REMOTE PARTICIPATION ONLY

LEGISLATIVE/COMMUNICATIONS AND MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 19, 2020
8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

PUBLIC ADVISORY
Given recent public health directives limiting public gatherings due to the threat of COVID-19 and in compliance with the Governor’s recent Executive Order N-29-20, the meeting will be held telephonically and electronically.

Please see next page for detailed instructions on how to participate in the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
In advance of the meeting, please submit Public Comments by email at: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov All Public Comments received will be included in the official record of the meeting.

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Kevin Gilhooley at (213) 236-1878 or via email at Gilhooley@scag.ca.gov. Agendas & Minutes are also available at: www.scag.ca.gov/committees

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. SCAG is also committed to helping people with limited proficiency in the English language access the agency’s essential public information and services. You can request such assistance by calling (213) 630-1402. We request at least 72 hours (three days) notice to provide reasonable accommodations and will make every effort to arrange for assistance as soon as possible.
Detailed Instructions for Participating in the Meeting

The meeting of the LCMC is scheduled for Tuesday, May 19 at 8:30 a.m. and is accessible telephonically and electronically (web-based video conferencing) via Zoom. As Zoom offers optimal functionality through its web-based application, we recommend using a computer to access the meeting. Instructions for both options can be found below.

**To Join By Zoom**
1. Click the following link: https://scag.zoom.us/j/805439887
2. If Zoom is not already installed on your computer, click “download & run Zoom” on the launch page and press “run” when prompted by your browser. If Zoom has previously been installed on your computer, please allow a few moments for the application to launch automatically.
3. Select “Join Audio via Computer.”
4. The virtual conference room will open. If you receive a message reading, “Please wait for the host to start this meeting,” simply remain in the room until the meeting begins.

**To Join By Phone**
1. Call (669) 900-6833 to access the conference room. Given high call volumes recently experienced by Zoom, please continue calling until you connect successfully.
2. Enter the Meeting ID: 805 439 887, followed by #.
3. Indicate that you are a participant by pressing # to continue.
4. You will hear audio of the meeting in progress. Remain on the line if the meeting has not yet started.

**Email Public Comments to:** ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov

The public is encouraged to submit comments by sending an email to: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov

All written comments received before and during the Public Comment period will be read by SCAG staff (up to 3 minutes) and included as part of the official record of the meeting. The Chair has the discretion to reduce the time limit based upon the number of e-comments received and may limit the total time for all public comments to twenty (20) minutes.

**To view past meeting videos:** http://scag.iqm2.com/Citizens/
1. **Hon. Jan Harnik**  
   LCMC Chair, RCTC Representative

2. **Hon. Margaret Clark**  
   LCMC Vice Chair, Rosemead, RC District 32

3. **Hon. Stacy Berry**  
   Cypress, RC District 18

4. **Hon. Margaret Finlay**  
   Duarte, RC District 35

5. **Sup. Curt Hagman**  
   San Bernardino County

6. **Hon. Steven Hofbauer**  
   Palmdale, RC District 43

7. **Hon. Clint Lorimore**  
   Eastvale, RC District 4

8. **Hon. Steve Manos**  
   Lake Elsinore, RC District 63

9. **Hon. Ray Marquez**  
   Chino Hills, RC District 10

10. **Hon. Larry McCallon**  
    Highland, RC District 7

11. **Hon. L. Dennis Michael**  
    Rancho Cucamonga, RC District 9

12. **Hon. Judy Mitchell**  
    Rolling Hills Estates, RC District 40

13. **Hon. Frank Navarro**  
    Colton, RC District 6

14. **Sup. Luis Plancarte**  
    Imperial County

15. **Hon. David Pollock**  
    Moorpark, RC District 46
16. Hon. Carmen Ramirez
   Oxnard, RC District 45

17. Hon. Rex Richardson
   Long Beach, RC District 29

   Bell, RC District 27

19. Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker
   El Centro, RC District 1

