

# C/CAG

## City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

## MEETING AGENDA

### C/CAG Legislative Committee

**Chair:** Gina Papan      **Vice Chair:** Adam Rak

**Members:** Davina Hurt (C/CAG Chair), Ricardo Ortiz (C/CAG Vice-Chair)  
Elizabeth Lewis, Karen Cunningham, Lisa Gauthier,  
Anders Fung, Sue Vaterlaus, Michael Salazar

**April 14, 2022 - 5:15 P.M.**

On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, which amended certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act in order to allow for local legislative bodies to conduct their meetings remotely via telephonically or by other electronic means under specified circumstances. Thus, pursuant to Government Code section 54953(e), C/CAG Committee meetings will be conducted via remote conferencing. Members of the public may observe or participate in the meeting remotely via one of the options below.

**Join by Zoom:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82251917605?pwd=SUprdS9Od2tUMnB5aHFiQ00wZXduZ09>

Meeting ID: 822 5191 7605

Passcode: 041422

**Join by Phone:**

(669)900-6833 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 822 5191 7605

Passcode: 041422

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82251917605?pwd=SUprdS9Od2tUMnB5aHFiQ00wZXduZ09>

Persons who wish to address the C/CAG Legislative Committee on an item to be considered at this meeting, or on items not on this agenda, are asked to submit written comments to Kim Springer at [kspringer@smcgov.org](mailto:kspringer@smcgov.org). Please see below for instructions. Spoken public comments will also be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. Please see instructions for written and spoken public comments at the end of this agenda.

\*\*\*\*\*

1.	Call to Order	Papan	
2.	COVID-19 announcement and brief overview of teleconference meeting procedures	Springer	
3.	Roll call	Springer	
4.	By motion, find that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency declared by Governor Newsom, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.	Charpentier	Pages 4-6
5.	Public comment on related items not on the agenda.	Papan	
6.	Review and approve the Legislative Committee meeting minutes from the meeting held on March 10, 2022.	Action Papan	Pages 7-10
7.	Update on scheduling meetings and topics of discussion with the San Mateo County Delegation in the 2022-23 Legislative Session.	Information Robinson/Antwih	Pages 11
8.	Review legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)	Possible Action Robinson/Antwih Papan	Pages 12-17
9.	Adjournment	Papan	

**Next Meeting: May 12, 2022**

**PUBLIC NOTICING:** All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Court Yard, 555 County Center, Redwood City, CA, and on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

**PUBLIC RECORDS:** Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board or committee. The Board has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>. Please note that C/CAG's office is temporarily closed to the public; please contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406 to arrange for inspection of public records.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETINGS:** Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

**Written Comments** should be emailed in advance of the meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. Your written comment should be emailed to [kspringer@smcgov.org](mailto:kspringer@smcgov.org) with the Subject line: C/CAG Leg. Written Comments.”
2. Your email should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda.
3. Members of the public are limited to one comment per agenda item.
4. The length of the emailed comment should be commensurate with the two minutes customarily allowed for verbal comments, which is approximately 250-300 words.
5. If your emailed comment is received at least 2 hours prior to the meeting, it will be provided to the C/CAG Committee members and made publicly available on the C/CAG website along with the agenda. We cannot guarantee that emails received less than 2 hours before the meeting will be able to be posted or provided to Committee members prior to the meeting, but such emails will be included in the administrative record of the meeting.

**Oral Comments** will be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. The Legislative Committee meeting may be accessed through Zoom at the online location indicated at the top of this agenda.
2. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting using an internet browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
3. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by your name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
4. When C/CAG Staff or the Committee Chair/Vice-Chair call for the item on which you wish to speak, click on “raise hand.” C/CAG staff will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called on to speak.
5. When called, please limit your remarks to the time allotted.

