22.6%
Mike A. Gipson (D)	AD 64 -Carson	N	Mike A. Gipson	Theresa Sanford	Mike A. Gipson 76.5% Theresa Sanford 23.5%	100%	Gipson 73.7% Sanford 26.3%
Young Kim (R)	AD 65- Fullerton	N	Sharon Quirk-Silva	Young Kim	Sharon Quirk-Silva 53% Young Kim 47%	100%	Quirk-Silva 53.2%, Kim 46.8%

California State Legislative Races - Assembly

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
David Hadley (R)	AD 66- Manhattan Beach	N	Al Muratsuchi	David Hadley	Al Muratsuchi 48.73% David Hadley 44.58%,	100%	Muratsuchi 53.7%, Hadley 46.3%
Melissa Melendez (R)	AD 67 - Lake Elsinore	N	Jorge Lopez	Melissa Melendez	Melissa Melendez 63.5% Jorge Lopez 36.5%	100%	Lopez 35.9%, Melendez 64.1%
Donald P. Wagner (R)	AD 68- Irvine	Y	Sean Jay Panahi	Steven Choi	Panahi 33.03% Choi 19.81%,	100%	Panahi 39.3%, Choi 60.7%
Tom F. Daly (D)	AD 69 - Anaheim	N	Tom F. Daly	Ofelia Velarde-Garcia	Tom Daly 70.3% Ofelia Velarde-Garcia 29.7%	100%	Daly 68.3%, Velarde-Garcia 31.7%
Patrick O'Donnell (D)	AD 70 - Long Beach	N	Patrick O'Donnell	Martha E. Flores-Gibson	Patrick O'Donnell 99.5% Martha E. Flores-Gibson 0.5%	100%	O'Donnell 66.5%, Flores-Gibson 33.5%
Brian Jones W. (R)	AD 71- Santee	Y	NONE	Leo Hamel, Randy G. Voepel	Randy Voepel 59.87% Leo Hamel 27.70%,	100%	Hamel 33.8%, Voepel 66.2%
Travis Allen (R)	AD 72 -Huntington Beach	N	Lenore Albert-Sheridan,	Travis Allen	Travis Allen 50.4% Lenore Albert-Sheridan 28.6%	100%	Albert-Sheridan 42.1%, Allen 57.9%
William P. Brough (R)	AD 73 - Dana Point	N	Mesbah Islam	William P. Brough	William (Bill) Brough 99.6% Mesbah Islam 0.4%	100%	Islam 31.1%, Brough 68.9%

California State Legislative Races - Assembly

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Matthew Harper (R)	AD 74 - Huntington Beach	N	Karina Onofre	Matthew Harper	Karina Onofre 42.4% Matthew Harper 38.9%	100%	Onofre 43.5%, Harper 56.5%
Marie Waldron (R)	AD 75 - Escondido	N	Andrew Masiel Sr	Marie Waldron	Marie Waldron 60.3% Andrew Masiel Sr. 39.7%	100%	Masiel 36.8%, Waldron 63.2%
Rocky Chávez (R)	AD 76 -Oceanside	N	NONE	Rocky Chávez / Thomas E Krouse	Rocky Chavez 99.5% Thomas E Krouse 0.5%	100%	Chavez 59.4%, Krouse 40.6%
Brian Maienschein (R)	AD 77 - San Diego	N	Melinda K. Vásquez	Brian Maienschein	Brian Maienschein 57.7% Melinda K. Vásquez 42.3%	100%	Vasquez 42.1%, Maienschein 57.9%
Toni G. Atkins (D)	AD 78- San Diego	Y	Todd Gloria	Kevin D. Melton	Todd Gloria 71.2% Kevin Melton 28.8%	100%	Gloria 69.1%, Melton 30.9%
Shirley N. Weber (D)	AD 79 - San Diego	N	Shirley N. Weber	John Moore	Shirley N. Weber 67.7% John Moore 32.3%	100%	Weber 64.8%, Moore 35.2%
Lorena Gonzalez (D)	AD 80 - San Diego	N	Lorena Gonzalez	Lincoln Pickard	Lorena Gonzalez 74.6% Lincoln Pickard 19%	100%	Gonzalez 77.1%, Pickard 22.9%