20. Hon. Donald Wagner
    Orange County

21. Hon. Alan Wapner
    SBCTA Representative
The Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee may consider and act upon any of the items listed on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as information or action items.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE  
(The Honorable Jan Harnik, Chair)

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
The public is encouraged to submit comments by sending an email to: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov. All written comments received before and during the Public Comment period will be read by SCAG staff (up to 3 minutes) and included as part of the official record of the meeting. The Chair has the discretion to reduce the time limit based upon the number of e-comments received and may limit the total time for all public comments to twenty (20) minutes.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Item

1. Minutes of the April 21, 2020 Meeting  
Receive and File

2. Legislative Tracking Report

INFORMATION ITEMS

3. Overview of the May Revise, featuring the Honorable Holly J. Mitchell,  
Chair of the Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review  
(Kevin Gilhooley, Manager of Legislation)

4. Media/Public Affairs Update  
(Margaret de Larios, Public Affairs Specialist II)
ACTION ITEM

5. COVID-19 Request Update and Legislation
   (Estee Sepulveda, Legislative Analyst III)

Recommended Action: Support

POLICY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION UPDATE
(Art Yoon, Director of Policy and Public Affairs)

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

ANNOUNCEMENT/S

ADJOURNMENT
The Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee held its April 21, 2020 meeting telephonically and electronically, given public health directives limiting public gatherings due to the threat of COVID-19 and in compliance with the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Imperial County
Cheryl Viegas-Walker District 1

Los Angeles County
Margaret Clark (VICE CHAIR) District 32
Margaret Finlay District 35
Steve Hofbauer District 43
Judy Mitchell District 40
Ali Saleh District 27

Orange County
Stacy L. Berry District 18
Donald Wagner Orange County Board of Supervisors

Riverside County
Jan Harnik (CHAIR) Riverside County Transportation Commission
Clint Lorimore District 4
Steve Manos District 63

San Bernardino County
Curt Hagman San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors
Ray Marquez District 10
Larry McCallon District 7
L. Dennis Michael District 9
Frank J. Navarro District 6

Ventura County
David Pollock District 46
Carmen Ramirez District 45
CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Hon. Jan Harnik, at 8:30 a.m. A quorum was confirmed and roll call was taken.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments submitted via email to ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

There was no reprioritization of the agenda.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

1. Minutes of the January 21, 2020 Meeting

   A MOTION was made (Finlay) to APPROVE the Consent Calendar.

   The MOTION was SECONDED (Marquez) and APPROVED by a majority vote. A roll call vote was taken and recorded as follows:

   **AYES:** Berry, Clark, Finlay, Hagman, Harnik, Lorimore, Manos, Marquez, McCallon, Michael, Mitchell, Navarro, Pollock, Ramirez, Saleh, Viegas-Walker (16).

   **NOES:** None

   **ABSTAIN:** None

INFORMATION ITEMS

2. Communications Update

   Margaret de Larios, Public Affairs Specialist, provided the Committee with an update on the status of SCAG events that have been impacted by COVID-19. Ms. de Larios stated that given public health considerations, SCAG made the tough decision to cancel the 2020 General Assembly originally scheduled for May 6 through May 8, 2020 in Palm Desert, Calif. Ms. de Larios noted that the business component of the General Assembly, which includes the
adoption of the agency’s budget and consideration of any changes to the bylaws, has been scheduled for Thursday, June 4, 2020. The SCAG Sustainability Awards program will proceed without a formal award ceremony and announcements for this year’s winners are anticipated for early May. Concerning the 31st Annual Demographic workshop, Ms. De Larios shared that this event would be redesigned as a two-part interactive Zoom webinar to be held on June 11 and June 18, 2020.

Chair Harnik inquired about the status of 2020 General Assembly sponsorships. Ms. de Larios confirmed that sponsors of the 2020 General Assembly had agreed to carry forward their sponsorships for next year’s event.

Hon. Carmen Ramirez asked how business would be conducted at the May Regional Council meeting and Ms. de Larios responded by stating that the meeting would be conducted using the Zoom platform.