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact C/CAG staff:

**Executive Director: Sean Charpentier:** [scharpentier@smcgov.org](mailto:scharpentier@smcgov.org)

**Transportation Systems Coordinator:** Kim Springer at [kspringer@smcgov.org](mailto:kspringer@smcgov.org)

**Administrative Assistant:** Mima Guilles (650) 599-1406

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** April 14, 2022

**To:** City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Legislative Committee

**From:** Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

**Subject:** By motion, find that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency declared by Governor Newsom, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

(For further information contact Sean Charpentier at [scharpentier@smcgov.org](mailto:scharpentier@smcgov.org))

---

### RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee find, by motion, that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency declared by Governor Newsom, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

### FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact.

### SOURCE OF FUNDS

Not applicable

### BACKGROUND

On June 11, 2021, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-08-21, which rescinded his prior Executive Order N-29-20 and set a date of October 1, 2021 for public agencies to transition back to public meetings held in full compliance with the Brown Act. The original Executive Order provided that all provisions of the Brown Act that required the physical presence of members or other personnel as a condition of participation or as a quorum for a public meeting were waived for public health reasons. If these waivers fully sunset on October 1, 2021, legislative bodies subject to the Brown Act would have to contend with a sudden return to full compliance with in-person meeting requirements as they existed prior to March 2020, including the requirement for full physical public access to all teleconference locations from which board members were participating.

On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, a bill that formalizes and modifies the teleconference procedures implemented by California public agencies in response to the Governor's Executive Orders addressing Brown Act compliance during the COVID-19 emergency. AB 361 allows a local agency legislative body to continue to use teleconferencing under the same basic rules as provided in the Executive Orders when certain circumstances occur or when certain findings have been

made and adopted by the legislative body.

AB 361 provides that Brown Act legislative bodies must return to in-person meetings on October 1, 2021, unless they choose to continue with fully teleconferenced meetings because a specific declaration of a state or local health emergency is appropriately made. AB 361 allows legislative bodies to continue to conduct virtual meetings as long as there is a gubernatorially-proclaimed public emergency in combination with (1) local health official recommendations for social distancing or (2) adopted findings that meeting in person would present an imminent risk to health or safety. AB 361 is effective immediately as urgency legislation and will sunset on January 1, 2024.

AB 361 also requires that, if the state of emergency remains active for more than 30 days, the legislative body must make findings by majority vote every 30 days to continue using the bill's exemption to the Brown Act teleconferencing rules. Specifically, the legislative body must find that the need for teleconferencing persists due to risks posed by the ongoing state of emergency. Effectively, this means that local agencies must either agendaize a Brown Act meeting once every thirty days to make these findings, or, **if a local agency has not made such findings within the prior 30 days, the local agency must re-adopt the initial findings if it wishes to conduct a remote meeting.**

Cities throughout San Mateo County and San Mateo County have made the findings required to continue remote meetings. On March 10, 2022, the C/CAG Board of Directors approved Resolution 22-11, which made the findings necessary for remote meetings for both the Board of Directors and its standing Committees, including the Legislative Committee.

Unfortunately, April 14, 2022 is 33 days after the C/CAG Board of Directors approved Resolution 21-88.

The April 14, 2022 C/CAG Board meeting includes a resolution similar to 22-11 that would make the findings necessary to continue with remote meetings for both the C/CAG Board and standing C/CAG Committees for another 30 days.

## **DISCUSSION**

The County's high vaccination rate, successfully-implemented local health measures (such as indoor masking), and best practices by the public (such as voluntary social distancing) have proven effective, in combination, at controlling the local spread of COVID-19.

However, reducing the circumstances under which people come into close contact remains a vital component of the County's COVID-19 response strategy. While local agency public meetings are an essential government function, the last 22 months have demonstrated that conducting such meetings virtually is feasible.

Public meetings pose high risks for COVID-19 spread for several reasons. These meetings bring together people from throughout a geographic region, increasing the opportunity for COVID-19 transmission. Further, the open nature of public meetings makes it difficult to enforce compliance with vaccination, physical distancing, masking, cough and sneeze etiquette, or other safety measures. Moreover, some of the safety measures used by private businesses to control these risks may be less

effective for public agencies.