California State Legislative Races - Senate

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Ted Gaines (R)	SD 01- El Dorado Hills	N	Rob Rowen	Ted Gaines	Ted Gaines 49.4% Rob Rowen 36.6%,	100%	Rowen 36.0%, Gaines 64.0%
Lois Wolk (D)	SD 03- Davis	Y	Bill Dodd, Mariko M. Yamada	NONE	Bill Dodd 37.40%, Mariko Yamada 29.89%	100%	Dodd 58.1%, Yamada 41.9%
Cathleen Galgiani (D)	SD 05- Stockton	N	Cathleen Galgiani	Alan Nakanishi	Cathleen Galgiani 56.75%, Alan Nakanishi 27.79%	100%	Galgiani 56.1%, Nakanishi 43.9%
Steve Glazer (D)	SD 07- Orinda	N	Steve Glazer	Joseph Alexander Rubay	Steve Glazer 54.3%, Joseph Alexander Rubay 27.2%	100%	Glazer 66.6%, Rubay 33.4%
Loni Hancock (D)	SD 09- Berkeley	Y	Nancy Skinner / Sandre Swanson	NONE	Nancy Skinner 47.82%, Sandre Swanson 30.47%	100%	Skinner 62.2%, Swanson 37.8%
Mark Leno (D)	SD 11- San Francisco	Y	Jane Kim / Scott D. Wiener	NONE	Jane Kim 75.31%, Scott Wiener 45.06%	100%	Kim 49.0%, Wiener 51.0%
Jerry Hill (D)	SD 13- San Mateo	N	Jerry Hill	Rick Ciardella	Jerry Hill 75.6%, Rick Ciardella 18.6%	100%	Hill 75.9%, Ciardella 24.1%
Jim Beall (D)	SD 15- San Jose	N	Jim Beall / Nora Campos	NONE	Jim Beall 49.44%, Nora Campos 26.88%	100%	Beall 62.5%, Campos 37.5%
William Monning (D)	SD 17- Carmel	N	Bill Monning	Palmer Kain	William Monning 68.8%, Palmer Kain 31.2%	100%	Monning 65.3%, Kain 34.7%

California State Legislative Races - Senate

<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Hannah-Beth Jackson (D)	SD 19- Santa Barbara	N	Hannah-Beth Jackson	Colin Patrick Walch	Hannah-Beth Jackson 64.1%, Colin Patrick Walch 35.9%	100%	Jackson 62.7%, Walch 37.3%
Sharon Runner (R)	SD 21- Lancaster	Y	Jonathon Ervin	Scott T. Wilk	Scott Wilk 46.69% Jonathon Ervin 33.69%,	100%	Ervin 46.4%, Wilk 53.6%
Mike Morrell (R)	SD 23- Rancho Cucamonga	N	Ronald J. O'Donnell	Mike Morrell	Mike Morrell 54.8% Ronald O'Donnell 29.8%,	100%	O'Donnell 42.9%, Morrell 57.1%
Carol Liu (D)	SD 25- La Canada Flintridge	Y	Anthony Portantino	Michael D. Antonovich	Michael Antonovich 39.51%, Anthony Portantino 26.82%	100%	Portantino 57.7%, Antonovich 42.3%
Fran Pavley (D)	SD 27- Agoura Hills	Y	Henry Stern	Steve Fazio	Steve Fazio 37.13% Henry Stern 27.30%	100%	Stern 55.5%, Fazio 44.5%
Bob Huff (R)	SD 29- San Dimas	Y	Josh B. Newman	Ling-Ling Chang	Ling -Ling Chang 44.01%, Josh Newman 29.19%	100%	Newman 50.3%, Chang 49.7%
Richard Roth (D)	SD 31 - Riverside	N	Richard Roth	Richard Reed	Richard Roth 61.2% Richard Reed 38.8%	100%	Roth 60.1%, Reed 39.9%
Ricardo Lara (D)	SD 33 - Bell Gardens	N	Ricardo Lara	NONE	Ricardo Lara 100%	100%	Lara 78.6%, Robson 21.4%

