



## CSDA Mid-Year Report – July 2020 2020 Legislative Year

ENVIRONMENT					
BILL/ AUTHOR	ISSUE	DESCRIPTION	CSDA POSITION	STATUS	COST/COST- SAVINGS
<b>AB 1936 (Rodriguez)</b>	<b>Price Gouging: Public Safety Power Shutoffs</b>	As amended 3/12/20: Would have applied the same price gouging prohibition and penalties currently in place for a period following the proclamation or declaration of emergency upon an announcement of a public safety power shutoff for a period lasting until 72 hours after the restoration of power and would have included durable medical devices, generators, and generator fuel as goods covered in the provisions.	<b>Support if amended</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Could have resulted in cost savings from stabilizing costs of generators and generator fuel.</b>
<b>AB 2178 (Levine)</b>	<b>Emergency Services</b>	As amended 7/8/20: Adds a deenergization event, defined as a planned Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS), to the existing list of conditions under which the Governor may declare a state of emergency and/or local officials of a county, city, or city and county may declare a local emergency. This potentially opens districts to receive financial reparation for costs incurred during the event as well as grants additional flexibility provided through the provisions of the California Emergency Services Act. This bill would take effect immediately as an urgency statute.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Governmental Organization Committee</b>	<b>Potential cost recovery</b>
<b>AB 2182 (Rubio)</b>	<b>Emergency Backup Generators Exemption: Water and Wastewater Facilities</b>	As introduced 2/11/20: Would have provided that use of an alternative power source by an essential public service to power a critical facility during a planned de-energization event initiated by electric utilities is considered emergency use even if an official emergency has not been declared by the State or local government and state that its use shall not be subject to any local, regional, or state limitations regulation regarding the operation of an alternative power source.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>

ENVIRONMENT					
BILL/ AUTHOR	ISSUE	DESCRIPTION	CSDA POSITION	STATUS	COST/COST- SAVINGS
<b>AB 2209 (Mayes)</b>	<b>California Geographic Information Office</b>	As introduced 2/12/20: Would have implemented the recommendations of the Little Hoover Commission by establishing the California Geographic Information Office within the Department of Technology for the purpose of coordinating the state's geographic information systems (GIS) projects, promulgating standards for data collection and sharing, and managing shared data resources in coordination with appointed stakeholders, including an appointment by the California Special Districts Association.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 2246 (Mayes)</b>	<b>Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975: Exemption for Metropolitan Water District of Southern California</b>	As introduced 2/13/20: The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 prohibits conducting surface mining operations unless a permit is obtained from, a specified reclamation plan is submitted to and approved by, and financial assurances for reclamation have been approved by the lead agency for the operation of the surface mining operation. The act exempts certain activities from the provisions of the act. This bill would have authorized Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to act as lead agency and would have exempted from the provisions of the act emergency excavations or grading conducted by the District for the specified purposes and surface mining operations conducted on lands owned or leased, or upon which easements or rights-of-way have been obtained by the District for the purpose of repairing, maintaining, or replacing pipelines, infrastructure, or related transmission systems used for the distribution of water in the specified counties.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential cost savings to Metropolitan Water District of Southern California</b>
<b>AB 2706 (Fong)</b>	<b>California Environmental Quality Act: Record of Proceedings</b>	As introduced 2/20/20: Would have limited disputes over the record of proceedings ("administrative record") to be used in the litigation by removing the option for a plaintiff to prepare the record and instead vested the preparation and certification in the local agency in a proceeding challenging a project that would be exclusively located or implemented in a county with fewer than 1,000,000 residents and, if the project were located in a city within that county, the city had fewer than 500,000 residents.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Fiscal impact unknown</b>

ENVIRONMENT					
BILL/ AUTHOR	ISSUE	DESCRIPTION	CSDA POSITION	STATUS	COST/COST- SAVINGS
<b>AB 2887 (Bonta)</b>	<b>Statewide Emergencies: Mitigation</b>	<p>As amended 3/16/20: Would have codified many of the Governor's COVID-19 waivers and provisions, including: prohibiting an electrical corporation, gas corporation, water corporation, municipal corporation, municipal utility district, or public utility district from terminating residential or small commercial electrical, gas, or water service for nonpayment for the first 3 billing cycles following a state of emergency or major disaster for a customer that may have been affected by the emergency or major disaster, except in compliance with the bill's requirements.</p> <p>These provisions would have been in effect following a state of emergency or major disaster declaration pursuant to the California Emergency Services Act (Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 8550) of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code) or the period of a major disaster or emergency declared by the President of the United States pursuant to the federal Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 5121 et seq.)</p> <p>This bill was reassigned to the budget but is not moving forward, and its provisions were not included in the budget.</p>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Fiscal impact unknown, potential cost burdens from non-payment to impacted districts</b>
<b>AB 3005 (R. Rivas)</b>	<b>Leroy Anderson Dam and Reservoir: Permitting and Public Contracting</b>	<p>As amended 6/3/20: This bill is specific to the Leroy Anderson Dam and Reservoir, owned by Valley Water, which has been determined to be at risk of an uncontrollable release of water in the event of a large earthquake. This bill expedites construction of the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit project by authorizing "best value" selection for the construction contractor, provides expedited judicial review of challenges to environmental documents issued in compliance with CEQA, requires expedited processing for state permitting by the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the State Water Resources Control Board, and ensures state costs associated with expedited permitting are borne by the district.</p>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>

<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 3256 (E. Garcia)</b>	<b>Economic Recovery, Wildfire Prevention, Safe Drinking Water, Drought Preparation, and Flood Protection Bond Act of 2020</b>	<p>As amended 6/4/20: This bill is the Assembly's vehicle for their version of a climate resiliency bond and enacts the Economic Recovery, Wildfire Prevention, Safe Drinking Water, Drought Preparation, and Flood Protection Bond Act of 2020, which places a \$6.98 billion general obligation bond before voters on the November 2020 ballot. Proposes the issuance of \$6.98 billion in general obligation bonds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$1.625 billion, wildfire prevention and climate risk reduction</li> <li>• \$1.1 billion, protection of coastal lands, bays, and oceans from climate risks</li> <li>• \$1.355 billion, protection of water supplies from droughts, reducing flood risk and safe drinking water</li> <li>• \$1.3 billion for the protection of California's wildlife, biodiversity, fisheries, and working and agricultural lands from climate risks</li> <li>• \$1.6 billion for regional climate resilience projects</li> </ul>	<b>Support if amended</b>	<b>Assembly Rules Committee</b>	<b>Would make grant funding available to eligible districts for climate mitigation projects.</b>
<b>AB 3279 (Friedman)</b>	<b>California Environmental Quality Act: Administrative and Judicial Procedures</b>	<p>As amended 7/1/20: Amends administrative and judicial procedures under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It reduces the time period by which a court must commence hearings on a CEQA appeal, from one year to 270 days; reduces the time a CEQA plaintiff/petitioner has to file a request for hearing from 90 days to within 60 days of filing the petition; and places requirements pertaining to concurrent preparation of the administrative record. The bill also eliminates certain CEQA exemptions and requires a court to make specific findings before it can issue an interlocutory order in CEQA litigation.</p>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</b>	<b>Fiscal impact unknown.</b>
<b>SB 55 (Jackson)</b>	<b>California Environmental Quality Act: Housing and Land Use</b>	<p>As amended 7/27/20: This bill is a gut and amend of SB 950, which was dubbed "CEQA 2.0," but with language that addresses many of our prior concerns. However, this bill continues to have significant issues regarding requirements pertaining to the preparation of the administrative record, specifically surrounding document disclosure and findings and declarations that would be problematic to local agencies.</p>	<b>Oppose unless amended</b>	<b>Assembly</b>	<b>Potential significant cost burdens</b>

<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>					
BILL/ AUTHOR	ISSUE	DESCRIPTION	CSDA POSITION	STATUS	COST/COST- SAVINGS
<b>SB 802 (Glazer)</b>	<b>Emergency Backup Generators: Permit Operating Condition Exclusions for Health Facilities</b>	As introduced 1/7/20: Would have required an air district to allow a health facility that has received a permit from the district to construct and operate an emergency backup generator to use that emergency backup generator during a de-energization event without having that usage count toward any time limitation on actual usage and routine testing and maintenance included as a condition for issuance of that permit.	<b>Support</b>	<b><i>Failed Passage</i></b>	<b><i>No direct fiscal impact.</i></b>
<b>SB 807 (Nielsen)</b>	<b>Reclamation District No. 108: Hydroelectric Power</b>	As introduced 1/9/20: Would have allowed Reclamation District (RD) 108 to continue to exercise hydroelectric power authority after January 1, 2021 and participate in the development of water facilities in the vicinity of the district and the Sacramento Valley, including the Sites Project Authority. RD 108 is responsible for water supply, levee maintenance, drainage, and flood control within its boundaries.	<b>Support</b>	<b><i>Failed Passage</i></b>	<b><i>No direct fiscal impact.</i></b>
<b>SB 950 (Jackson)</b>	<b>California Environmental Quality Act: Housing and Land Use</b>	As amended 3/19/20: Dubbed “CEQA 2.0,” would have placed significant new mandates on special districts acting as the lead agency in a project subject to CEQA, including but not limited to: requirement to place certain projects subject to CEQA on the ballot for voter approval; mandatory translation of numerous CEQA documents into non-English languages spoken by a substantial number of people served by the lead agency; new procedures for written and oral comments to a CEQA notice; and new meet and confer and mandatory conference requirements on the lead agency facing prospective litigation. The bill also established a “CEQA docket” for superior courts in counties with a population in excess of 200,000 and would have allowed for actions to be moved from a county with a population of less than 200,000 to an adjoining venue with a “CEQA docket.”  *SB 25 (Caballero) is an active bill gut and amend of SB 950.	<b>Oppose unless amended</b>	<b><i>Failed Passage</i></b>	<b><i>Potential significant cost burdens.</i></b>

<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 1099 (Dodd)</b>	<b>Critical Facilities Emergency Backup Generators: Stipulations of Order for Abatement</b>	As amended 7/27/20: Pertains to exemptions for backup generator use by critical facilities and would require an air district without a specified rule on emergency backup generators that allow the use in exceedance of applicable runtime and testing and maintenance limits that chooses to adopt such a rule after January 1, 2021 to include in the provisions pertaining to exemption that the critical facility must attest to and provide evidence of having also taken demonstrable steps toward implementing the use of backup power technologies that meet or exceed emission standards set by the state board.	<b>Support if amended</b>	<b>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact.</b>
<b>SB 1185 (Moorlach)</b>	<b>Emergency Backup Generators: Emergency Variance for Operation during Deenergization Events</b>	As amended 7/27/20: Authorizes an air district to adopt or revise a rule to specify that hours for usage due to the loss of normal electrical service during a deenergization event by a permitted natural-gas-powered emergency backup generator that is either federally compliant or state board designated are prohibited from counting toward that permit's conditions for usage.	<b>Oppose unless amended</b>	<b>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</b>	<b>Fiscal impact unknown</b>