These factors combine to make in-person public meetings imminently risky to health and safety.

Because local rates of transmission of COVID-19 are in the “high” tier as measured by the Centers for Disease Control as of the date of this report, we recommend that the Board avail itself of the provisions of AB 361 allowing continuation of remote meetings by adopting findings to the effect that conducting in-person meetings would present an imminent risk to the health and safety of attendees.

Given that the Legislative Committee meeting is occurring 33 days after the approval of C/CAG Resolution 22-11, staff recommend that in order to continue to have remote meetings, the Legislative Committee find, by motion, that conducting in-person meetings at the present time would present an imminent risk to the health and safety of attendees.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

None

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 14, 2022

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Legislative Committee

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and approve the Legislative Committee meeting minutes from the meeting held on March 10, 2022.

(For further information, contact Kim Springer at [kspringer@smcgov.org](mailto:kspringer@smcgov.org))

---

### RECOMMENDATION

That the Legislative Committee review and approve the Legislative Committee meeting minutes from the meeting held on March 10, 2022.

### ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft C/CAG Legislative Committee Meeting Minutes, March 10, 2022

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

**Draft Meeting Minutes  
March 10, 2022 Meeting**

**Staff and Guests Attending:**

C/CAG Staff:

Sean Charpentier, Kim Springer, Reid Bogert, Jeffrey Lacap, Kaki Cheung, Mima Crume, Susy Kalkin, Eva Gaye, Audrey Shiramizu

Legislative Consultant:

Andrew Antwih and Matt Robinson – Shaw / Yoder / Antwih / Schmelzer and Lange, Inc.

Others Attending:

Drew – Public

**1. Call to Order.**

Chair Papan called the meeting to order at approximately 5:18 p.m.

**2. COVID-19 announcement and brief overview of Zoom teleconference meeting procedures.**

C/CAG staff read the COVID-19 announcement and teleconference meeting procedures.

**3. Roll call.**

C/CAG staff conducted roll call, and a quorum of seven was present at roll call and two additional committee members arrived for a total of nine as shown below.

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Mar 10, 2022</b>
Atherton	Elizabeth Lewis	X
Belmont	Davina Hurt	
Brisbane	Karen Cunningham	X
East Palo Alto	Lisa Gauthier	X
Hillsborough	Marie Chuang	X
Millbrae	Gina Papan (Chair)	X
Millbrae	Anders Fung	X
Pacifica	Sue Vaterlaus	X
San Bruno	Michael Salazar	X
San Carlos	Adam Rak (Vice Chair)	X

**4. Public comment on related items not on the agenda.**

There were no written or public comments.



**5. Review and approve the Legislative Committee meeting minutes from the meeting held on February 10, 2022.**

The Committee approved the meeting minutes from the February 10, 2022 C/CAG Legislative Committee Meeting. Member Rak motioned approval, seconded by Member Fung. Roll call vote was taken. Motion passed with Members Cunningham, Papan, and Vaterlaus, abstaining (4:0:3).

**6. Update on scheduling meetings and topics of discussion with the San Mateo County Delegation early in the 2022-23 Legislative Session.**

The Committee took this Item last during the meeting.

Consultant Matt Robinson shared an update on completed meetings with legislators on the two: Hwy 101/92 Area Improvement and Stormwater budget requests. Robinson mentioned that staff intends to meet on the same two requests with Senator Berman sometime in the near future.

Next meetings with legislature would be more focused on legislation, as was the case with Senator Becker at the Legislative Committee meeting on this date.

**7. Review legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)**

Note: Item 7 was heard prior to Item 6 due to the attendance of Senator Josh Becker:

C/CAG state legislative consultant Matt Robinson described the Bay Area Seamless bill, SB 917 re-authored by Senator Josh Becker. Robinson explained that the Seamless bill is still early in its form in terms of expected comments from agencies and suggested the Committee hear from Senator Becker. Chair Papan reminded the Committee that the legislation coincides with the MTC Bay Area Transit Transformation Action Plan.