3. Legislative Tracking Report

Kevin Gilhooley, Legislation Manager, provided an oral report to accompany the Legislative Tracking Report. In addition, he informed the Committee that he was joined on the phone by Tim Egan, SCAG’s lobbyist and Principal of the Capital Representation Group. Mr. Gilhooley began by stating that Governor Newsom issued a State of Emergency Proclamation for the entire state of California on March 4, 2020 due to the Coronavirus outbreak. 10 days later the Legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 89 and immediately afterward adjourned into recess to observe social distancing directives. Mr. Gilhooley indicated that this recess was an opportunity for legislators to work from their districts and was originally scheduled to end on April 13, but Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon and Senate President pro Tempore Toni Atkins extended it until May 4. Mr. Gilhooley reported that during this time the Legislature had not been able to evaluate bills, hold hearings or receive input from the public and if the Legislature were to return on May 4, as later planned, their focus would have to be on passing a constitutionally required balanced state budget. In response to recognizing this reality, Mr. Gilhooley reported Senate President pro Tempore Atkins’ office instructed policy committee chairs to put a pause on “pre-existing non-coronavirus bills” introduced in early 2020 and by so doing would allow the Senate to focus on the work of responding to the pandemic. Mr. Gilhooley continued by stating Senate President pro Tempore Atkins had urged senators to reduce their bill loads this year and that Assembly Speaker Rendon was leaving such decisions to the respective chairs of the various policy committees in the Assembly. Mr. Gilhooley explained that, therefore, not all of the bills contained in the tracking report would move forward this year. Mr. Gilhooley concluded his remarks by explaining that staff would reprioritize SCAG engagement based upon confirmation that certain measures would in fact be moving forward or by monitoring certain proposals that could get slipped into a budget trailer bill this year.
Mr. Gilhooley invited Mr. Egan to offer some remarks. In his remarks, Mr. Egan noted the reduced time frame during which the Legislature must accomplish its work. He went on to discuss the state budget and its constitutionally required deadline for adoption by June 15. Mr. Egan noted that Governor Newsom would release the May Revise on May 14, at which point stakeholders would have a better understanding of the pandemic’s impact on the state’s financial situation. On this point, Mr. Egan discussed an April 10 Department of Finance memo in which the Department reported that the State had already spent seven billion dollars in its initial efforts to combat COVID-19 and that it projected that the state’s entire reserves would be exhausted.

Lastly, Mr. Egan reported that the Governor’s Department of Finance had notified the Legislature of its intent to develop the state budget in the context of a “workload budget,” meaning that new spending obligations would not be considered. Mr. Egan concluded his remarks by offering to answer questions from the Committee.

Hon. Margaret Clark asked about the status of certain housing bills, specifically whether SB 902, SB 725, and Assembly Bill (AB) 1279 would be moving forward this year. Mr. Egan responded that the two (2) budget committee chairs have informed their respective members that only bills relating to COVID-19 and its associated budget impacts, wildfire prevention, and homelessness would move forward.

Hon. Margaret Clark asked if there were any discussions or potential lawsuits for controversial bills suddenly passed through trailer bills without sufficient public input, given the current circumstances. Mr. Egan shared the difficulties of a recent informational hearing conducted by the Senate Budget Committee and extrapolated the difficulties for public input in light of that. He offered two (2) insights: during the pandemic, it will be very difficult for members, staff or anyone to get into the state capitol without official business in process and when official business does resume, he suspects that most legislative work will be performed electronically due to occupancy limitations and social distancing requirements in the committee rooms.

Hon. Carmen Ramirez asked if the Legislature was allowed to vote remotely. Mr. Egan confirmed that legislators could vote remotely pursuant to a joint resolution recently passed. A quorum must be established, however, and the chair and vice chair of the presiding committee must be physically present in the committee room. Hon. Carmen Ramirez also inquired if any members of the Legislature had become ill. Mr. Egan stated no, but confirmed some legislative staff had.