California State Legislative Races - Senate							
<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Isadore Hall III (D) *running for Congress	SD 35- Compton	Y	Steven Bradford, Warren Furutani	NONE	Steve Bradford 35.58%, Warren Furutani 24.44%	100%	Bradford 53.7 %, Furutani 46.3%
John M.W. Moorlach (R)	SD 37 - Costa Mesa	N	Ari Grayson	John M.W. Moorlach	John M.W. Moorlach 54.8% Ari Grayson 45.2%	100%	Grayson 42.6%, Moorlach 57.4%
Marty Block (D) *not termed out, but not running	SD 39-San Diego	Y	Toni G. Atkins	John Renison	Toni Atkins 66.33% John Renison 18.14%	100%	Atkins 62.4%, Renison 37.6%

United States Senate Race							
<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Barbara Boxer	CA	Y	Kamala Harris, Loretta Sanchez	NONE	Kamala Harris 40.4% Loretta Sanchez 18.6%	100%	Harris 62.0%, Sanchez 38.0%

United States Congressional Races							
<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Doug La Malfa (R)	CD 01- Richvale	N	Jim Reed	Doug La Malfa	Doug La Malfa 40.8%, Jim Reed 28.3%	100%	Reed 41.1%, La Malfa 58.9%
Jared Huffman (D)	CD 02- Marina	N	Jared Huffman	Dale Mensing	Jared Huffman 68.3%, Dale Mensing 15.7%	100%	Huffman 77.6%, Mensing 22.4%
John Garamendi (D)	CD 03- Walnut Grove	N	John Garamendi	Eugene Cleek	John Garamendi 63.1%, Eugene Cleek 24.3%	100%	Garamendi 59.4%, Cleek 40.6%
Tom McClintock (R)	CD 04- Elk Grove	N	Robert Derlet	Tom McClintock	Robert Derlet 27.5%, Tom McClintock 61.5%	100%	Derlet 37.3%, McClintock 62.7%
Mike Thompson (D)	CD 05- St. Helena	N	Mike Thompson	Carlos Santamaria	Mike Thompson 65.7%, Carlos Santamaria 19.2%	100%	Thompson 77.2%, Santamaria 22.8%
Doris Matsui (D)	CD 06- Sacramento	N	Doris Matsui	Robert Evans	Doris Matsui 70.4%, Robert Evans 18.4%	100%	Matsui 75.3%, Evans 24.7%
Ami Bera (D)	CD 07- Elk Grove	N	Ami Bera	Scott Jones	Ami Bera 54%, Scott Jones 46%	100%	Bera 51.0%, Jones 49.0%
Paul Cook (R)	CD 08- Yucca Valley	N	Rita Ramirez	Paul Cook	Rita Ramirez 21.9% Paul Cook 42%	100%	Ramirez 37.5%, Cook 62.5%
Jerry McNerney (D)	CD 09- Pleasanton	N	Jerry McNerney	Tony Amador	Jerry McNerney 55.3% Tony Amador 21.7%	100%	McNerney 57.1%, Amador 42.9%

United States Congressional Races							
<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Jeff Denham (R)	CD 10- Atwater	N	Michael Eggman	Jeff Denham	Michael Eggman 27.6% Jeff Denham 47.7%	100%	Eggman 47.9%, Denham 52.1%
Mark DeSaulnier (D)	CD 11- Concord	N	Mark DeSaulnier	Roger Petersen	Mark DeSaulnier 75.3% Roger Petersen 24.7%	100%	DeSaulnier 71.8%, Petersen 28.2%
Nancy Pelosi (D)	CD 12- San Francisco	N	Nancy Pelosi	Preston Picus (NPP)	Nancy Pelosi 78.1%, Preston Picus 7.7%	100%	Pelosi 80.9%, Picus 19.1%
Barbara Lee (D)	CD 13- Oakland	N	Barbara Lee	Sue Caro	Barbara Lee 92%, Sue Caro 8%	100%	Lee 90.8%, Caro 9.2%
Jackie Speier (D)	CD 14- Hillsborough	N	Jackie Speier	Angel Cardenas (NPP)	Jackie Speier 99%, Angel Cardenas 1%	100%	Speier 80.9%, Cardenas 19.1%
Eric Swalwell (D)	CD 15- Dublin	N	Eric Swalwell	Danny Turner	Eric Swalwell 76.5%, Danny Turner 23.5%	100%	Swalwell 73.8%, Turner 26.2%
Jim Costa (D)	CD 16- Fresno	N	Jim Costa	Johnny Tacherra	Jim Costa 55.9%, Johnny Tacherra 32.8%	100%	Costa 58.3%, Tacherra 41.7%
Mike Honda (D)	CD 17- San Jose	N	Mike Honda / Ro Khanna	NONE	Mike Honda 37.4%, Ro Khanna 39.1%	100%	Honda 39.0%, Khanna 61.0%
Anna Eshoo (D)	CD 18- Menlo Park	N	Anna Eshoo	Richard Fox	Anna Eshoo 68.2%, Richard Fox 24.4%	100%	Eshoo 71.1%, Fox 28.9%
Zoe Lofgren (D)	CD 19- San Jose	N	Zoe Lofgren	Burt Lancaster	Zoe Lofgren 76.1%, Burt Lancaster 23.9%	100%	Lofgren 74.0%, Lancaster 26.0%