Senator Becker reminded the Committee of the years of work that has gone into the bill and that the bill provides improvements and required timelines. Senator Becker also shared that they bill is consistent with C/CAG's legislative priorities.

After discussion by the Committee about the need for the legislation and need for additional feedback from transit agencies prior to full support, and after feedback from the public requesting consideration of alternatives to zone pricing on Caltrain, the Committee voted on a Support in Concept for SB 917.

A motion to Support in Concept was made by Committee Chair Papan and seconded by member Salazar. Roll call vote was taken. Motion passed. (9,0,0)

The Committee next discussed SB 922 (Wiener), CEQA exemptions for transportation projects, aimed at extending the exemption indefinitely prior to its expiration on December 31, 2022. The legislation adds CMAs to the list of exempt agency projects. It also adds zero-emission charging infrastructure to the exemption.

The Committee discussed concerns that the exemption might allow transit agencies, such as

BART or Caltrain to add infrastructure in a way that is beyond local control, and the exemption being indefinite. Robinson stated that the exemption would only apply to existing agencies in existing transportation corridors.

After further discussion, the Committee motioned to Monitor the SB 922. The motion was made by member Rak and seconded by member Lewis. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed. (9,0,0)

The Committee reviewed SB 852 (Dodd) on Infrastructure Districts. Robinson explained that staff and his office are suggesting Support with Amendments and that staff will develop language to both include JPAs (such as C/CAG) and language related to Stormwater infrastructure. The meeting packet included major points to be covered in eventual language. The Committee moved to a roll call vote with a motion to Support with Amendments coming from member Gauthier and a second from member Chuang. (9,0,0)

The Committee briefly discussed several other bills: AB 1690 (Rivas), the single-use tobacco bill, which the Committee agreed to Watch, pending policy committee hearings, AB 1817 (Ting) on PFAS for which staff recommended Support and the Committee had concerns about enforcement. The Committee requested these bills be brought back in April.

The Committee also briefly discussed AB 2097 (Friedman) on Parking Minimums, which staff recommended the Committee oppose. After discussion, the Committee motioned to Oppose and took a roll call vote. The motion was made by member Salazar and seconded by member Vaterlaus. (9,0,0)

The Committee then discussed AB 1944 (Lee) on the Brown Act, to allow elected officials to attend meetings remotely without locally posting and agenda and inviting the public. Staff will likely recommend a support position at the April meeting once other agencies chime in on the bill. The Committee agreed to monitor AB 1944.

## **8. Adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:28 P.M.

**C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

Date: April 14, 2022

To: C/CAG Legislative Committee

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Update on scheduling meetings and topics of discussion with the San Mateo County Delegation in the 2022-23 Legislative Session.

(For further information, contact Kim Springer at [kspringer@smcgov.org](mailto:kspringer@smcgov.org))

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee receive an update on scheduling meetings and topics of discussion with the San Mateo County Delegation early in the 2022-23 Legislative Session.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

N/A

**SOURCE OF FUNDS**

N/A

**BACKGROUND**

Staff and consultants, Matt Robinson and Andrew Antwih, of Shaw, Yoder, Antwih, Schmelzer, & Lange (SYASL), will provide an update on potential priority legislative issues for discussion with the SMC delegation in the current legislative session. Future meetings with the delegation will be focused on C/CAG positions on current bills in Committee and any legislation C/CAG may want to see sponsored in the next legislative cycle.

Staff recommends receiving an update and looks forward to input from Committee members.

**ATTACHMENTS**

None.

**C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

Date: April 14, 2022

To: C/CAG Legislative Committee

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Review legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)

(For further information, contact Kim Springer at [kspringer@smcgov.org](mailto:kspringer@smcgov.org))

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Legislative Committee review the legislative update and, if appropriate, recommend approval of C/CAG legislative policies, priorities, or positions. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified in the legislative update. Action is only necessary if recommending approval of a policy, priority, or position.)