Lastly, Chair Harnik inquired as to the date of the Department of Finance memo, which reported the amount of funds spent thus far. Mr. Egan responded that the initial estimate does not
include the funds that would be off-set by assistance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

4. **COVID-19 Related Relief Legislation**

Estee Sepulveda, Legislative Analyst, provided the Committee with a report on relief efforts recently passed by state and federal governments to address the public health and economic impacts of COVID-19.

Ms. Sepulveda began her report by stating U.S. unemployment claims had reached over 22 million, of which 2.8 million were from Californians. Ms. Sepulveda also highlighted three (3) important dates: March 4, the day Governor Newsom formally declared a State of Emergency in response to the COVID-19 pandemic; March 16, the day the Legislature approved SB 89 which appropriated up to one billion dollars for any purpose related to the State of Emergency Proclamation; and March 22, the day Governor Newsom requested a Presidential Major Disaster Declaration to assist in California’s COVID-19 preparedness and emergency response efforts. Ms. Sepulveda continued by explaining three (3) emergency aid packages that Congress passed in response to the crisis: House Resolution (H.R.) 6074, the Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplemental Appropriations Act; H.R. 6201, the Families First Coronavirus Response Act; and H.R. 748, the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act. Ms. Sepulveda noted some of the highlights of the third emergency aid package and then offered to take questions from Committee members.

Hon. Carmen Ramirez addressed concern about her city, one of the many in the SCAG region that has a population under 500,000, making it ineligible for direct relief from the federal government’s CARES Act. Hon. Carmen Ramirez requested that SCAG advocate to correct this situation. Hon. Don Wagner agreed with this concern and reiterated the role SCAG should play to the benefit of all cities and counties in the region. Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker mentioned the efforts of the League of California Cities and National League of Cities to address this topic.

Hon. L. Dennis Michael shared that city officials represented by Congressman Pete Aguilar held a conference call with him, and that on that call, the Congressman indicated his efforts to provide this needed relief to local governments. Hon. L. Dennis Michael agreed for the need to advocate on this topic both as individual cities and with a regional voice.

After the Committee members had concluded their questions and comments, Ms. Sepulveda added that she had participated on a webinar with the National League of Cities in which they advocated for H.R. 6467, the Coronavirus Community Relief Act. In this bill, funding would be provided to cities that were not eligible under the CARES Act, she said.
Chair Harnik asked Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker or Ms. Sepulveda if either knew what the thinking was for not providing any help to communities under the 500,000 population. Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker responded with her thoughts on the matter.

Hon. Steve Hofbauer raised the issue of the organization and partnership among California’s largest 13 cities and their success advocating in Sacramento. Chair Harnik concluded the discussion by underscoring the need for SCAG to harness its collective voice and have a larger and more robust presence in Sacramento and Washington, D.C.

**ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

5. **AB 2011 (Holden) – West San Bernardino Rail Construction Authority and SB 1390 (Portantino) – Montclair to Ontario Airport Construction Authority**

Melvin Sanchez, Legislative Analyst, provided the Committee with a report on AB 2011 and SB 1390 and explained SCAG staff’s recommendation to oppose both bills.

Mr. Sanchez explained that both bills would create new construction authorities that would award and oversee all design and construction contracts for a potential extension of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority’s (LA Metro) Gold Line light rail service from the city of Montclair, in San Bernardino County, to the Ontario International Airport. Mr. Sanchez noted that both bills require the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) to enter into an agreement with the newly created construction authorities to hold in trust all real property interests held by SBCTA necessary for the construction of the project.

Mr. Sanchez continued by explaining how SB 1390 would require SBCTA to identify funding that it would then be required to transfer to the newly created authority for the completion of the project. This would include funding from voter-approved sales tax measures, he said.

Mr. Sanchez explained that during the March 4 SBCTA board of director’s meeting, the directors allocated three million dollars to conduct the Ontario International Airport Rail Access Alternatives Analysis study to examine costs, benefits, and impacts of a range of transportation alternatives that could accomplish the goal of connecting transit to the Ontario International Airport. Mr. Sanchez concluded his report by offering to answer any questions.