United States Congressional Races							
<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Sam Farr (D) *not running	CD 20- Carmel	Y	Jimmy Panetta	Casey Lucius	Jimmy Panetta 70.8%, Casey Lucius 19.8%	100%	Panetta 70.3%, Lucius 29.7%
David Valadao (R)	CD 21- Hanford	N	Emilio Huerta	David Valadao	Emilio Huerta 24.2%, David Valadao 54%	100%	Huerta 43.2%, Valado 56.8%
Devin Nunes (R)	CD 22- Tulare	N	Louie Campos	Devin Nunes	Louie Campos 29.7%, Devin Nunes 63.8%	100%	Campos 32.2%, Nunes 67.8%
Kevin McCarthy (R)	CD 23- Bakersfield	N	Wendy Reed	Kevin McCarthy	Wendy Reed 27.4%, Kevin McCarthy 55.5%	100%	Reed 30.4%, McCarthy 69.6%
Lois Capps (D) *not running	CD 24- Santa Barbara	Y	Salud Carbajal	Justin Fareed	Salud Carbajal 31.9%, Justin Fareed 20.5%	100%	Carbajal 53.3%, Fareed 46.7%
Steve Knight (R)	CD 25- Palmdale	N	Bryan Caforio	Steve Knight	Bryan Caforio 29%, Steve Knight 48.3%	100%	Caforio 46.3%, Knight 53.7%
Julia Brownley (D)	CD 26- Oakpark	N	Julia Brownley	Rafael Dagnesses	Julia Brownley 64%, Rafael Dagnesses 36%	100%	Brownley 60.0%, Dagnesses 40.0%
Judy Chu (D)	CD 27- Monterey Park	N	Judy Chu	Jack Orswell	Judy Chu 66.2%, Jack Orswell 28.1%	100%	Chu 67.1%, Orswell 32.9%
Adam Schiff (D)	CD 28- Burbank	N	Adam Schiff	Lenore Solis	Adam Schiff 70.2%, Lenore Solis 18.4%	100%	Schiff 78.0%, Solis 22.0%
Tony Cardenas (D)	CD 29- Los Angeles	N	Tony Cardenas / Richard Alarcon	NONE	Tony Cardenas 61.4%, Richard Alarcon 13%	100%	Alarcon 24.9%, Cardenas 75.1%

United States Congressional Races							
<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Brad Sherman (D)	CD 30- Sherman Oaks	N	Brad Sherman	Mark Reed	Brad Sherman 60.1%, Mark Reed 14%	100%	Sherman 72.5%, Reed 27.5%
Pete Aguilar (D)	CD 31- Redlands	N	Pete Aguilar	Paul Chabot	Pete Aguilar 43.1%, Paul Chabot 22.7%	100%	Aguilar 55.8%, Chabot 44.2%
Grace Napolitano (D)	CD 32- Norwalk	N	Grace Napolitano	NONE	Grace Napolitano 51.4%, Roger Hernandez (Dropped Out) 24.7%	100%	Hernandez 38.1%, Napolitano 61.9%
Ted Lieu (D)	CD 33- Torrance	N	Ted Lieu	Kenneth Wright	Ted Lieu 69.2%, Kenneth Wright 30.8%	100%	Lieu 66.3%, Wright 33.7%
Xavier Becerra (D)	CD 34- Los Angeles	N	Xavier Becerra / Adrienne Edwards	NONE	Xavier Becerra 77.6%, Adrienne Edwards 21.2%	100%	Becerra 77.7%, Edwards 22.3%
Norma Torres (D)	CD 35- Pomona	N	Norma Torres	Tyler Fischella	Norma Torres 75.6%, Tyler Fischella 24.4%	100%	Torres 72.1%, Fischella 27.9%
Raul Ruiz (D)	CD 36- Palm Desert	N	Raul Ruiz	Jeff Stone	Raul Ruiz 58.5%, Jeff Stone 31.6%	100%	Ruiz 61.4%, Stone 38.6%
Karen Bass (D)	CD 37- Los Angeles	N	Karen Bass / Chris Wiggins	NONE	Karen Bass 80.2%, Chris Wiggins 10.7%	100%	Bass 81.5%, Wiggins 18.5%
Linda Sanchez (D)	CD 38- Lakewood	N	Linda Sanchez	Ryan Downing	Linda Sanchez 70%, Ryan Downing 20.9%	100%	Sanchez 70.3%, Downing 29.7%