ENVIRONMENT					
BILL/ AUTHOR	ISSUE	DESCRIPTION	CSDA POSITION	STATUS	COST/COST- SAVINGS
SB 1296 (Durazo)	Natural Resources: The Nature and Parks Career Pathway and Community Resiliency Act of 2020	<p>As amended 6/2/20: Would have created the "Nature and Parks Career Pathway and Community Resiliency Act of 2020." The act would require the Wildlife Conservation Board and a state conservancy to establish independent grant programs to fund climate mitigation, adaptation, or resilience, natural disaster, and other climate emergency projects that accomplish both the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the risks of, or mitigate, climate change impacts on vulnerable communities, fish and wildlife, or natural, cultural, historical, or tribal resources; or mitigate, prepare for, respond to, or support recovery from natural disasters or other climate emergencies.</li> <li>• Provide comprehensive workforce development opportunities, including education, training, certifications, or placement services for jobs and careers in the natural, cultural, historical, or tribal resources fields.</li> </ul> <p>Grants for projects would have prioritized the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects located in or that benefit low-income, disadvantaged, under-resourced, frontline, vulnerable, or marginalized communities.</li> <li>• Projects in areas vulnerable to catastrophic wildfires, sea level rise, or extreme heat.</li> <li>• Projects in areas recently burned by catastrophic wildfires.</li> <li>• Projects that leverage match funding.</li> <li>• Projects that implement local adopted plans.</li> <li>• Projects that support other state plans, priorities, and goals.</li> </ul> <p>Special districts were among the eligible entities listed in the bill to apply for grant funds.</p>	Support	Failed Passage	Would have made grant funding available for climate mitigation projects

<b>FORMATION AND REORGANIZATION</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 854 (Mayes)</b>	<b>Imperial Irrigation District: Retail Electric Service</b>	As introduced 2/20/20: Would have reconstituted the board of directors of the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) against the will of IID. Additionally, it would have changed the board from a five-member board to an 11-member board with six of the members being from Riverside County. Riverside county currently has no representation on the IID Board of Directors, because while IID provides power to the residents of Riverside County, they are outside their service area, which is allowed by Water Code Sections 22115, and 22120.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential costs to Imperial Irrigation District</b>
<b>AB 2777 (Quirk)</b>	<b>Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District</b>	As introduced 2/20/20: A "clean-up" bill, this sought to update and modernize the transit law, particularly with Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit). It would have amended and clarified several issues including eliminating the need to form more transit districts within AC Transit's territory in order to expand service between cities, allowing for electronic signatures on certain online forms, clarifying that former staff turned board members do not continue to accrue service credit, expanding the length of time to pay certain debt from one fiscal year to the combination of two consecutive fiscal years, as well as the time period to fill a vacancy before the governor can fill it. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Single district flexibility with existing funds</b>
<b>SB 1386 (Moore)</b>	<b>Local Government: Assessments, Fees, and Charges: Water</b>	As amended 6/27/20: Restates that "water" for purposes of the Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act also includes fire hydrants and the water dispensed from them. Therefore, a property-related water service fee or charge by a local agency may include the costs to construct, maintain, repair, or replace public hydrants and the associated water attached to a water system, to the extent those fees or charges are consistent with the California Constitution. Ideally, this measure would lessen local agencies' exposure to litigation, like those lawsuits that have already been filed against 81 water suppliers, so that communities may maintain a high level of fire protection.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Assembly Local Government Committee</b>	<b>Potentially significant existing revenue preservation for districts that provide fire hydrants and savings in litigation costs,</b>

<b>GOVERNANCE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 225 (Brough)</b>	<b>Political Reform Act of 1974: Campaign Funds: Childcare Costs</b>	As introduced 1/16/19: Attempted to eliminate an impediment for people considering running for office by allowing campaign funds to be used to cover the costs of childcare in order to allow more parents to run for office.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 315 (C. Garcia)</b>	<b>Local Government: Lobbying Associations: Expenditure of Public Funds</b>	As amended 1/6/20: Would have limited the associations of local agencies or districts from using funds paid from local agencies for purposes that are not for lobbying the Legislature or Congress or strictly educational or professional development activities. The bill also required the associations to disclose funds expended for educational activities and lobbying activities.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Would have reduced public agency association funding</b>
<b>AB 510 (Cooley)</b>	<b>Local Government Records: Destruction of Records</b>	As introduced 2/13/20: This CSDA sponsored bill would have allowed special districts, cities, and counties to adopt record retention policies for routine video monitoring recordings as well as radio and telephone recordings that differ from the current standard of 1-year for video recordings and 100-days for radio and telephone recordings. If an agency did not adopt their own policies, then the current standard would have applied. This change in law would have allowed agencies to save money on unnecessary data storage costs.	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Significant cost savings for districts utilizing extensive video monitoring</b>
<b>AB 654 (B. Rubio)</b>	<b>Public Records: Disclosure of Utility Customers Personal Information</b>	As introduced 2/15/20: This CSDA sponsored bill would have included a sixth category to code section 6254.16 of the Government Code providing that a local agency may disclose specific customer information to another governmental agency for scientific, educational, or other research purposes, and that the requesting agency agrees to maintain it as confidential.	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 844 (Irwin)</b>	<b>Health Facilities: Mandated Hospital Service and Activities</b>	As amended 3/5/19: Would have established an independent, nonpartisan body to advise the Governor and Legislature on the financial impact of proposed mandated hospital services and activities.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 992 (Mullin)</b>	<b>Open Meetings: Social Media Use</b>	As amended 4/22/19: Excludes posting comments, expressing position, and liking comments on social media from the Brown Act, provided that a majority of the members do not discuss among themselves business of a specific nature that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body of the local agency.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Governance and Finance Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>

<b>GOVERNANCE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 1471 (Gray)</b>	<b>State-Mandated Local Costs: Reimbursement of Preventable Lost Revenue</b>	As amended 3/14/19: Would have required the Commission on State Mandates approve test claims for reimbursement to an underprivileged or disadvantaged local agency for preventable lost revenue sustained as a result of the delayed implementation of a state action.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potentially significant costs recovery for districts serving underprivileged communities</b>
<b>AB 2093 (Gloria)</b>	<b>Public Records: Email Retention</b>	As introduced 2/5/20: Identical to AB 1184 (Gloria, 2019), this bill would have mandated that all public agencies, including special districts, must maintain all emails pertaining to the public's business for two years. In practice this would require public agencies to keep all emails sent and received for two years. Additionally, this mandate was placed in the California Public Records Act to purposely avoid requirements for the State to reimburse local agencies for the costs of new or higher levels of service required by new laws.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Significant new costs to districts not currently maintaining two years of past emails</b>
<b>AB 2123 (Chau)</b>	<b>Internet Website Accessibility</b>	As amended 5/4/20: Provided a rebuttable presumption that a business's website is ADA-compliant if the website meets the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 AA standard. The bill further required the California Commission on Disability Access to review the WCAG standards and determine whether they are the most up-to-date standards for effective communication through websites.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential cost savings due to reduced litigation</b>
<b>AB 2138 (Chau)</b>	<b>California Public Records Act</b>	As amended 5/4/20: Would have recodified and reorganized the California Public Records Act. The bill included provisions to govern the effect of recodification and state that the bill was intended to be entirely nonsubstantive in effect.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Minor costs to districts associated with updating CPRA guidance materials</b>
<b>AB 2155 (Oberholte)</b>	<b>Public Officers: Conflict of Interest in Contracting</b>	As introduced 2/10/20: Existing law prohibits members of the Legislature, and state, county, district, judicial district, and city officers or employees from being financially interested in any contract made by them in their official capacity, or by anybody or board of which they are members, subject to certain exceptions and qualifications. Should a body enter into a contract (including contracts utilizing bond funds), a party directly impacted by the contract can contest it. This bill would have expanded the contesting authority to any person, not just those that are directly impacted.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potentially significant increase in litigation costs</b>

<b>GOVERNANCE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 2370 (Limón)</b>	<b>Ventura Port Districts: Aquaculture Plots in Federal Waters</b>	As amended 3/16/20: Due to some concern that the local agency formation commission does not have the authority to activate a power outside of the Ventura Port District's sphere of influence in federal waters, this measure sought to except the Ventura Port District for the purpose of certain aquaculture projects, provided they have otherwise obtained permission from the federal agencies required. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential revenue gains for single district</b>
<b>AB 2438 (Chau)</b>	<b>California Public Records Act: Conforming Revisions</b>	As introduced 2/19/20: This bill was a clarifying rewrite of the California Public Records Act (CPRA). It was intended to not make any changes to the function of the Act. However, it would have resulted in costs to all public agencies to update all of their CPRA materials. Additionally, all applicable code sections would have been renumbered and all training materials would have needed to be rewritten.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Minor costs to districts associated with updating CPRA guidance materials</b>
<b>AB 2452 (C. Garcia)</b>	<b>High-Risk Local Government Agency Audit Program</b>	As introduced 2/19/20: Would have authorized the California State auditor to audit associations representing public agencies utilizing the High-Risk Local Agency Audit Program, which was created to identify potential financial waste, fraud, and abuse.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact to districts</b>
<b>AB 2629 (Mayes)</b>	<b>Imperial Irrigation District: Retail Electric Service</b>	As amended 5/4/20: Would have required the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (Energy Commission), the Imperial County Local Agency Formation Commission, and the Riverside County Local Agency Formation Commission to meet to determine the sphere of influence of the Imperial Irrigation District and options for electrical service to the Coachella Valley at the end of a certain lease of electrical rights. It would have required the Energy Commission to report to the Legislature the findings of this stakeholder group.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Unknown long- term fiscal impacts to single district</b>
<b>ACR 179 (Voepel)</b>	<b>Special Districts Week</b>	As introduced 2/26/20: A non-binding resolution, this measure proclaims the week of May 17 to May 23, 2020, to be Special Districts Week. This week was intended to coincide with CSDA's Legislative Days. It recognizes the important historical role that special districts play in service and infrastructure delivery. The Covid-19 crisis has dampened the odds that this measure will advance.	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Assembly Rules Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>