Hon. Don Wagner commented that the Orange County Transportation Authority’s (OCTA) legislative committee took ‘oppose’ positions on these bills and expects the full board to ratify them. Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker followed by confirming that the California Association of Councils of Government (CALCOG) also took a formal oppose position. Hon. Don Wagner asked
if SBCTA had taken positions on these bills, to which Hon. L. Dennis Michael confirmed that SBCTA had in fact done so.

A MOTION was made (Wagner) to OPPOSE AB 2011 and SB 1390. The MOTION was SECONDED (Michael) and APPROVED by a majority vote. A roll call vote was taken and recorded as follows:

**AYES:** Berry, Clark, Finlay, Harnik, Hofbauer, Lorimore, Manos, Marquez, McCallon, Michael, Mitchell, Navarro, Pollock, Ramirez, Saleh, Viegas-Walker, Wagner (17).

**NOES:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

6. **SB 1291 (Beall) – Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program: submissions**

Ms. Sepulveda provided the Committee with a report on SB 1291 and explained staff’s recommendation to support this bill.

Ms. Sepulveda began her report by stating that on March 31, the Trump Administration finalized the Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule requiring automakers to improve their fuel efficiency at a rate of 1.5 percent per year, thus replacing a previous rule which required a five percent efficiency gain. Ms. Sepulveda explained that this Rule may impact transportation conformity determinations for Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) and the upcoming 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), for which SCAG is the agency responsible for the Southern California region.

Ms. Sepulveda noted that the adoption of a new RTP or FTIP requires the use of California’s emissions model to perform a conformity determination. She continued that federal law requires the FTIP to be updated every four years, while state law requires an FTIP to be updated every two years. SB 1291 would eliminate the state requirement that an FTIP be adopted every two years, for only the year 2020, she said, thus negating the requirement for a conformity determination. The regular two-year cycle would resume in 2022, she added.

Ms. Sepulveda further explained that SB 1291 would give the California Air Resources Board (CARB) time to make adjustments to the state’s emission model that takes into consideration both parts of the SAFE Vehicle Rule. SB 1291 was introduced by the Senate Transportation Committee, signaling its status as a top priority, and noted that the bill was sponsored by CALCOG.
A MOTION was made (Viegas-Walker) to SUPPORT SB 1291. The MOTION was SECONDED (Ramirez) and APPROVED by a majority vote. A roll call vote was taken and recorded as follows:


NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

There were no future agenda items presented.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Art Yoon, Director of Policy and Public Affairs, announced that SCAG’s Nominating Committee had met the prior week to decide the SCAG officer nominations and was pleased to report that Chair Harnik was nominated for the 2nd Vice President officer position. Members of the Committee congratulated Chair Harnik on this honor.

Lastly, Hon. McCallon thanked the Committee for opposing AB 2011 and SB 1390.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Harnik adjourned the meeting at 9:23 a.m. The next regular meeting of the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee is scheduled for 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 19, 2020.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The Legislative Tracking Report is provided to keep the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) apprised of any developments related to bills in Sacramento that have a nexus to the Regional Council’s positions on policies and legislative initiatives related to SCAG’s core planning and policy areas. Staff will update the report constantly with emerging legislation and welcomes the Committee’s input on bills it would like to follow.

BACKGROUND:
SCAG’s Legislative Tracking Report serves as a resource for the Committee to remain up-to-date on bills moving through the legislative process in Sacramento. Bills included in the tracking report have a nexus to the Regional Council’s positions on policies and legislative initiatives related to SCAG’s core planning and policy areas. Staff welcomes the Committee’s input on bills it would like to follow throughout the legislative session.