United States Congressional Races							
<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Ed Royce (R)	CD 39- Fullerton	N	Brett Murdock	Ed Royce	Ed Royce 60.5%, Brett Murdock 39.5%	100%	Murdock 42.6%, Royce 57.4%
Lucille Roybal-Allard (D)	CD 40- Downey	N	Lucille Roybal-Allard	Roman Gonzalez (NPP)	Lucille Roybal-Allard 76.3%, Roman Gonzalez 23.7%	100%	Roybal-Allard 71.7%, Gonzalez 28.3%
Mark Takano (D)	CD 41- Riverside	N	Mark Takano	Doug Shepherd	Mark Takano 64.5%, Doug Shepherd 17.5%	100%	Takano 64.4%, Shepherd 35.6%
Ken Calvert (R)	CD 42- Corona	N	Tim Sheridan	Ken Calvert	Ken Calvert 54.9%, Tim Sheridan 37.5%	100%	Sheridan 41.0%, Calvert 59.0%
Maxine Waters (D)	CD 43- Los Angeles	N	Maxine Waters	Omar Navarro	Maxine Waters 76.1%, Omar Navarro 23.9%	100%	Waters 75.9%, Navarro 24.1%
Janice Hahn (D) *not running	CD 44- San Pedro	Y	Isadore Hall / Nanette Barragan	NONE	Isadore Hall 40.1%, Nanette Barragan 22%	100%	Barragan 52.0%, Hall 48.0%
Mimi Walters (R)	CD 45- Laguna Niguel	N	Ron Varasteh	Mimi Walters	Mimi Walters 40.9%, Ron Varasteh 27.6%	100%	Varasteh 41.1%, Walters 58.9%
Loretta Sanchez (D) *not running	CD 46- Garden Grove	Y	Lou Correa / Bao Nguyen	NONE	Lou Correa 43.7%, Bao Nguyen 14.6%	100%	Correa 70.0%, Nguyen 30.0%
Alan Lowenthal (D)	CD 47- Long Beach	N	Alan Lowenthal	Andy Whallon	Alan Lowenthal 66.1%, Andy Whallon 21.9%	100%	Lowenthal 63.3%, Whallon 36.7%

United States Congressional Races							
<u>Current Legislator</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Vacant Seat?</u>	<u>Democrat Candidates</u>	<u>Republican Candidates</u>	<u>Primary Results</u>	<u>PERCENT REPORTING</u>	<u>General Election Results</u>
Dana Rohrabacher (R)	CD 48- Costa Mesa	N	Suzanne Savary	Dana Rohrabacher	Dana Rohrabacher 56.6%, Suzanne Savary 28.9%	100%	Savary 41.7%, Rohrabacher 58.3%
Darrell Issa (R)	CD 49- Vista	N	Doug Applegate	Darrell Issa	Darrell Issa 50.8%, Doug Applegate 45.5%	100%	Applegate 49.6%, Issa 50.4%
Duncan D. Hunter (R)	CD 50- Alpine	N	Patrick Malloy	Duncan D. Hunter	Duncan D. Hunter 56.5%, Patrick Malloy 21.8%	100%	Malloy 36.4%, Hunter 63.6%
Juan Vargas (D)	CD 51- San Diego	N	Juan Vargas	Juan Hidalgo	Juan Vargas 66.8%, Juan Hidalgo 15.4%	100%	Vargas 72.4%, Hidalgo 27.6%
Scott Peters (D)	CD 52- La Jolla	N	Scott Peters	Denise Gitsham	Scott Peters 58.9%, Denise Gitsham 16.2%	100%	Peters 56.5%, Gitsham 43.5%
Susan Davis (D)	CD 53- San Diego	N	Susan Davis	James Veltmeyer	Susan Davis 65.5%, James Veltmeyer 15.2%	100%	Davis 66.8%, Veltmeyer 33.2%