**FISCAL IMPACT**

N/A

**SOURCE OF FUNDS**

N/A

**BACKGROUND**

The C/CAG Legislative Committee receives monthly written reports and oral briefings from C/CAG's State legislative advocates. Important or interesting issues and votes on positions taken by the Committee, that arise out of the committee meetings, are reported to the full C/CAG Board. The attached report may include updates from Sacramento with respect to the State Budget process, State grant programs, recent committee hearings, and bill progress of interest to C/CAG since the Committee last met on March 10, 2022. The Legislature is well into the second year of the 2021-22 legislative session, into which approximately 2100 new bills have been introduced. Spring Recess will be from April 7th to April 18<sup>th</sup> this year.

C/CAG continues to pursue budget funding requests with members of the State delegation for projects benefitting San Mateo County. C/CAG staff, joined by staff from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, met with Senator Becker and Assembly Member Mullin in mid-March to present and respond to questions posed by the delegates. One request for \$10 million is for the construction phase of the US 101/SR 92 Interchange Area Improvements project. The other is a dual-

purpose request for \$10 million for a stormwater project at Red Morton Community Park in Redwood City and for completing design work with Caltrans on a stormwater project in San Bruno, near the Hwy 380-280 interchange.

At this Committee meeting, the Committee will continue reviewing bills of interest and recommended positions to be shared with the C/CAG Board. The bills for discussion and any current or recommended positions, are provided in Attachment 1 to this staff report, and some have been returned to the Committee as requested at the March meeting.

For additional information with respect to what the Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Association of Bay Area Governments Joint Legislative Committee, California League of Cities, California State Association of Counties (CSAC), and California Association of Councils of Government (CALCOG) are tracking, staff has included informational links to the relevant bill tracking websites, as well as the full legislative information for the State Legislature and the 2021 calendar of legislative deadlines. Lastly, staff have also included links to the 2022 legislation websites for the San Mateo County delegates for information only.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. C/CAG Legislative Update, March 31, 2022 from Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange

Below are informational links:

2. [Recent Joint ABAG MTC Legislation Committee Agendas](#)
3. [California State Association of Counties \(CSAC\) 2021 bill positions and tracking](#)
4. [California Associations of Councils of Government \(CALCOG\) 2021 bill tracking](#)
5. Full Legislative information is available for specific bills at <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>
6. [2022 California State Calendar of Legislative Deadlines](#)
7. San Mateo County Delegation Sponsored Legislation 2021
  - [2021 Legislation from Assemblymember Marc Berman](#)
  - [2021 Legislation from Assemblymember Kevin Mullin](#)
  - [2021 Legislation from Assemblymember Phil Ting](#)
  - [2021 Legislation from Senator Josh Becker](#)
  - [2021 Legislation Senator Scott Wiener](#)
8. Current client roster for Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange - <https://syaslparters.com/clients/>



March 31, 2022

TO: Board of Directors, City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

FM: Matt Robinson & Andrew Antwih, Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange

RE: **STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – April 2022**

---

***Legislative Update***

The Legislature is wrapping up its initial round of budget hearings on the proposals in the Governor’s Proposed Fiscal Year 2022-23 State Budget. Most of the key proposals, including funding for transportation, will be subject to future discussions after the Governor releases his May Revise, the spring update to the budget. The Legislature has ramped up policy committee hearings, with the policy committee deadline approaching at the end of April. **The Legislature will break for Spring Recess on April 7 and will return on April 18.**

***Governor Unveils Proposals to Address Impact of High Fuel Prices***

On March 25, the Governor Newsom announced a [proposal](#) to provide \$11 billion in relief to Californians to help negate the impact of increased fuel costs. The proposal would provide: \$9 billion in direct tax refunds to Californians in the form of \$400 per vehicle direct payments to registered vehicle owners, capped at two vehicles; \$750 million in incentive grants to transit and rail agencies to provide free transit for Californians for 3 months; \$600 million to pause a part of the sales tax rate on diesel for one year (this relief would only pause the 2.5 percentage points directed to the State General Fund); \$523 million to pause the inflationary adjustment to gas and diesel excise tax rates (restating the "gas tax holiday" included in the Fiscal Year 2022-23 State Budget); and \$500 million in additional funding for active transportation projects (building on the \$500 million in proposed in the Fiscal Year 2022-23 State Budget).