The Legislative Tracking Report has been modified to reflect the realities of policymaking in the State Legislature. Given that substantially fewer bills will be progressing because of the COVID-19 pandemic, staff has removed bills that will not be considered this session.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with the Legislative Tracking staff report is contained in the Indirect Cost budget, Legislation 810-0120.10.
ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Legislative Tracking Report
**SCAG Legislative Tracking Report**

**Wednesday, May 13, 2020**

**AB 291** (Chu D) **Local Emergency Preparedness and Hazard Mitigation Fund.**

**Introduced:** 1/28/2019  
**Last Amended:** 1/23/2020  
**Status:** 1/30/2020-Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Senate. In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.  
**Location:** 1/30/2020-S. RLS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>1st House</th>
<th>2nd House</th>
<th>Conf. Conc.</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Vetoed</th>
<th>Chaptered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary:**  
Would establish a Local Emergency Preparedness and Hazard Mitigation Fund to, upon appropriation by the Legislature, support staffing, planning, and other emergency mitigation priorities to help local governments meet emergency management, preparedness, readiness, and resilience goals. The bill would require the Office of Emergency Services to establish the Local Emergency Preparedness and Hazard Mitigation Fund Committee under the Standardized Emergency Management System Advisory Board.

**History:**

**2019**

Jan. 28 Read first time. To print.  
Jan. 29 From printer. May be heard in committee February 28.  
Mar. 25 Referred to Com. on G.O. From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on G.O. Read second time and amended.  
Mar. 26 Re-referred to Com. on G.O.  
Apr. 22 From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on G.O. Read second time and amended.  
Apr. 23 Re-referred to Com. on G.O.  
Apr. 29 From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 15. Noes 1.) (April 24).  
Apr. 30 Read second time and amended.  
May. 1 Re-referred to Com. on APPR.  
May. 8 In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.  
May. 16 In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.

**2020**


**Organization:** SCAG  
**Position:** Tracking

**AB 725** (Wicks D) **General plans: housing element: moderate-income and above moderate-income housing: suburban and metropolitan jurisdictions.**

**Introduced:** 2/19/2019  
**Last Amended:** 1/16/2020  
**Status:** 1/30/2020-Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Senate. In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.  
**Location:** 1/30/2020-S. RLS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>1st House</th>
<th>2nd House</th>
<th>Conf. Conc.</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Vetoed</th>
<th>Chaptered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary:**  
The Planning and Zoning Law requires that the housing element include, among other things, an inventory of land suitable for residential development, to be used to identify sites that can be developed for housing within the planning period and that are sufficient to provide for the jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need determined pursuant to specified law. This bill would require that at least 25% of a metropolitan jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need for moderate-income housing be allocated to sites with zoning that allows at least 2 units of housing, but no more than 35 units per acre of housing. The bill would require that at least 25% of a metropolitan jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need for above moderate-income housing be allocated to sites with zoning that allows at least 2 units of housing, but no more than 35 units per acre of housing.
AB 828
(Ting D) Temporary moratorium on foreclosures and unlawful detainer actions: coronavirus (COVID-19).

Introduced: 2/20/2019
Last Amended: 4/8/2020
Status: 5/11/2020-Re-referred to Com. on RLS.
Location: 5/11/2020-S. RLS.

Summary:
Would prohibit a person from taking any action to foreclose on a residential real property while a state or locally declared state of emergency related to the COVID-19 virus is in effect and until 15 days after the state of emergency has ended, including, but not limited to, causing or conducting the sale of the real property or causing recordation of a notice of default. This bill would require a tax collector to suspend the sale, and not attempt to sell, tax-defaulted properties while a state or locally declared state of emergency related to the COVID-19 virus is in effect and until 15 days after the state of emergency has ended.

History:
2019
Feb. 19 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 20 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Mar. 4 Referred to Com. on JUD.
Mar. 26 From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended. To Consent Calendar. (Ayes 12. Noes 0.) (March 26).
Mar. 27 Read second time and amended. Ordered returned to second reading.
Mar. 28 Read second time. Ordered to Consent Calendar.
Apr. 4 Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Senate. (Ayes 75. Noes 0. Page 1040.) In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.
Apr. 24 Referred to Coms. on PUB. S. and JUD.
May. 22 In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.