<b>GOVERNANCE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 217 (Portantino)</b>	<b>Recreational and Organizational Camps</b>	<p>As amended 6/23/20: Adds "recreation camp" to the existing definition of "organized camp," and defines it as a camp that operates for profit or nonprofit purposes, serves 5 or more children, and operates for at least 5 days during any season. These camps need to be licensed and comply with a long list of requirements and mandates, among which include obtaining a license from the local agency of the jurisdiction where the camp is located for a fee, compliance inspections, fines for non-compliance, compliance with new regulations from various departments including health department and the fire marshal. It creates a statewide Recreational Camp Safety Advisory Council within the state government to advise and consult on policy matters relating to recreational camps, requires each recreational camp to employ a camp director and a health director who has to be a medical professional. It sets minimum age limits and training requirements on camp counselors, junior counselors, lifeguards and other staff and volunteers. Staff and volunteers additionally need to have a criminal background check. The bill requires each recreational camp to develop an emergency action plan and requires each counselor and member of camp staff to be trained in the procedures of the plan. The bill requires each camp to comply with a specified counselor-to-camper ratio, depending on the age of the campers and the specific activities provided. This bill imposes specified requirements on high-risk specific camp activities including, among others, riflery, archery, horseback riding, climbing, swimming, and scuba diving. The bill requires each camp to obtain specified certifications before offering high-risk activities.</p> <p>CSDA has taken an Oppose Unless amended to clarify that this measure does not affect local governments.</p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Assembly Health Committee</b>	<b>Potentially significant costs for Parks and CSD's who operate day or summer camps</b>
<b>SB 241 (Moorlach)</b>	<b>Personal Income Tax: California Voluntary Contribution Program</b>	<p>As amended 4/29/19: This bill that previously dealt with Joint Powers Authority agreements was gutted and amended to deal with voluntary tax check-offs on personal income tax returns.</p>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>

<b>GOVERNANCE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 615 (Hueso)</b>	<b>Public Records Disclosure</b>	As introduced 2/22/19: Would have required California Public Records Act requestors to meet-and-confer with the agency they are requesting records from to try to resolve disputes prior to filing litigation.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potentially significant cost savings resulting from fewer CPRA lawsuits</b>
<b>SB 931 (Wieckowski)</b>	<b>Local Government Meetings: Distribution of Agenda and Documents</b>	As amended 4/2/20: Would have required public agencies to email meeting agendas and the supporting agenda packets, or a link to where they can be found on an agency's website, to members of the public that have requested them. Just like when the public requests meeting materials be mailed to them, this standing request would have been valid for one year. In the event that it is not technically feasible to email the meeting materials or a link to where it can be found on a website, an agency could have physically mailed the materials and charged the requested for the costs of the mailings. Amendments to the bill addressed a majority of CSDA's previous concerns.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>SB 939 (Wiener)</b>	<b>COVID-19 Emergency: Commercial Tenancy Eviction</b>	As amended 5/29/20: Would have prohibited evictions of private or commercial tenants during the state of emergency related to COVID-19. Also authorized a commercial tenant that is a small business or is an eating or drinking establishment, place of entertainment, or performance venue that meets certain financial criteria, to engage in negotiations with its landlord to modify rent or other economic requirements, which could result in the tenant terminating the lease under certain circumstances. The above provisions all carried penalties for non-compliance. This measure had an urgency clause and required a 2/3rds vote of the legislature. This measure was held under submission in Senate Appropriations and is dead for the year.	<b>Oppose unless amended</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Would have resulted in significant revenue losses for any district with leased properties.</b>

<b>GOVERNANCE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 998 (Moorlach)</b>	<b>Local Government Investments</b>	As amended 5/22/20: Increases Cities' and Special Districts' cap on investments in commercial paper to 40% for those agencies that have \$100,000,000 or more of investment assets under management (AUM). Those with less in AUM remain at 25%. Restricts investing more than 10% of an agency's total investment assets in the commercial paper and the medium-term notes of any single issuer. Includes recognized California Indian tribes within the definition of local agency for purposes of investing in shares of beneficial interest issued by a joint powers authority. Would allow the holding of zero or sub-zero interest rate securities.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Assembly Local Government Committee</b>	<b>Potentially long-term fiscal benefits by providing more investing options for certain districts</b>
<b>SB 1180 (Dahle)</b>	<b>Fallen Leaf Lake Community Services District Elections</b>	As introduced 2/20/20: In response to a 2019 state auditor report recommendation to ensure that the district has an electorate of sufficient size from which it can elect a board, this measure created a hybrid electorate consisting of registered voters, landowners or their proxies and holders of certain federal land permits.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 367 (Flora)</b>	<b>Presence at Care Facilities: Conviction of Crime</b>	As amended 1/15/20: Would have prohibited people convicted of pimping or identity theft from working at a residential care facility.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 1231 (Boerner Horvath)</b>	<b>Emergency Services: Response Times</b>	As introduced 2/21/19: Would have required response time requirements in any contract for ground emergency medical transportation entered into, amended, or renewed, by a state or local entity on and after January 1, 2020, to be consistent with performance standards established by the International Academies of Emergency Dispatch. Currently standards vary and response time requirements are included in contracts. However, the required times vary greatly depending on whether the service is located in a rural or urban community.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potentially significant cost increases for districts offering emergency medical transportation</b>

<b>HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 1775 (Jones- Sawyer)</b>	<b>911 Emergency System: Harassment</b>	As amended 6/17/20: Would have expanded the definition of a “fee” for the purposes of Fee Mitigation Act by eliminating existing exclusions to the act, such as the Quimby fees for parks. The measure was "gut-and-amended" April 9, 2019 to be an environmental justice measure aimed at cities counties, which allowed CSDA to go Neutral. It has since been gutted and amended again to deal with discrimination in 9-1-1 calls.	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Senate Public Safety Committee</b>	<b>As introduced would have potentially significant costs to parks services due to recalculation of Quimby fees.</b>
<b>ACR 149 (Voepel)</b>	<b>Opioid Epidemic</b>	As introduced 1/16/20: Designates the month of September 2020 as Opioid Awareness Month in California.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Assembly Rules Committee</b>	<b>No direct Fiscal impact</b>
<b>SB 231 (Galgiani)</b>	<b>Local Emergencies: Port Districts</b>	As introduced 2/7/19: Would have allowed port districts to declare a local state of emergency. This bill is similar to SB 531 (Galgiani, 2018) which CSDA supported in 2018. However, the Governor vetoed SB 531 with the following message: "this bill adds port districts that are not a department, division, or a subdivision of a city or county to the list of political subdivisions permitted to declare a local emergency under the California Emergency Services Act. Allowing port districts to declare a local emergency without involving their neighboring cities and counties runs counter to the system of mutual aid which is dependent upon local cooperation. By facilitating the efficient flow of resources and information, local cooperation during an emergency allows the state to determine the proper allocation of emergency support. This bill will disrupt the state's ability to evaluate such resource requests - to the possible detriment of those who need help."	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>SB 378 (Wiener)</b>	<b>Deenergization Events: Cost Recovery</b>	As amended 7/27/20: This is a gut and amend that now pertains to controlled substances and probation. The bill previously would have required the California Public Utilities Commission, in consultation with the Public Advocate’s Office, on or before June 1, 2021, to establish a procedure for customers, local governments, and others affected by a de-energization event to recover costs accrued during the deenergization event from an electrical corporation with more than 2,500,000 electrical service connections in California.	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Assembly Utilities and Energy Committee</b>	<b>Potential cost recovery for impacted districts</b>