***Budget Requests***

As you are aware, C/CAG is pursuing budget funding requests with members of our delegation for two projects benefitting San Mateo County. C/CAG staff, joined by staff from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, met with staff from Senator Becker and Assembly Member Mullin’s Offices in mid-January to brief them on our asks. As a reminder, one is a request for \$10 million for the construction phase of the US 101/SR 92 Interchange Area Improvements project. The other is a dual-purpose request for \$10 million for a stormwater project at Red Morton Community Park in Redwood City and for completing design work with Caltrans on a stormwater project in San Bruno.

***Bills For Discussion / Possible Action***

**SB 1067 (Portantino) Parking Requirements – *RECOMMEND DISCUSS***

[This bill](#) would prohibit a city, county, or city and county from imposing minimum automobile parking requirements on a housing development located within one-half mile of public transit and either dedicates 25 percent of the total units to very low, low-, and moderate-income households, students, the elderly, or persons with disabilities, or the developer demonstrates that the development would not have a negative impact on the local agency's ability to meet specified housing needs and would not have a negative impact on existing residential or commercial parking within one-half mile of the project.

**AB 1817 (Ting) PFAS Ban in Textiles – *RECOMMEND SUPPORT***

Beginning January 1, 2023, existing law prohibits any food packaging that contains regulated perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances or PFAS and requires a manufacturer to use the least toxic alternative when replacing regulated PFAS in food packaging. Existing law will also prohibit the sale and distribution of any new juvenile product that contains regulated PFAS chemicals. [This bill](#) would prohibit, beginning January 1, 2024, any person from selling or distributing any textile articles that contain regulated PFAS, and requires a manufacturer to use the least toxic alternative when replacing regulated PFAS in textile articles to comply with these provisions.

**AB 1944 (Lee) Brown Act Changes – *RECOMMEND SUPPORT IF AMENDED***

[This bill](#) would make changes to the Brown Act to clarify that if a member of a legislative body elects to teleconference from a location that is not public, the address does not need to be identified in the notice and agenda or be accessible to the public. This bill would also require all public meetings of a legislative body using teleconferencing to provide a video stream accessible to members of the public and an option for members of the public to address the body remotely during the public comment period through an audio-visual or call-in option. ***We suggest the author amend this bill to include an urgency clause so that it would take effect immediately.***

**AB 2237 (Friedman) Sustainable Communities Strategies Implementation – *RECOMMEND MONITOR***

[This bill](#) would require the Strategic Growth Council, in consultation with ARB, the Department of Housing and Community Development, and CalSTA to convene a task force to review the roles and responsibilities of MPOs and to define "sustainable community." This bill would also require that projects included in each RTIP be consistent with the MPO's current SCS and the state's climate goals, as defined in the bill to mean the California Transportation Plan, the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure, or ARB's Scoping Plan. The bill would require the MPO, by December 15, 2025 and biennially thereafter, to submit a report to ARB determining whether the projects in its most recent RTIP are consistent with its SCS and state climate goals and ARB, in consultation with OPR, to determine whether projects are consistent with the SCS and the state's climate goals. If not, ARB may reallocate moneys from inconsistent projects to other projects in the region and would prohibit an MPO from funding inconsistent projects or programs.

**AB 2247 (Bloom) PFAS Reporting Platform – *RECOMMEND SUPPORT***

[This bill](#) would require, as part of the hazardous waste control laws, the Department of Toxic Substances Control to work with the Interstate Chemicals Clearinghouse to establish a publicly accessible reporting platform to collect information about PFAS and products or product components containing regulated PFAS, being sold, offered for sale, distributed, or offered for promotional purposes in California by

January 1, 2024. The bill would require, on or before March 1, 2024, and annually thereafter, a manufacturer of PFAS or a product or a product component containing regulated PFAS to register the PFAS or the product or product component containing regulated PFAS on the publicly accessible reporting platform.