2020
Apr. 8 From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on PUB. S.
May. 11 Re-referred to Com. on RLS.

Organization: SCAG
AB 1251  (Santiago D)  Planning and zoning: housing development.
Introduced: 2/21/2019
Last Amended: 9/4/2019
Status: 9/5/2019-Read second time. Ordered to third reading. Re-referred to Com. on RLS. pursuant to Senate Rule 29.10(c).
Location: 9/5/2019-S. RLS.

Summary:
The Planning and Zoning Law requires that the housing element include, among other things, an inventory of land suitable and available for residential development, as provided. If the inventory of sites does not identify adequate sites to accommodate the need for groups of all household income levels, as specified, current law requires the local government to rezone those sites within specified time periods. Current law requires this rezoning to accommodate 100% of the need for housing for very low and low-income households, allocated as provided, for which site capacity has not been identified in the inventory of sites on sites zoned to permit specified residential developments as a use by right, as that term is defined. This bill would additionally require that, if a local government fails to complete the above-described rezoning within one year of the specified deadline, a housing development in which at least 40% of the units have an affordable housing cost or affordable rent for lower income households be a use by right in all zones where multifamily, commercial, and mixed uses are permitted.

History:
2019
Feb. 21 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 24.
Mar. 11 Referred to Com. on JUD.
Apr. 3 From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 11. Noes 0.) (April 2).
Apr. 4 Read second time and amended.
Apr. 8 Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Apr. 25 Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
May. 6 Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Senate. (Ayes 76. Noes 0. Page 1510.) In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.
May. 16 Referred to Com. on JUD.
Jul. 10 From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. with recommendation: To Consent Calendar. (Ayes 8. Noes 0.) (July 9). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Aug. 12 From committee: Be ordered to second reading file pursuant to Senate Rule 28.8 and ordered to Consent Calendar.
Aug. 13 Read second time. Ordered to Consent Calendar.
Aug. 19 Withdrawn from Engrossing and Enrolling. Ordered to the Senate.
Aug. 20 In Senate. Held at Desk.
Sep. 4 Action rescinded whereby the bill was read third time, passed, and to Assembly. Ordered to third reading. Read third time and amended. Ordered to second reading.
Sep. 5 Read second time. Ordered to third reading. Re-referred to Com. on RLS. pursuant to Senate Rule 29.10(c).

Organization:  SCAG
Position:  Tracking

AB 1279  (Bloom D)  Planning and zoning: housing development: high-opportunity areas.
Introduced: 2/21/2019
Last Amended: 4/24/2020
Status: 4/24/2020-From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on HOUSING.
Location: 4/24/2020-S. HOUSING

Summary:
The Planning and Zoning Law allows a development proponent to submit an application for a development that is subject to a specified streamlined, ministerial approval process not subject to a conditional use permit if the development satisfies certain objective planning standards, including that the development is (1) located in a locality determined by the Department of Housing and Community
Development to have not met its share of the regional housing needs for the reporting period, and (2) subject to a requirement mandating a minimum percentage of below-market rate housing, as provided. This bill would require the department to designate areas in this state as high-opportunity areas, as provided, by January 1, 2022, in accordance with specified requirements and to update those designations within 6 months of the adoption of new Opportunity Maps by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee.

History:
2019
Feb. 21 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 24.
Mar. 11 Referred to Coms. on H. & C.D. and NAT. RES.
Mar. 21 Re-referred to Com. on RLS. pursuant to Assembly Rule 96(a).
Apr. 10 From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on L. GOV. (Ayes 6. Noes 1.) (April 10). Re-referred to Com. on L. GOV.
Apr. 25 From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (April 24). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
May. 8 In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.
May. 20 Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
May. 30 In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.
Jun. 12 Referred to Coms. on HOUSING, EQ. and GOV. & F.
2020
Apr. 24 From committee chair, with author’s amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on HOUSING.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

Introduced: 2/22/2019
Last Amended: 1/15/2020
Status: 1/28/2020-In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.
Location: 1/28/2020-S. RLS.

Summary:
Would, on or before December 31, 2021, require the Strategic Growth Council, in consultation with stakeholders and relevant permitting agencies, to prepare and submit to the Legislature a report that provides a scoping plan for the state to meet its organic waste, climate change, and air quality mandates, goals, and targets and would require the scoping plan to include, among other things, recommendations on policy and funding support for the beneficial reuse of organic waste.