<b>HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 1044 (Allen)</b>	<b>PFAS Chemicals in Firefighting Equipment and Foam</b>	As amended 6/18/20: Requires notice from the manufacturer or distributor of firefighting equipment that contains polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). One year later it generally bans the use or sale of firefighting foam containing PFAS chemicals except in situations where it is federally required. When federal requirements are rescinded, these applications will also switch to non-PFAS foams.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Assembly Environmental Safety and Toxic Materials Committee</b>	<b>Potentially some costs as firefighting chemicals are transitioned. Potential cost saving for PFAS mitigation</b>
<b>SB 1348 (Stern)</b>	<b>Fire Prevention Grant Eligibility</b>	As amended 6/18/20: Among other things, adds two more categories of eligible grant funding to certain local entities, including resource conservation districts, through an existing program administered by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. Specifically, it adds vegetation management along roadways and driveways to reduce fire risk including defensible space training, and public education outreach regarding making homes and communities more wildfire resistant as eligible activities for grant funding.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</b>	<b>Potential grant funding for RCD's or other eligible districts for certain projects</b>
<b>SCR 88 (Galgiani)</b>	<b>California Peace Officers' Memorial Day</b>	As introduced 3/4/20: Designates Monday, May 4, 2020, as California Peace Officers' Memorial Day, and recognizes specific California peace officers who were killed in the line of duty.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Assembly</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 33 (Bonta)</b>	<b>State Public Retirement Systems: Divesture from Private Prison Companies</b>	As introduced 12/3/18: This bill would have directed CalPERS to divest from private prisons by July 1, 2020.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential investment losses at CalPERS</b>
<b>AB 196 (Gonzalez)</b>	<b>Workers' Compensation: COVID-19: Essential Occupations and Industries</b>	As amended 5/5/20: Establishes costly "conclusive presumption" of injury. Significantly increases workers' compensation costs for employers by "conclusively" presuming (non-rebuttable) that contraction of COVID-19 by all "essential workers" is a workplace injury. Establishes an extremely concerning precedent for expanding presumptions into the private sector for COVID-19 issues, which the Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau recently estimated will add billions in costs to California's workers' compensation system.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Significant costs to districts resulting from increased workers' compensation costs</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 316 (Ramos)</b>	<b>Medi-Cal: Beneficiaries with Special Dental Care Needs</b>	As amended 4/4/19: This bill would have increased the Medi-Cal reimbursement rate for doctors treating a Medi-Cal beneficiary with special dental care needs. This payment would have been an adjustment to cover the extra time needed to render dental services to a Medi-Cal beneficiary with special dental care needs.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Would have been a cost savings to healthcare districts providing dental care</b>
<b>AB 555 (Gonzalez)</b>	<b>Paid Sick Leave</b>	As amended 4/29/19: Would have amended the Healthy Workplaces, Healthy Families Act to extend the number of paid sick days employers are required to provide from 3 days to 5 days. Suggested amendments were: (1) Statewide preemption should apply to all provisions of the bill (2) Payment for paid sick leave should be at the employee's base rate of pay (3) Verification should be allowed after 3 consecutive days	<b>Oppose unless amended</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased costs associated with providing additional sick days</b>
<b>AB 628 (Bonta)</b>	<b>Employment: Leave Protections for Victims of Sexual Harassment</b>	As amended 5/16/19: Current law allows employees that are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to take time off to access related services or counseling, without fear of retaliation from their employers (25 or more employees). This bill, similar to AB 2366 (Bonta, 2018) would have allowed this time off for victims of sexual harassment and immediate family members of victims of sexual harassment. The bill would have required the employee to support their claims with evidence and provide prior notification of any anticipated leave to the extent possible.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased costs associated with employee loss time</b>
<b>AB 664 (Cooper)</b>	<b>Workers' Compensation COVID-19 Presumption</b>	As amended 5/18/20: This bill has been gutted and amended into a workers' compensation presumption bill related to COVID-19. Under this bill, it is presumed, without the opportunity for rebuttal, that for the purposes of workers compensation, an employee sustaining an injury, as defined, is entitled to specific benefits.  Injury, in this case, is defined to include direction for an employee to enter into quarantine by a licensed health care professional, a public health officer or agency, or the employer as a result of, or exposure to or contraction of, a communicable disease, including coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), that occurs on or after January 1, 2020, and that is the subject of a state or local declaration of a state of <b>(Continued on next page)</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Significant increased workers' compensation costs</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 664 (Cooper)</b>	<b>Workers' Compensation COVID-19 Presumption</b>	<p align="center"><b>- Continued -</b></p> <p>emergency that is issued on or after January 1, 2020. For purposes of this bill, the injury may occur prior to the declaration of a state of emergency.</p> <p>The employees covered by AB 664 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active firefighting members, whether volunteers, partly paid, or fully paid, of all of the following fire departments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A fire department of a city, county, city and county, district, or other public or municipal corporation or political subdivision.</li> <li>○ A fire department of the University of California and the California State University.</li> <li>○ The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.</li> <li>○ A county forestry or firefighting department or unit.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Peace officers</li> <li>• Health care employees who provide direct patient care in an acute care hospital</li> <li>• Fire and rescue services coordinators who work for the Office of Emergency Services</li> </ul> <p>AB 664 requires the following benefits to be provided to anyone meeting the above injury to receive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full hospital, surgical, medical treatment, disability indemnity, and death benefits</li> <li>• Reasonable costs of reimbursement to the employee for all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emergency equipment or personal protective equipment (PPE) that provides, or is ancillary to other emergency equipment or PPE that provides, protection from the injury for the person.</li> <li>○ Emergency equipment or PPE that provides, or is ancillary to other emergency equipment or PPE that provides, protection for other persons from transmission of the injury by the person.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><i>(Continued on next page)</i></b></p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b><i>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</i></b>	<b><i>Significant increased workers' compensation costs</i></b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 664 (Cooper)</b>	<b>Workers' Compensation COVID-19 Presumption</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>- Continued -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reasonable medical expenses relating to protection from or treatment of the injury and, in addition, reasonable living expenses, other than temporary housing costs, that exceeded the living expenses usually incurred by the person and that were incurred as a direct result of the injury.</li> <li>• An employee is not required to have been directed to enter quarantine in order to be eligible for reimbursement of the expenses.</li> <li>• Temporary housing costs incurred by an employee in the scope of performing duties relating to the declaration of a state of emergency, or for the purpose of protecting others from being exposed to or contracting the communicable disease.</li> </ul> <p>The presumption would be applied to employees up to 90-days after they have left employment.</p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Significant increased workers' compensation costs</b>
<b>AB 685 (Reyes)</b>	<b>Occupational Safety: Notification of COVID-19 Exposure</b>	<p>As amended 6/29/20: Requires employers to take all of the following actions within 24 hours after the employer knew or reasonably should have known of COVID-19 exposure to the employee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a notice to all employees at the worksite where the exposure occurred that they may have been exposed to COVID-19. This notification shall be, at a minimum, in writing in both English and the language understood by the majority of the employees. Employers shall also make every reasonable effort necessary to notify workers verbally.</li> <li>2. Notify the exclusive representative, if any. This notification shall be, at a minimum, in writing in both English and the language understood by the majority of the employees. Employers shall also make every reasonable effort necessary to notify the exclusive representative verbally.</li> <li>3. Notify all employees and the exclusive representative, if any, of options for exposed employees including COVID-19-related leave, company sick leave, state-mandated leave, supplemental sick leave, or negotiated leave provisions.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Continued on next page)</b></p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Increased costs associated with potential translation and distribution of notification materials</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 685 (Reyes)</b>	<b>Occupational Safety: Notification of COVID-19 Exposure</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>- Continued -</b></p> <p>4. Notify all employees and the exclusive representative, if any, on the cleaning and disinfecting plan that the employer plans to implement prior to resuming work.</p> <p>5. Notify the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 6409.1, of the number of employees by occupation with a COVID-19 positive test, diagnosis, order to quarantine, or death that could be COVID-19 related.</p> <p>6. Notify the California Department of Public Health and the appropriate local public health agency of the number of employees by occupation with a COVID-19 positive test, diagnosis, order to quarantine, or death that could be COVID-19 related.</p> <p>The bill defines “Exposed to COVID-19” as exposure to a person with any of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A positive COVID-19 test.</li> <li>2. A positive COVID-19 diagnosis from a licensed health provider.</li> <li>3. A COVID-19-related order to quarantine from a licensed health provider.</li> <li>4. A fatality that was or could have been caused by COVID-19.</li> </ol>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Increased costs associated with potential translation and distribution of notification materials</b>
<b>AB 882 (McCarty)</b>	<b>Discrimination in Employment: Drug Rehabilitation Programs</b>	As amended 1/6/20: Would have prohibited an employer from discriminating against an employee for past drug use if they have gone through a rehabilitation program or are no longer using illegal drugs.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 890 (Wood)</b>	<b>Nurse Practitioners: Scope of Practice</b>	As amended 1/23/20: This priority legislation for the Association of California Healthcare Districts expands the scope of practice for nurse practitioners, allowing them to practice and provide services to the full extent of their education and training, without supervision by a physician. These services, including diagnosing patients, performing therapeutic procedures, prescribing medications and devices, are already being provided to patients throughout the state. This change in law will allow hospitals to fill critical workforce gaps.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee</b>	<b>Cost saving for healthcare districts</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 1066 (Gonzalez)</b>	<b>Unemployment Insurance: Eligibility for Benefits during Trade Disputes</b>	As amended 6/30/20: Amends unemployment law to require employers to provide the Employment Development Department (EDD) with requested records within 10 days on employees seeking unemployment benefits. If an employer does not provide the records within 10 days, the unemployment claim will be approved at the maximum total benefits payable. If an employer with 500 or more employees has not paid its required contributions to EDD, then EDD can turn over recovery to the Attorney General.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Potential, but avoidable, increased unemployment insurance costs</b>
<b>AB 1107 (Chu)</b>	<b>State and Local Emergencies: Translation of Proclamations, Communications, and Materials</b>	As amended 7/2/20: This bill has been amended from an unemployment insurance bill to require the state and counties to provide emergency orders and proclamations in various languages.	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Senate Governmental Organization Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 1224 (Gray)</b>	<b>Disability Insurance: Paid Family Leave Program</b>	As amended 4/22/19: Current law allows an employee with more than 12 months of service with the employer, who has at least 1,250 hours of service with the employer during the previous 12-month period, upon request, to take up to 12 weeks of parental leave to bond with a new child within one year of the child's birth, adoption, or foster care placement. This bill would have expanded paid family leave (PFL) benefits by allowing two six-week PFL claims per year.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased employee loss time costs</b>
<b>AB 1332 (Bonta)</b>	<b>Sanctuary State Contracting and Investment Act</b>	As amended 4/29/19: The bill was aimed at non-assistance with the federal government's immigration policies and practices. The bill would have prevented any public agency from entering into a contract with or investing in a contractor that also contracts with a federal immigration agency providing any data broker, extreme vetting, or detention facilities services, unless the public agency had made a finding that no reasonable alternative exists. This bill would have resulted in public agencies not being able to contract with companies such as Microsoft and Westlaw and agencies would have needed to divest from them as well.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Significant costs associated with alternative contracting and divestment</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 1492 (Boerner Horvath)</b>	<b>Employment: Telecommuting Act</b>	As amended 6/29/20: This bill was an attempt to appease environmental groups by codifying a court decision to prevent a toll road through San Onofre State Park. The bill has been gutted and amended and is now a bill related to telecommuting. The bill is sponsored by the California Chamber of Commerce and is intended to provide clarification and guidance to assist employers on telecommuting requirements. Additional amendments are anticipated.	<b>No position</b>  *A position is anticipated to be adopted at August Legislative Committee meeting	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment, and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 1631 (Gray)</b>	<b>Fire Protection: Volunteer Firefighter Training</b>	As introduced 2/22/19: Would have required the State Fire Marshal to provide weekend and evening training classes year-round to volunteer fire departments and those fire departments consisting of a combination of volunteer, partly paid, or fully paid members. The bill would have also authorized firefighters to receive 100% reimbursement from the State Fire Marshal for attending training classes at a local community college if the State Fire Marshal is unable to provide training classes.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Cost saving for firefighter training</b>
<b>AB 1832 (Salas)</b>	<b>Workers' Compensation: Medical-Legal Expenses</b>	As introduced 7/11/19: Would have increased costs on the workers' compensation system by increasing reimbursement rates for Qualified Medical Evaluators (QME) without addressing QME process issues that result in benefit delays for injured workers.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased workers' compensation costs</b>
<b>AB 1850 (Gonzalez)</b>	<b>Worker Classification: Employees and Independent Contractors</b>	As amended 5/12/20: This is going to be the vehicle for fixes and updates to AB 5 (Gonzalez, 2019) which was signed into law in 2019 related to determinations of independent contractors. In its current form, the bill tries to clarify business to business contracts and referral agencies.  Suggested amendment: Include an exemption for recreation and park workers from the provisions of AB 5.	<b>Support if amended</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 1947 (Kalra)</b>	<b>Employment Violation Complaints: Time Requirements</b>	As introduced 1/17/20: Increases the statute of limitations for filing a worker retaliation claim from six months to one year in the administrative process and adds one-sided fee recovery by allowing the ability to seek attorney's fees for prevailing employees in the legal process, but not the employer.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Judiciary Committee</b>	<b>Increased litigation costs</b>
<b>AB 2307 (Bonta)</b>	<b>Public Employment: Paid Release Time</b>	As introduced 2/14/20: Similar to AB 314 (Bonta, 2019) which was vetoed, and AB 2154 (Bonta, 2018), which CSDA opposed, this bill would have circumvented the memorandum of understanding (MOU) process at the local level by providing employee union representatives with paid release time to investigate potential or existing grievances, attend employee orientations, and testify before the governing body of the local agency, as well as preparation time for those activities.  Suggested Amendment: Remove the provisions of the bill related to leave for employee orientations.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased employee loss time</b>
<b>AB 2355 (Bonta)</b>	<b>Employment Discrimination: Medical Cannabis</b>	As introduced 2/18/20: Similar to AB 2069 (Bonta, 2018) which CSDA opposed, this bill would not have allowed an employer to take an adverse action against an employee or candidate for employment for using marijuana if the employee or candidate has a medical license for the marijuana or is using it for medical purposes.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 2365 (Rodriguez)</b>	<b>Public Employees' Retirement System: Employment without Reinstatement</b>	As amended 5/4/20: Changes the requirement that CalPERS reinstate a retired annuitant to active service if they violate the hours worked provisions of the law and instead makes CalPERS reinstatement permissive. Prior to amendments this bill also would have required CalPERS to notify employers prior to an annuitant exceeding the hourly limit. Due to the amendments CSDA removed its support for the bill.	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 2378 (Cooper)</b>	<b>Public Employees' Retirement System: Postretirement Death Benefit</b>	As introduced 2/18/20: Would have authorized the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System, beginning on or after January 1, 2021, to adjust the death benefit amounts following each actuarial valuation to reflect changes in the All Urban California Consumer Price Index, which would have resulted in increased benefits for retirees.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased cost pressures at CalPERS</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 2394 (Cooper)</b>	<b>Public Employees' Retirement System: Cost of Living Adjustment</b>	As introduced 2/18/20: Would have changed the index used to adjust the Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) for CalPERS retirees to the California Consumer Price Index (CPI).	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased CalPERS pension costs</b>
<b>AB 2465 (Gonzalez)</b>	<b>Independent Contractors: Barbering and Cosmetology</b>	As introduced 2/19/20: Would have recast and reorganized the exemptions from AB 5 (Gonzalez, 2019) for a person licensed as an esthetician, electrologist, manicurist, barber, or cosmetologist.  Suggested amendment: Include an exemption for recreation and park workers from the provisions of AB 5.	<b>Support if amended</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 2473 (Cooper)</b>	<b>Public Investment Funds</b>	As amended 6/3/20: Allows certain information related to CalPERS investment in private equity to be exempt from the California Public Records Act. This will allow for CalPERS to place greater investments in private equity and manage those investments internally.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 2537 (Rodriguez)</b>	<b>Personal Protective Equipment: Health Care Employees</b>	As amended 6/29/20: Requires all care providers of potential opioid overdose patients in a first responder or hospital setting to adopt a new illness and injury prevention program (IIPP) with very prescriptive personal protective equipment requirements.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Cost increases for opioid care providers</b>
<b>AB 2570 (Stone)</b>	<b>False Claims Act</b>	As amended 7/2/20: Sponsored by the State Attorney General and supported by the California State Association of Counties, this bill helps public agencies recover additional revenues by granting the Attorney General the ability to prosecute tax fraud under the False Claims Act.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Judiciary Committee</b>	<b>Cost savings resulting from loss recovery</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 2747 (Santiago)</b>	<b>Health Data Disclosure: Health Policy Organizations and Labor Unions</b>	<p>As introduced 2/20/20: Existing law requires an organization that operates, conducts, owns, or maintains a health facility, each hospital, and each general acute care hospital and freestanding ambulatory surgery clinic to make and file with the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development in the California Health and Human Services Agency certain information regarding patients that is recorded on a Hospital Discharge Abstract Data Record, an Emergency Care Data Record, and an Ambulatory Surgery Data Record. The information includes, among other things, the date of birth, race, date of services, and principal diagnosis of the patient. This information is shared with the office, which then shares this information with certain entities, including any California hospital and any local health department or local health officer in California.</p> <p>This bill would have required that information also be shared with any nonprofit health policy organization and any labor union.</p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 2947 (Bonta)</b>	<b>Discrimination: Employment Record Retention</b>	<p>As introduced 2/21/20: The California Fair Employment and Housing Act protects and safeguards the right and opportunity of all persons to seek, obtain, and hold employment without discrimination, abridgment, or harassment on account of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual orientation, or military and veteran status. The act requires an employer to maintain personnel records and files of employees, applicants, and terminated employees for at least 2 years. This bill would have increased the time records need to be maintained to 5 years.</p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased litigation costs</b>
<b>AB 2967 (O'Donnell)</b>	<b>Public Employees' Retirement System: Contracting Agencies: Exclusion from Membership</b>	<p>As amended 6/29/20: Prevents employers from entering or amending their CalPERS contracts to exclude any particular group of employees from the contract. The goal is to prevent the actions of the City of Placentia where just firefighters were excluded from the city's CalPERS contract.</p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Prevents potential cost savings from CalPERS contract amendments</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 2992 (Weber)</b>	<b>Employment Practices: Leave Time</b>	As amended 5/11/20: This bill has been amended from providing some level of protected paid leave to all employees to only expand leave protections that are currently afforded to an employee who is a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to an employee who is a victim of a crime and to an employee whose immediate family member is deceased as a direct result of a crime.	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 2999 (Low)</b>	<b>Bereavement Leave</b>	As amended 7/14/20: Requires employers with 25 or more employees, including public employers, to provide 10 days of bereavement leave to all employees, while requiring employers with fewer than 25 employees to provide 3 days of bereavement leave and creates a private right of action should there be a violation. The bill does not apply to employees covered by a valid collective bargaining agreement if the agreement expressly provides for bereavement leave and the wages, hours of work, and working conditions of the employees, and if the agreement provides premium wage rates for all overtime hours worked, where applicable, and a regular hourly rate of pay for those employees of not less than 30 percent more than the state minimum wage.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Judiciary Committee</b>	<b>Increased employee loss time</b>
<b>AB 3191 (Gray)</b>	<b>Utility Workers and Vehicles</b>	As introduced 2/21/20: Would have authorized vehicles owned by a local publicly owned electric utility, a community choice aggregator, or an irrigation district to display flashing amber warning lights when parked on a highway or when moving slower than the normal flow of traffic. It would also add utility vehicles to the list of stationary vehicles drivers must treat with caution; make a lane change or slow to a prudent speed. It also created criminal penalty enhancements for assault or battery against a utility worker. This bill was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct cost</b>
<b>AB 3196 (Kiley)</b>	<b>Small Business Regulatory Relief Act</b>	As amended 5/11/20: This bill titled the "Small Business Regulatory Relief Act" would have required the head of each state agency to conduct a review of regulations the agencies have imposed and determine which pose the greatest costs and barriers to small businesses by April 1, 2021. Additionally, this bill would have allowed employers to grant flexible schedules to non-exempt employees who elect individually to work those flexible schedules (rather than a vote of 2/3 of all employees in a unit). The flexible schedules would not have allowed an employee to work more than 10 hours in a day without receiving overtime pay.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 3216 (Kalra)</b>	<b>Employee Leave</b>	<p>As amended 7/16/20: Proposes a number of changes to various leave laws that worker advocates have been pushing for a number of years. These proposed changes include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amends the California Family Rights Act (CFRA) (not just the new emergency family and medical leave requirement) to apply to employers of any size. CFRA currently applies to employers with 50 or more employees within 75 miles of the worksite. California recently enacted the New Parent Leave Act (NPLA) which, after significant legislative debate was enacted to apply to employers with 20 or more employees. This bill completely eliminates that new law and instead applies all of CFRA to employers of any size</li> <li>Expands the categories of “family members” under CFRA to include leave to care for a grandparent, grandchild, or sibling</li> <li>Expands employer coverage under California’s Pregnancy Disability Leave (PDL) law from 5 employees to one or more employees</li> <li>Eliminates the provision of existing law under the Paid Family Leave (PFL) program that provides an employee is not eligible for leave if another family member is ready, willing and able to provide care</li> <li>Eliminates the provision of existing law under the PFL that allows an employer to require the employee to take up to two weeks of earned but unused vacation prior to the receipt of PFL benefits</li> </ul>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Increased employee loss time</b>
<b>AB 3240 (Gray)</b>	<b>Labor Disputes: Health Care Coverage during Strikes</b>	As amended 5/5/20: Would have required public agencies to maintain current healthcare coverage payments for striking employees.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased healthcare costs</b>
<b>AB 3329 (Daly)</b>	<b>Unemployment Insurance Compensation: COVID-19 Pandemic: Temporary Benefits</b>	As amended 5/4/20: Would have increased unemployment benefits by an additional \$100 per week after the federal \$600 supplement is ended.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased Unemployment Insurance costs</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 135 (Jackson)</b>	<b>Paid Family Leave</b>	<p>As amended 3/25/19: Makes several changes related to the Paid Family Leave (PFL) Program and the California Family Rights Act (CFRA). Specifically, this bill would have:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expanded the scope of CFRA by reducing the employee threshold and time of service requirement to prohibit employers with five or more employees from refusing to grant an employee request to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for family care and medical leave if the employee had 180 days of service with the employer</li> <li>2. Expanded the reasons for which CFRA leave can be taken to grant access to more employees</li> <li>3. Repealed provisions enacted in 2017 that created the New Parent Leave Act and instead expands the scope of CFRA to cover these provisions</li> <li>4. Expanded the list of individuals for which a worker can take leave under CFRA to include child-in-laws, grandparents, grandchildren, siblings, domestic partners, parent-in-laws, or a designated person</li> <li>5. Expanded the scope of PFL to include time off to care for a seriously ill designated person or child-in-law, as defined, or to bond with a designated person or child-in-law within one year of the birth or placement of that individual.</li> </ol>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b><i>Increases costs associated with maintaining healthcare coverage for employees while also paying for replacement employee's costs</i></b>
<b>SB 341 (Morrell)</b>	<b>Public Employment and Retirement</b>	<p>As introduced 2/19/19: Existing law requires CalPERS and CalSTRS to annually report on investment returns and assumptions to the Legislature. This bill would have required additional reporting by requiring CalPERS to report a calculation of liabilities based on a discount rate equal to the yield on a 10-year United States Treasury note in the year prior to the report. The bill would have also required CalSTRS to provide a description of the discount rate the board uses for reporting liabilities, a calculation of liabilities based on a discount rate that is two percent below the long-term rate of return assumed by the board, and a calculation of liabilities based on a discount rate equal to the yield on a 10-year United States Treasury note in the year prior to the report.</p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b><i>No direct fiscal impacts</i></b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 567 (Caballero)</b>	<b>Workers' Compensation: Hospital Employees</b>	As amended 1/8/20: Would have created rebuttable presumptions that a hospital employee who provides direct patient care in an acute care hospital that suffers an infectious diseases, cancer, musculoskeletal injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and respiratory diseases to have arose out of and in the course of the employment. Of note, at the time of introduction this would have been the first time a rebuttable presumption would have been applied to a non-public employee. However, the Governor's COVID-19 Executive Order related to workers' compensation became the first application of a presumption to private employers.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased costs of workers' compensation for hospitals and increased costs of healthcare</b>
<b>SB 893 (Caballero)</b>	<b>Workers' Compensation: Hospital Employees</b>	As amended 4/29/20: Similar to SB 567 (Caballero), would have created rebuttable presumptions that a hospital employee who provides direct patient care in an acute care hospital that suffers an infectious diseases, cancer, musculoskeletal injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and respiratory diseases to have arose out of and in the course of the employment. Of note, at the time of introduction this would have been the first time a rebuttable presumption would have been applied to a non-public employee. However, the Governor's COVID-19 Executive Order related to workers' compensation became the first application of a presumption to private employers.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Increased costs of workers' compensation for hospitals and increased costs of healthcare</b>
<b>SB 900 (Hill)</b>	<b>Department of Industrial Relations: Employees and Independent Contractors</b>	As amended 3/26/20: This bill was the anticipated vehicle for an AB 5 (Gonzalez) fix for the Senate.  Suggested amendment: Exempt recreation and park workers from the provisions of AB 5.	<b>Support if amended</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>SB 1129 (Dodd)</b>	<b>Itemized Wage Statements Violations</b>	As introduced 2/19/20: Existing law requires employers to provide employees with an accurate itemized wage statement either at the time they are paid or semimonthly. An employee can sue for a knowing and intentional violation of that requirement by an employer and recover damages and attorney fees. This bill would have provided employers with a 65 day correct and cure provision prior to any suit being brought.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Costs savings resulting from reduced litigation</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 1159 (Hill)</b>	<b>Workers' Compensation: COVID-19 Presumption for Critical Workers</b>	As amended 6/18/20: This bill has been amended into a workers' compensation presumption bill related to COVID-19. Under this bill, for "critical workers," public and private, that get sick or die from COVID-19, it will be presumed that they contracted the illness from exposure in the workplace and will be entitled to workers' compensation benefits. The benefits included in this legislation are: compensation for full hospital, surgical, medical treatment, disability indemnity, and death benefits. The presumption in this bill is rebuttable. In order to be eligible for the benefits, the critical worker's illness will need to have been confirmed by a positive laboratory test or, if a laboratory test was not available, as diagnosed and documented by the critical worker's physician based on the employee's symptoms. "Critical worker" means a public sector or private sector employee who is employed to combat the spread of COVID-19.	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Assembly Insurance Committee</b>	<b>Increased workers' compensation costs</b>
<b>SB 1173 (Durazo)</b>	<b>Public Employment: Employee Information Sharing with Unions</b>	As amended 7/27/20: When the employee orientation law was signed in 2018 it included a requirement that public agencies share employee information of existing employees with unions at least every 120 days and every 30 days for new employees. This bill imposes liability on a public employer for violations of the requirements if the violations occur 3 or more times in a 12-month period. The employer would be liable for the reasonable expenses of an employee organization incurred in enforcing its rights, including staff time and payments to associated counsel.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Assembly Public Employment and Retirement Committee</b>	<b>Increased litigation costs</b>