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 8, 2016
To: C/CAG Legislative Committee
From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Annual C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2017

(For further information or response to questions, contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Legislative Committee review and recommend approval of the Annual C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2017.

FISCAL IMPACT

Many of the policies listed in the attached document have the potential to increase or decrease the fiscal resources available to C/CAG member agencies.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

New legislation

BACKGROUND

Each year, the C/CAG Board adopts a set of legislative policies to provide direction to its Legislative Committee, staff, and legislative advocates. In the past, the C/CAG Board established policies that:

- Clearly defined a policy framework at the beginning of the Legislative Session.
- Identified specific policies to be accomplished during this session by C/CAG's legislative advocates.
- Limited the activities of C/CAG to areas where we can have the greatest impact.

The adoption of a list of policies will hopefully maximize the impact of having legislative advocates represent C/CAG in Sacramento and will also significantly reduce the amount of C/CAG staff time needed to support the program.

Recommendations from the Legislative Committee on December 8, 2016 will be presented verbally to the Board.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2017

DRAFT C/CAG LEGISLATIVE POLICIES FOR 20162017

Policy #1 -

Protect against the diversion of local revenues and promote equitable distribution of state/regional resources and revenues.

- 1.1 Support League, ~~and~~ CSAC, and other initiatives to protect local revenues.
- 1.2 Provide incentives and tools to local government to promote economic vitality and to alleviate blighted conditions.
- 1.3 Support the reinstatement of state funding for economic development and affordable housing.
- 1.4 Pursue and support efforts that direct state and regional funds equitably to ensure a return to source.

Policy #2 -

Protect against increased local costs resulting from State action without 100% State reimbursement for the resulting costs.

- 2.1 ~~Require all~~ Support State actions ~~to that~~ take into consideration the fiscal impact to local jurisdictions, by ensuring that adequate funding is made available by the State, for delegated re-alignment responsibilities and by ensuring that all State mandates are 100% reimbursed.
- 2.2 Oppose State actions that delegate responsibilities to local jurisdictions without full reimbursement for resulting costs.

Policy #3 -

Support actions that help to meet municipal stormwater permit requirements and secure stable funding to pay for current and future regulatory mandates.

- 3.1 Primary focus on securing additional revenue sources for both C/CAG and its member agencies for funding state- and federally mandated stormwater compliance efforts.
 - a. Support additional efforts to exempt storm sewers from the voting requirements imposed by Proposition 218, similar to water, sewer, and refuse services; or efforts to reduce the voter approval threshold for special taxes related to stormwater management.
 - b. Advocate for inclusion of water quality and stormwater management as a priority for funding in new sources of revenues (e.g. water bonds) and protect against a geographically unbalanced North-South allocation of resources.
 - c. Advocate for an integrated approach to both funding and project types for incorporating stormwater management with statewide and regional infrastructure efforts.

- d. Track and advocate for resources for stormwater management in State and Federal grant and loan programs.
- e. Support efforts to identify regulatory requirements that are unfunded state mandates and ensure provision of state funding for such requirements.
- f. Pursue and support efforts that address stormwater issues at statewide or regional levels and thereby reduce the cost share for C/CAG and its member agencies and limit the need to implement such efforts locally.

3.2 ~~Pursue~~ Support efforts to secure statewide legislation mandating abatement of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in building materials prior to demolition of relevant structures, in accordance with requirements in the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board's Municipal Regional Permit.

3.3 Pursue and support efforts that control pollutants at the source and extend producer responsibility, especially in regard to trash and litter control.

3.4 Support efforts to place the burden/ accountability of reporting, managing, and meeting municipal stormwater requirements on the responsible source rather than the cities or county, such as properties that are known pollutant hot spots and third party utility purveyors.