**AB 2438 (Friedman) Transportation Funding Programs – *RECOMMEND MONITOR***

[This bill](#) would require the state agencies and departments that administer transportation funding programs (SHOPP, STIP, SCCP, RMRA, LPP, TCEP, LSR) to revise the guidelines or plans applicable to those programs to ensure that projects included in the applicable program align with the California Transportation Plan, the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure and specified greenhouse gas emissions reduction standards. The bill would require CalSTA, Caltrans, and the CTC, in consultation with ARB and the Strategic Growth Council, to prepare and submit a report to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2025, that comprehensively reevaluates transportation program funding levels, projects, and eligibility criteria with the objective of aligning the largest funding programs with the goals set forth in the above-described plans and away from projects that increase VMT.

**AB 2622 (Mullin) Sales Tax Exemption for Transit Buses – *RECOMMEND SUPPORT***

[This bill](#) would extend the sunset date from January 1, 2024 to January 1, 2034 on the state sales and use tax exemption for zero-emission buses (ZEBs) purchased by California public transit agencies. This bill is likely to be amended to shorten the sunset.

***Bills With Positions***

**SB 852 (Dodd) Climate Resilience Districts – *SUPPORT IF AMENDED***

Existing law authorizes certain local agencies to form a community revitalization authority (authority) within a community revitalization and investment area to carry out provisions of the Community Redevelopment Law in that area for purposes related to, among other things, infrastructure, affordable housing, and economic revitalization. [This bill](#) would authorize a city, county, city and county, special district, or a combination of any of those entities to form a climate resilience district for the purposes of raising and allocating funding for eligible projects and would define “eligible project” as projects that address sea level rise, extreme heat, extreme cold, the risk of wildfire, drought, and the risk of flooding. The bill would authorize the district to provide property tax increment revenues to the district, and/or other tax revenues, levying a benefit assessment, special tax, property-related fee, or other service charge or fee consistent with the requirements of the California Constitution.

**SB 917 (Becker) Seamless Bay Area – *SUPPORT IN CONCEPT***

[This bill](#) would require the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to develop and adopt a Connected Network Plan, adopt an integrated transit fare structure, develop a comprehensive, standardized regional transit mapping and wayfinding system, develop an implementation and maintenance strategy and funding plan, and establish open data standards to support a more integrated public transportation network in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. This bill would also require the region’s transit agencies to comply with those established integrated fare structure, regional transit mapping and wayfinding system, implementation and maintenance strategy and funding plan, and open data standards.



**SB 922 (Wiener) CEQA Exemptions for Transit – *MONITOR***

[This bill](#) would permanently extend statutory exemptions from the requirement of the California Environmental Quality Act for clean transportation projects that make streets safer for walking and biking; speed up bus service on streets and improve its on-time performance; support faster bus service on state highways; expand carpooling; and improve wayfinding for people using transit, biking, or walking. This bill would similarly permanently extend CEQA exemptions for the construction of infrastructure of facilities to charge or refuel zero-emission transit vehicles; and the building of new bus and light rail stations or terminals.

**AB 2097 (Friedman) Parking Minimums – *OPPOSE***

[This bill](#) would prohibit a public agency from imposing a minimum automobile parking requirement, or enforcing a minimum automobile parking requirement, on residential, commercial, or other development if the development is located on a parcel that is within one-half mile of public transit. The bill does not preclude any requirement imposed on a new multifamily residential or nonresidential development to provide EV charging or accessible spaces.

**ACA 1 (Aguiar-Curry) Local Government Financing: Affordable Housing and Public Infrastructure: Voter Approval - *SUPPORT***

[This constitutional amendment](#) would lower the necessary voter threshold from a two-thirds supermajority to 55 percent to approve local general obligation bonds and special taxes for affordable housing and public infrastructure projects, including public transit. The C/CAG Board supported a nearly identical measure, also ACA 1 (Aguiar-Curry), in 2019.