<b>HUMAN RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 1383 (Jackson)</b>	<b>Employees: Time Off</b>	<p>As amended 6/29/20: Requires employers with five or more employees to provide 12-weeks of protected leave of absence each year. Since the proposed leave is "protected," an employer has no discretion to deny it or ask the employee to modify the leave to accommodate the employer's business operations or other employees who may be out of work on other California leaves of absence. An employer that denies, interferes with, or discourages the protected leave could be subject to costly litigation and subject to punitive damages.</p> <p>This leave is in addition to existing leaves of absences already required, thereby requiring up to 6 months of mandatory leave. Through the federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security Act ("CARES Act"), the federal government expanded its federal leave law to all employers and requires them to provide 12 weeks of leave to care for a child as a result of COVID-19. The CARES Act also mandated two weeks of paid sick leave for an employee who is sick from COVID-19 or to care for a family member who is sick. Specifically, an employee could be entitled to 14 weeks of leave under the CARES Act and then another 12 weeks of leave under this bill, totaling 26 weeks of protected leave.</p> <p>SB 1383 also amends the definition of family member for whom the employee can take leave under the CFRA to include a child of a domestic partner, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, or domestic partner. Additionally, the bill removes the requirement that a "child" be under the age of 18 or a dependent adult child. In doing so, the Family and Medical Leave Act's (FMLA) and CFRA's qualifying requirements no longer conform with each other. Since California cannot preempt or limit the application of federal law under FMLA, an employee's ability to qualify for FMLA leave is not negated by previously taking leave under CFRA.</p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Assembly</b>	<b>Significant new employee loss time and replacement costs for employers with fewer than 50 employees but with a least five or more employees</b>
<b>SB 1416 (Bradford)</b>	<b>Assault and Battery of a Public Utility Worker</b>	<p>As amended 3/25/20: Creates criminal penalty enhancements for assault of a utility worker, engaged in the performance of their duties. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.</p>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Rules Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>