3.5 Advocate for integrated, prioritized, and achievable stormwater regulations that protect water quality and beneficial uses and account for limitations on municipal funding.

3.6 Pursue and support pesticide regulations that protect water quality and reduce pesticide toxicity.

Policy #4 -

Support lowering the 2/3rd super majority vote for local special purpose taxes and fees.

4.1 Support constitutional amendments~~bills~~ that reduce the vote requirements for special taxes and fees.

4.2 Oppose bills that impose restrictions on the expenditures, thereby reducing flexibility, for special tax category.

4.3 Support modification or elimination of the Proposition 26 two-thirds requirements.

Policy #5-

Protect and support transportation funding.

5.1 Oppose the transfer of additional State transportation funds to the State General Fund and support the redirection of truck weight fees to the State Highway Account

5.2 Support stabilizing and indexing the STIP and additional new revenues for transportation ~~across all modes~~ funding.

- 5.3 Protect existing funding and support additional funding for maintenance of streets and roads and oppose the any negative adjustments by the Board of Equalization to the excise tax on gasoline.
- 5.4 Monitor [and engage in](#) the implementation of the “Road User Charge.”
- 5.5 Protect existing funding and support new funding for the State of California SHOPP program, which provides resources for maintenance of State highways. [Proposed new funding for the SHOPP program should not be proposed at the expense of the STIP.](#)
- 5.6 Support revisions in the Peninsula Joint Powers Agreement that provide equitable funding among the Caltrain partners.
- 5.7 Support a dedicated funding source for the operation of Caltrain.
- 5.8 Support efforts to secure the appropriation and allocation of “cap and trade” revenues to support San Mateo County needs.
- 5.9 Support or sponsor efforts that finance and/ or facilitate operational improvements on the US 101 corridor.
- 5.10 Support the development of an expenditure plan for a potential countywide sales tax measure to fund transportation in San Mateo County.
- 5.11 [Support the development of a new bridge toll program \(Regional Measure 3\) and ensure an appropriate share of new revenues is available for projects in San Mateo County.](#)

Policy #6 -

Advocate for revenue solutions to address State budget issues that are also beneficial to Cities/ Counties

- 6.1 Support measures to ensure that local governments receive appropriate revenues to service local communities.

Policy #7 -

Support reasonable climate protection action, Greenhouse Gas reduction, and energy conservation legislation

- 7.1 Support incentive approaches toward implementing AB32 [and SB 32](#).
- 7.2 Oppose climate legislation that would conflict with or override projects approved by the voters.
- 7.3 Support funding for both transportation and housing investments, which support the implementation of SB 375, so that housing funds are not competing with transportation funds.
- 7.4 [Monitor the regulatory process for implementing SB 743 and impacts the new regulations may have on congestion management plans.](#)

- | 7.54 Alert the Board on legislation that would require recording of vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as part of vehicle registration.
- | 7.65 Support local government partnerships to foster energy conservation, as well as the generation and use of renewable and/ or clean energy sources (wind, solar, etc.).
- | 7.6 Support efforts to develop disadvantage community screening tools used to meet programmatic targets established in the “cap and trade” program that result in an equitable distribution of resources throughout the Bay Area

***Policy #8 -
Protection of water user rights***

- 8.1 Support the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Association (BAWSCA) efforts in the protection of water user rights for San Mateo County users.

***Policy #9 –
Other***

- 9.1 Support/sponsor legislation that identifies revenue to fund airport/land use compatibility plans.
- 9.2 Support efforts that will engage the business community in mitigating industry impacts associated with stormwater, transportation congestion, greenhouse gas emissions, and energy consumption.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 8, 2016

To: C/CAG Legislative Committee

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director

Subject: Review and recommend approval to the C/CAG Board to exercise the option to extend the contract with Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc. to provide state legislative advocacy service for the same annual fee of \$72,000 in an amount not to exceed \$144,000 for the 2017 and 2018 legislative session.

(For further information or response to questions, contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Legislative Committee review and recommend approval to the C/CAG Board to exercise the option to extend the contract with Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc. to provide state legislative advocacy service for the same annual fee of \$72,000 in an amount not to exceed \$144,000 for the 2017 and 2018 legislative session.