<b>PUBLIC WORKS AND FACILITIES</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 584 (Gallagher)</b>	<b>Paradise Irrigation District: Water Pipeline Design-Build Process</b>	As amended 1/6/20: Would have authorized the Paradise Irrigation District to utilize the design-build project delivery process to assign contracts for the construction of a water conveyance pipeline from the Town of Paradise to the City of Chico.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential cost savings to Paradise Irrigation District</b>
<b>AB 1957 (Gallagher)</b>	<b>Paradise Irrigation District: Water Pipeline Design-Build Process</b>	As amended 2/14/20: Would have authorized the Paradise Irrigation District to utilize the design-build project delivery process to assign contracts for the construction of a water conveyance pipeline from the Town of Paradise to the City of Chico.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential cost savings to Paradise Irrigation District</b>
<b>AB 1958 (Cooper)</b>	<b>State Plan of Flood Control: Facilities</b>	As amended 6/3/20: Strengthens protections against unauthorized excavations, cuts, alterations, or destruction of the levee system in order to protect against premature levee failure which could result in flooding, displacement of residents and thousands of dollars of damage to homes and property.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 2050 (Arambula)</b>	<b>Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District: Contracts</b>	As amended 5/4/20: Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District is a special act district. Currently the act allows FMFCD to enter into a contract without public bidding if the contract price is less than \$10,000. Any increase to their purchasing authority to account for rising costs of construction requires legislative amendment. This bill would have increased the contract price to \$25,000 for a contract for materials or supplies or \$10,000 for a contract for the construction or repair of works or improvements.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential cost savings to Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District</b>

<b>PUBLIC WORKS AND FACILITIES</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 2186 (Grayson)</b>	<b>Public Contracting: Contractor Retention Withholding</b>	As introduced 2/11/20: Existing law authorizes the legislative body of a local agency to prescribe how the local agency makes payment on a contract with the local agency for the creation, construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of any public structure, building, road, or other improvement of any kind that will exceed a total of \$5,000. This authority is limited by requiring progress payments on the contract not to be made in excess of 95% of the percentage of actual work completed plus a like percentage of the value of material delivered on the ground or stored subject to, or under the control of, the local agency, and unused. Additionally, a local agency shall not withhold less than 5% of the contract price until final completion and acceptance of the project, unless, at any time after 50% of the work has been completed, the local agency finds that satisfactory progress is being made. This bill would have eliminated the above described 95% limitations on a local agency's authority to prescribe payments on these contracts and would have prohibited the local agency from withholding more than 5% of the contract price for contracts for the creation, construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of any public structure, building, road, or other improvement of any kind that will exceed \$5,000 in total costs.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Fiscal impact unknown</b>
<b>AB 2852 (Mullin)</b>	<b>Public Employee Housing: Local Agencies</b>	As amended 5/12/20: Existing law allows for school districts to provide rental housing to their employees under certain circumstance. This bill would have extended that allowance to employees of other school districts, community college districts, cities, counties, and special districts. This bill was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 2987 (Flora)</b>	<b>Local Agency Public Contracts: Bidding Procedures</b>	As introduced 2/21/20: Would have authorized a public agency, as an alternative to the publication or posting requirement, to meet the notice inviting formal bids requirement by transmitting notice electronically, as specified, and publishing the notice electronically in a prescribed manner on the public agency's internet website at least 14 calendar days before the date of opening the bids.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential cost savings from electronic noticing</b>

<b>PUBLIC WORKS AND FACILITIES</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 3290 (E. Garcia)</b>	<b>The Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act</b>	As introduced 2/21/20: Pursuant to <i>Synergy Project Management, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco</i> (2019), the Court of Appeal ruled that a public agency may initiate a substitution of a subcontractor under contract to a prime contractor at the agency's discretion. AB 3290 would have reversed this to remove the authority of a public agency to initiate subcontractor substitution.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential to cause significant cost impacts to local agencies</b>
<b>SB 4 (McGuire)</b>	<b>Housing</b>	As amended 4/10/19: Would have contained a package of laws aimed to reduce local discretion for permitting infill housing development. Relevant to special districts, SB 4 would have included a ban on impact fees, except connection and capacity charges for sewer, water, and electrical infrastructure, for "neighborhood multifamily" developments and Transit Oriented Developments (TODs). It would have prevented park and fire districts from collecting impact fees on these developments. Amendments were taken in the Senate Governance and Finance Committee to remove the fee prohibition in the bill until the Department of Housing and Community Development's fee study could be delivered and considered, this moved CSDA to neutral.	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>As introduced would have caused significant losses from impact fees</b>
<b>SB 952 (Nielsen)</b>	<b>Sales and Use Taxes: Backup Electrical Generators Exemption</b>	As amended 5/29/20: Provides a tax exemption for the sale of, or the storage, use, or consumption of, a backup electrical resource that is purchased for exclusively powering a critical facility by a city, county, city and county, special district, or other political subdivision during deenergization events and the purchaser provides to the seller a written statement with regard to these facts. This bill exempts the state from the requirement to reimburse cities and counties for lost tax revenue from the exemption under this act and thereby places the burden of the solution on the back of local government rather than the state or IOU.  Suggested amendment: expand the scope of allowed use of generators procured to apply to any power outage event.	<b>Support if amended</b>	<b>Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee</b>	<b>Potential cost savings to districts from the exempted sales tax in the purchase of costly generators.</b>

BILL/ AUTHOR	ISSUE	REVENUE DESCRIPTION	CSDA POSITION	STATUS	COST/COST- SAVINGS
<b>AB 11 (Chiu)</b>	<b>Community Redevelopment Law of 2019</b>	<p>As amended 4/11/19: The Community Redevelopment Law of 2019 would have authorized a city or county to propose the formation of an affordable housing and infrastructure agency by adoption of a resolution, notification of the affected agencies and a public hearing. It requires 30 percent of monies raised by tax increment financing of affected entities to be set aside for affordable housing. The Strategic Growth Council (SGC) would have had to approve any new entities, after meeting certain requirements. It contemplated a "pass-through" for the return of any monies contributed by special districts or counties. It relied on Prop 98 back fill to make schools whole.</p> <p>In 2018, a nearly identical measure, AB 3037 (Chiu) stalled in the Assembly Appropriations committee after taking amendments in the Assembly Local Government Committee on April, 25 2018, which attempted to address concerns raised by local governments and labor regarding the mechanics and calculation of the pass-through, among other technical details. CSDA and its local government and labor partners were in the process of offering more amendments to clean up the measure on the same points when it stalled. CSDA and its partners held an oppose-unless amended at that point.</p> <p>AB 11 was amended on April 11, 2019 to address the remaining concerns that CSDA and its local government partners had regarding the technicalities of timely, accurate pass-through payments allowing CSDA to go neutral.</p>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>As Introduced would have had significant costs associated with Redirecting RDA revenue</b>
<b>AB 77 (Budget Committee)</b>	<b>Education Omnibus Bill</b>	<p>As amended 6/23/20: While the measure has been positively amended, due to a robust advocacy effort by local agencies, it still has major deficiencies; this measure will have the State Controller issue new guidelines for the calculation of excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF) in five counties: San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Napa and Marin. These guidelines will be retroactive one year and are exempt from the Administrative Procedures Act. While it did not ultimately pass, its identical sibling, SB 98 (Budget and Fiscal Review Committee), was signed by the Governor and takes effect immediately.</p>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate</b>	<b>Depending on the forthcoming guidelines there is a risk of substantial revenue losses for many districts in 5 counties.</b>

		<b>REVENUE</b>			
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 217 (Burke)</b>	<b>Income Tax Credits</b>	As amended 6/13/20: Previously AB 217 (E. Garcia), would have created a Safe and Affordable Drinking Water Fund that would have funded projects to secure access to safe drinking water for all Californians. Previously the bill specified that fees on dairy and fertilizer production and a \$0.50 per service connection per month on all public water systems would fund the Fund. AB 217 was gutted-and-amended to become an unrelated bill on income tax credits authored by Assembly Member Burke.	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 291 (Chu)</b>	<b>Local Emergency and Hazard Mitigation Fund</b>	As amended 1/23/20: Would have established a Local Emergency Preparedness and Hazard Mitigation Fund, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to support staffing, planning, and other emergency mitigation priorities to help local governments meet emergency management, preparedness, readiness, and resilience goals. If an eligible local government does not have a local hazard mitigation plan, multiyear training and exercise plan, and threat and hazard identification and risk assessment plan it would have allowed monies allocated from the Fund to develop a plan. This bill will not be moving forward due to the cost impact to the state.	<b>Support if amended</b>	<b>Senate Governmental Organization Committee</b>	<b>Would have provided funding available to special districts for hazard mitigation preparedness.</b>
<b>AB 557 (Wood)</b>	<b>Atmospheric Rivers: Research, Mitigation, and Climate Forecasting Program</b>	As introduced 2/13/2019: Would have appropriated \$9,250,000 from the General Fund to the Atmospheric Rivers: Research, Mitigation, and Climate Forecasting Program in the Department of Water Resources to conduct research relating to improving forecasting of atmospheric rivers and the impacts of climate change on atmospheric rivers. This bill allows the program to use any funds appropriated by the Legislature rather than only special or private funds.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 1484 (Grayson)</b>	<b>Mitigation Fee Act: Housing Developments</b>	As amended 9/6/19: This measure was gutted and amended in the final weeks of the 2019 session. It touches on both development impact fees and capacity and connection charges by requiring projects to have an individualized determination of its alignment with the agency's nexus study, prohibits levels of service from exceeding that of the "existing community," new facilities to be funded via impact fees would have to be specifically identified within the local agency's Capital Improvement Plan, prohibits capital cost level of service and creates new public website postings, hearings and comment periods prior to adopting a nexus study.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Senate Rules Committee</b>	<b>Significant costs due to new mandates and/or revenue loss due to changes in impact, connection and capacity charges</b>

<b>REVENUE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 1924 (Grayson)</b>	<b>Housing Development Fees</b>	As introduced 1/14/20: Required that impact fees for housing development projects be proportionate to the square footage of the proposed unit or units. The bill did not appear to affect Quimby, capacity or connection fees. Some suggested amendments could have included delayed implementation, clarification that it would be prospective, accountability and metrics to learn if policy objective was met, and/or sunset review. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Oppose unless amended</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Likely costs for some districts to potentially change their fee formulas or new studies.</b>
<b>AB 2107 (Rodriguez and Gray)</b>	<b>Securitized Limited Obligation Notes (SLONs)</b>	As introduced 2/6/20: Reauthorizes a statute that expired December 31, 2019, which authorizes a special district to issue securitized limited obligation notes (SLONs) for the acquisition or improvement of land, facilities, or equipment. These notes must mature within 10 years and can be issued to a cumulative \$2 million dollars outstanding at one time. They can be secured with any available revenues. Would reinstate these notes for 5 more years.	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Senate Governance and Finance Committee</b>	<b>Potential savings in borrowing costs cash flow opportunity costs</b>
<b>AB 2722 (McCarty)</b>	<b>Development Fees and Charges: Deferral</b>	As introduced 2/20/20: Would have prohibited the collection of development fees, for 20 years, by a local agency that did not meet its regional housing needs goal during the most recent regional housing needs assessment cycle. While special districts do not have to meet these housing needs goals, the land use authority may not be able to collect and pass on those development fees to the districts as the bill was originally drafted. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Significant direct costs due to 20 year delay in fee collection</b>
<b>AB 3145 (Grayson)</b>	<b>Housing Development Projects Fees and Exactions Cap</b>	As introduced 2/21/20: Would have prohibited a city or county from imposing fees on certain housing developments, including Quimby park fees, impact mitigation fees, and connection and capacity charges, if the total dollar amount of the fees on a proposed housing development is greater than 12 percent of the city's or county's median home price. Would have required all local agencies to post their fees on their website expressed as a percentage of the median housing cost of the that city or county. The Attorney General would have been empowered to enforce this law. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Significant costs to those districts whose fees are capped or potentially eliminated</b>

<b>REVENUE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 3147 (Gabriel)</b>	<b>Fees for Development Projects</b>	As introduced 2/21/20: Would have allowed for connection and capacity charges to be paid under protest, allowing the fees to be challenged well after the work was completed. This used the current impact fee protest statutes to achieve this. However, the process has not been the same for connection and capacity charges as it is for impact fees historically due to the large investment of this type of infrastructure and the methodology that is used to arrive at these charges. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potentially Significant costs to certain districts for litigation and the outcomes related to infrastructure charges</b>
<b>AB 3148 (Chiu)</b>	<b>Affordable Housing Fee Reductions</b>	As introduced 2/21/20: Would have required local agencies to reduce an impact fee or Quimby fee on a sliding scale relative to the target income level of the unit(s) built under a density bonus (low income units vs moderate income units). Specifically, would have exempted connection and capacity charges. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Some fee losses to those districts servicing specific types of developments</b>
<b>AB 3149 (Gloria)</b>	<b>Mitigation Fee Act: Notice, Data Posting, and Notice Timeline Requirements</b>	As amended 5/4/20: This measure would have added new and duplicative website mandates, data posting, and notice timeline requirements before a district raised fees. Additionally, would have made any data not posted inadmissible in defense of a protest or "action." This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Costs for new mandates, potential litigation</b>
<b>SB 15 (Portantino)</b>	<b>Property Tax Revenue Allocations: Local-State Sustainable Investment Program</b>	As amended 4/24/19: Would have required a county auditor to decrease the amount of ad valorem property tax revenue that is allocated to the county Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) to instead be allocated to Revenue Development Agencies (RDA) successor agencies for affordable housing, keeping RDA alive.  The bill was amended April 2019 to create the local-state sustainable investment program allowing CSDA to move from oppose to neutral.	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potentially significant revenue losses related to RDA successor agencies perpetuating new projects</b>
<b>SB 38 (Hill)</b>	<b>Sales and Use Taxes: Volunteer Fire Department Exemption</b>	As amended 6/18/20: Extends the sunset date for 5 more years of the sales tax exemption for fundraisers that all-volunteer fire departments currently enjoy.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee</b>	<b>Potential increased revenue for all- volunteer fire departments</b>

		<b>REVENUE</b>			
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 45 (Allen)</b>	<b>Wildfire Prevention, Safe Drinking Water, Drought Preparation, and Flood Protection Bond Act of 2020</b>	<p>As amended 1/23/20: Would place the Wildfire, Drought, and Flood Protection Bond Act of 2020 on the ballot and would authorize the issuance of bonds to finance projects to restore fire damaged areas, reduce wildfire risk, create healthy forest and watersheds, reduce climate impacts on urban areas and vulnerable populations, protect water supply and water quality, protect rivers, lakes, and streams, reduce flood risk, protect fish and wildlife from climate impacts, improve climate resilience of agricultural lands, and protect coastal lands and resources.</p> <p>Suggested amendments: Requesting a definition of local government to be included that specifies special districts, which would clean up eligibility issues.</p>	<b>Support if amended</b>	<b>Assembly</b>	<b>Would make grant funding available to eligible districts for climate mitigation projects.</b>
<b>SB 98 (Budget and Fiscal Review Committee)</b>	<b>Education Omnibus Bill</b>	As amended 6/23/20: While the measure has been positively amended, due to a robust advocacy effort by local agencies, it still has major deficiencies; this measure will have the State Controller issue new guidelines for the calculation of excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF) in five counties: San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Napa and Marin. These guidelines will be retroactive one year and are exempt from the administrative procedures act. This measure was signed by the Governor and takes effect immediately.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Chapters</b>	<b>Depending on the outcome of the State Controller's forthcoming guidelines, could cause significant revenue losses for many districts in 5 counties</b>
<b>SB 804 (Wiener)</b>	<b>Electric Utilities: Rate Reduction Bonds</b>	As amended 3/16/20: Would have extended existing authority to issue rate reduction bonds to certain publicly owned electric utilities. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential cost savings in borrowing</b>
<b>SB 928, 929, 930 (Governance and Finance Committee)</b>	<b>Validations</b>	As introduced 2/5/20: Enacts the Validating Acts of 2020, which validates the organization, boundaries, acts, proceedings, and bonds of the state government, counties, cities, special districts and school districts, among other public bodies. The annual Acts protect investors from the chance that a minor error might undermine the legal integrity of a public agency's bond. The three Acts cure typographical, grammatical, procedural errors.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Assembly Local Government Committee</b>	<b>Protects special districts from potential litigation</b>