FISCAL IMPACT

The cost of the state legislative advocacy services is \$72,000 per year, a total of \$144,000 for two years.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funds for state legislative advocacy are programmed into the C/CAG fiscal year 2017 budget and are proposed for the fiscal year 2018 budget.

BACKGROUND

On October 24, 2014, C/CAG staff issued a Request for Qualifications/Proposals for state legislative advocacy. On December 5, 2014, proposals were received from three firms, Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc., Khouri Consulting, and JEA & Associates Inc.

A selection panel was convened, consisting of C/CAG staff, a Santa Clara VTA Senior policy analyst, and a SamTrans government affairs officer. After an evaluation of proposals, Khouri Consulting and Shaw/Yoder/ Antwih Inc. (SYA) were invited to interviews. Interviews were held on December 16, 2014.

Shaw/ Yoder/ Antwih Inc. (SYA) received the highest scores on both the proposal and interview. SYA was selected to be moved on to the contract negotiation step. In addition SYA proposed an option to extend the contract to the 2017 and 2018 legislative session with the same annual fee of \$72,000.

On January 8, 2014 the C/CAG Board approved entering a contract with SYA for the 2015 and 2016

legislative session. The Board also considered the option to extend the contract to the 2017 and 2018 legislative session, subject to approval of the Board at the time of extension.

Staff recommends that the Legislative Committee recommend approval of the option to extend the contract to provide state legislative advocacy service for the same annual fee of \$72,000 in an amount not to exceed \$144,000 for the 2017 and 2018 legislative session.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Amendment No. 1 between C/CAG and Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

EXTENDING THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY AND SHAW/YODER/ANTWIH, INC. TO PROVIDE STATE LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY SERVICE FOR AN ANNUAL FEE OF \$72,000 IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$144,000 FOR THE 2017/18 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

WHEREAS, the City/County Association of Governments for San Mateo County (hereinafter referred to as C/CAG) has entered into an agreement for services with Advocation, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as Consultant) on January 8, 2015; and

WHEREAS, Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc. has included an option to extend the contract to the 2017/18 legislative session under the same terms; and

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Board also considered the option to extend the contract to the 2017 and 2018 legislative session, subject to approval of the Board at the time of extension; and

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Board has decided that it desires to have Consultant continue to provide these services for the 2017/ 2018 legislative session; and

WHEREAS, Consultant has reviewed and accepted this amendment.

THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY AGREED by the C/CAG Chair and Consultant that: The contract to provide state legislative advocacy service will be extended for the same annual fee of \$72,000 in an amount not to exceed \$144,000 for the 2017 and 2018 legislative session, thereby making the new total contract amount two hundred and eighty eight thousand dollars (\$288,000); and

The extension of the contract for the 2017 and 2018 legislative session modifies the contract term date, thereby making the new termination date February 14, 2019; and

All other provisions of the original agreement between C/CAG and Consultant dated January 8, 2015 and subsequent amendments shall remain in full force and effect; and

This amendment to the agreement shall take effect upon signature by both parties.

For C/CAG Chair:

For Consultant:

Alicia C. Aguirre, Chair

Signature

Date: _____

By: _____

Date: _____

Approved as to form:

Nirit Eriksson, C/CAG Legal Counsel

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 8, 2016
To: C/CAG Legislative Committee
From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director
Subject: Review and approval of the 2017 C/CAG Legislative Committee calendar.

(For further information or response to questions, contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee review and approve the 2017 C/CAG Legislative Committee calendar.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

The C/CAG Legislative Committee generally meets just before the C/CAG Board meeting. The C/CAG Board does will meet in August therefore no meeting is planned for August. The Legislative session generally is scheduled to start in January, after New Year's, and close at the end of August. It is proposed to hold no Legislative Committee meetings in October and November.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed 2017 Legislative meeting calendar

**C/CAG Legislative Committee
2017 Calendar**

**City / County Association of Governments
of San Mateo County (C/CAG)**

Time: 5:30 p. m. to 6:30 p.m.

Location: 2nd Floor Auditorium
San Mateo County Transit District
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos

January 12

February 9

March 9

April 13 – Room changed to 4th Floor “Dining Room”

May 11

June 8

July 13

August - No meeting scheduled

September 14

October - No meeting scheduled

November - No meeting scheduled

December 14

NOTE: This schedule is subject to change should significant issues arise or develop over the course of the year.