<b>REVENUE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 1067 (Moorlach)</b>	<b>Local Agencies: Refunding Bonds for Pension Obligations</b>	As amended 5/6/20: Would have prospectively required that refunding bonds that were to be used to refund pension obligation bonds be approved by 55 percent of the voters and have a maturity date of more than 36 months after the date the bonds are issued. It would have also required a public notice mandate. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passaged</b>	<b>Significant cost for lost interest rate arbitrage opportunities</b>
<b>SB 1171 (Nielsen)</b>	<b>Reclamation Districts: Formation of Improvement Districts</b>	As amended 3/25/20: Would have authorized the board of directors of a reclamation district to form an improvement district to incur a bonded indebtedness for the acquisition, construction, completion, or repair of improvements, works, or property to be payable from taxes levied upon less than all of the lands within the reclamation district. This measure was not heard and is dead for the year.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential revenue gains for reclamation districts</b>
<b>SB 1300 (Skinner)</b>	<b>Redevelopment Agency Dissolution: City of Hercules Finding of Completion</b>	As amended 5/22/20: Would have specified a redevelopment successor agency, with the approval of the Department of Finance (DOF), to be eligible for a finding of completion if it has entered into an agreed-upon written installment payment plan with the DOF and is in compliance with that plan. This measure was held under submission in the Senate Appropriations Committee and is dead for the year.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential revenue losses should more debt be added to RDA's payable obligations</b>
<b>SB 1431 (Glazer)</b>	<b>Property Taxation: Reassessment: Disaster Relief</b>	As amended 5/6/20: Current law allows a property owner whose property was damaged or destroyed without their fault, to apply for reassessment of that property. This bill would have expanded these provisions to include diminution in the value of property as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic retroactive to April 5, 2020, and authorize a person to submit an application for reassessment in connection with the COVID-19 pandemic within the later of 12 months of the bill's effective date or the time specified in the county's ordinance. This measure was held under submission in Senate Appropriations and is dead for the year.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potentially significant property tax revenue losses</b>

<b>WATER, CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 231 (Mathis)</b>	<b>California Environmental Quality Act: Recycled Water Exemption</b>	As introduced 1/17/20: Would have exempted a project from CEQA to construct or expand a recycled water pipeline to mitigate drought conditions when a state of emergency has been proclaimed by the Governor. Under AB 231, an exempted project would have had to be located on or adjacent to a critically overdrafted groundwater basin or a project where the construction impacts are fully mitigated and does not affect wetlands or sensitive habitat.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Fiscal impact unknown</b>
<b>AB 405 (B. Rubio)</b>	<b>Sales and Use Taxes: Water Treatment Exemption</b>	As amended 4/25/19: Would have provided a sales and use tax (SUT) exemption for chemicals and other agents used by a city, county, public utility or sanitation district to treat water, recycled water or wastewater until January 1, 2025. This SUT exemption would have been available regardless of whether those chemicals or agents become a component of water and whether the treatment takes place before or after delivery to consumers.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential cost savings to utility and sanitation districts</b>
<b>AB 533 (Holden)</b>	<b>Income Taxes Exclusion: Turf Removal Water Conservation Program</b>	As amended 4/4/19: Would have extended the sunset date for a gross income exclusion for amounts received from a local water agency or supplier as part of a turf removal water conservation program. Currently, financial incentives on energy conservations are tax-exempt. This would have brought greater parity to incite participation and public support for programs that fundamentally change long-standing water-use practices.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>AB 1204 (B. Rubio)</b>	<b>Public Water Systems: Implementation Date of Primary Drinking Water Standards</b>	As introduced 2/21/19: Would have required the adoption or amendment of a primary drinking water standard for a contaminant in drinking water not regulated by a federal primary drinking water standard or that is more stringent than a federal primary drinking water standard to take effect 3 years after the date on which the state board adopts or amends the primary drinking water standard and would have authorized the state board to delay the effective date of the primary drinking water standard adoption or amendment by no more than 2 additional years as necessary for capital improvements to comply with a maximum contaminant level or treatment technique.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Fiscal impact unknown</b>

<b>WATER, CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 1672 (Bloom)</b>	<b>Solid Waste: Nonwoven Disposable Products</b>	As amended 7/9/20: Would require, commencing January 1, 2021, certain nonwoven disposal products to be labeled clearly and conspicuously to communicate that they should not be flushed and would prohibit a covered entity from making a representation about the flushable attributes, benefits, performance, or efficacy of those nonwoven disposal products.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</b>	<b>Potential cost savings in repairs to agencies impacted by obstructed pipes and motors from wipes build up</b>
<b>AB 2095 (Cooper)</b>	<b>Public Water Systems: Reduction of Water Charges: Customers impacted by COVID-19</b>	As amended 5/4/20: Originally, would have authorized the legislative body of local agency to pass an ordinance making violation of an ordinance regarding water theft subject to an administrative fine or penalty: 1) not exceeding \$1,000 for a first violation, 2) not exceeding \$2,000 for a second violation of the same ordinance within one year, and 3) not exceeding \$3,000 for each additional violation of the same ordinance within one year.  This bill was later a gut and amend that would have authorized a public water system to reduce the water charges imposed on a customer impacted by COVID-19 during the duration of the impact, provided that the reduction does not increase the water charges imposed on another ratepayer.	<b>Support in concept</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Fiscal impact unknown</b>
<b>AB 2519 (Wood)</b>	<b>Conservation Projects: Advanced Payments of Grants</b>	As amended 6/4/20: Would require the Natural Resources Agency, the State Coastal Conservancy, the Department of Water Resources, and the State Water Resources Control Board, when awarding grants for conservation projects, to provide an advance payment of up to 25 percent of the total grant award if requested by a grant recipient and would require the recipient to submit specified reports of the use of funds to the granting entity. "Conservation project" means a conservation project that enhances climate resilience, restores watersheds, or protects and preserves natural lands.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee</b>	<b>Would provide advance payment of up to 25% of grants for conservation projects</b>

<b>WATER, CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>AB 2560 (Quirk)</b>	<b>Water Quality: Notification and Response Levels Procedures</b>	As amended 6/29/20: Requires the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) to post on its internet website and distribute through email information when it initiates the development of a Notification Level (NL) or Response Level (RL) for a contaminant. Specifically, this bill requires the State Water Board to do all of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Post on its internet website and distribute through e-mail information explaining it has initiated the development of a NL or RL.</li> <li>2. Post on its internet website and distribute through e-mail a notice that a draft NL or RL is available, including documents that were used to support the draft NL or RL, and whether or not those documents were peer reviewed.</li> <li>3. Include, prior to finalizing a NL or RL, as an information item, the draft NL or RL at a regularly noticed meeting.</li> </ol>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impact</b>
<b>SB 332 (Hertzberg)</b>	<b>Wastewater Treatment: Recycled Water</b>	As amended 4/30/19: Would have declared that the discharge of treated wastewater from ocean outfalls is a waste and unreasonable use of water and would have required each wastewater treatment facility that discharge to the ocean outfall to reduce the facility's annual flow by at least 50 percent by January 1, 2030, and by at least 95 percent by January 1, 2040. The bill would have subjected the owner or operator of a wastewater treatment facility, as well as the affiliated water suppliers, to a civil penalty of \$2,000 per acre-foot of water above the required reduction for the failure to meet these deadlines.	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Potential significant cost impacts from new standards</b>
<b>SB 414 (Caballero)</b>	<b>Small System Water Authority Act of 2019</b>	As amended 6/25/19: Would have created the Small System Water Authority Act, which would have allowed Local Agency Formation Commissions in concert with the State Water Resources Board to consolidate clusters of small water systems that have chronically failed to provide safe and affordable drinking to their customers. These small, failing systems would be reformed into a single Small System Water Authority, benefiting from economies of scale and improved governance and accountability. SB 414 is substantially similar to AB 2050 (Caballero, 2018), which CSDA supported. AB 2050 was vetoed by the Governor.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Fiscal impact unknown</b>

<b>WATER, CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 669 (Caballero)</b>	<b>Water Quality: Safe Drinking Water Fund</b>	As introduced 2/22/19: Would have created the Safe and Affordable Drinking Water Fund to fund projects that expand access to safe drinking water in disadvantaged communities around the state. SB 669 proposed to fund these projects with interest generated by the Safe and Affordable Drinking Water Fund, which would also be created by the bill.	<b>Support</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>Would have provided funds for safe drinking water projects</b>
<b>SB 971 (Hertzberg)</b>	<b>Small Water Supplier and Countywide Water Shortage Contingency Planning</b>	As introduced 2/11/20: Would have enacted recommendations from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) forthcoming County Drought Advisory Group report, which was required by AB 1668 (Friedman, 2018) (Ch. 15, Statutes of 2018) by 1) requiring a small water supplier, with 1,000 to 2,999 service connections, to prepare and adopt a water shortage contingency plan, 2) small water suppliers with 15 to 999 service connections to take specific actions related to water shortage planning and response, and 3) requiring a county at risk of drought or water shortage to include drought and water shortage planning information in the county's existing planning processes and establish a county drought and water storage task force. The county drought and water storage task force would have been comprised of representatives from local governments, community-based organizations, local water suppliers, and members of the public. Additionally, SB 971 would have required DWR, in consultation with the State Water Board and relevant state agencies, to establish an inter-agency drought and water storage task force to facilitate state planning and coordination for pre-drought planning and post-drought emergency response.	<b>Support in concept</b>	<b>Failed Passage</b>	<b>No direct fiscal impacts</b>

<b>WATER, CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE</b>					
<b>BILL/ AUTHOR</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CSDA POSITION</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>COST/COST- SAVINGS</b>
<b>SB 996 (Portantino)</b>	<b>State Water Resources Control Board: Constituents of Emerging Concern Program</b>	As amended 4/1/20: Would have required the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) to establish the Constituents of Emerging Concern Program to assess the state of information and recommend areas for further study on constituents of emerging concern in drinking water that may pose risks to public health. Additionally, it would have required the State Water Board to establish the Stakeholder Advisory Group and the Science Advisory Panel to assist in the gathering and development of information for the program. Opportunities for public participation would have been required, including conducting stakeholder meetings and workshops to solicit relevant information and feedback for development and implementation of the program.	<b>Support</b>	<b><i>Failed Passage</i></b>	<b><i>No direct fiscal impact</i></b>
<b>SB 1052 (Hertzberg)</b>	<b>Water Quality: Municipal Wastewater Agencies</b>	As introduced 2/18/20: Would have authorized municipal wastewater agencies to enter into voluntary agreements with entities responsible for storm water management including municipal, industrial, and commercial storm water dischargers to more effectively manage storm water and dry weather runoff. Any agreement made under these provisions would have been voluntary.	<b>Support</b>	<b><i>Failed Passage</i></b>	<b><i>No direct fiscal impact</i></b>