History:
2019
Feb. 22Introduced. To print.
Feb. 23 From printer. May be heard in committee March 25.
Feb. 25 Read first time.
2020
Jan. 6 Referred to Com. on NAT. RES. From committee chair, with author’s amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on NAT. RES. Read second time and amended.
Jan. 7 Re-referred to Com. on NAT. RES.
Jan. 14 From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 11. Noes 0.) (January 13).
Jan. 15 Read second time and amended.
Jan. 16 Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Jan. 27 Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Senate. (Ayes 78. Noes 0. Page 3899.)
Jan. 28 In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking
**AB 1845**  (Rivas, Luz D)  Homelessness: Office to End Homelessness.

**Introduced:** 1/6/2020  
**Status:** 3/11/2020-Coauthors revised. From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 6. Noes 1.) (March 11). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

**Location:** 3/11/2020-A. APPR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk Policy Fiscal Floor</th>
<th>Desk Policy Fiscal Floor</th>
<th>Conf. Conc.</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Vetoed</th>
<th>Chaptered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st House</td>
<td>2nd House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**  
Would create, within the Governor’s office, the Governor’s Office to End Homelessness, which would be administered by the Secretary on Housing Insecurity and Homelessness appointed by the Governor. The bill would require that the office serve the Governor as the lead entity for ending homelessness in California and would task the office with coordinating the various federal, state, and local departments and agencies that provide housing and services to individuals experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness.

**History:**  
2020  
Jan. 6 Read first time. To print.  
Jan. 7 From printer. May be heard in committee February 6.  
Jan. 17 Referred to Com. on H. & C.D.  
Mar. 11 Coauthors revised. From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 6. Noes 1.) (March 11). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

**Organization:** SCAG  
**Position:** Tracking

**AB 1851**  (Wicks D)  Religious institution affiliated housing development projects: parking requirements.

**Introduced:** 1/6/2020  
**Last Amended:** 5/5/2020  
**Status:** 5/12/2020-Coauthors revised. From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 8. Noes 0.) (May 12). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

**Location:** 5/12/2020-A. APPR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk Policy Fiscal Floor</th>
<th>Desk Policy Fiscal Floor</th>
<th>Conf. Conc.</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Vetoed</th>
<th>Chaptered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st House</td>
<td>2nd House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**  
Would prohibit a local agency from requiring the replacement of religious-use parking spaces that a developer of a religious institution affiliated housing development project proposes to eliminate as part of that housing development project. The bill would prohibit the number of religious-use parking spaces requested to be eliminated from exceeding 50% of the number that are available at the time the request is made. The bill would prohibit a local agency from requiring the curing of any preexisting deficit of the number of religious-use parking spaces as a condition of approval of a religious institution affiliated housing development project.

**History:**  
2020  
Jan. 6 Read first time. To print.  
Jan. 7 From printer. May be heard in committee February 6.  
Jan. 30 Referred to Coms. on L. GOV. and H. & C.D.  
May. 5 From committee chair, with author’s amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on L. GOV. Read second time and amended.  
May. 6 Re-referred to Com. on L. GOV.  
May. 12 Coauthors revised. From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 8. Noes 0.) (May 12). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

**Organization:** SCAG  
**Position:** Tracking

**AB 1920**  (Boerner Horvath D)  Climate change: California Climate Adaptation Center and Regional Support Network.

**Introduced:** 1/13/2020  
**Last Amended:** 5/4/2020  
**Status:** 5/5/2020-Re-referred to Com. on NAT. RES.

**Location:** 4/24/2020-A. NAT. RES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk Policy Fiscal Floor</th>
<th>Desk Policy Fiscal Floor</th>
<th>Conf. Conc.</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Vetoed</th>
<th>Chaptered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st House</td>
<td>2nd House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
Current law requires the Natural Resources Agency, in collaboration with the Ocean Protection Council, to create, and update biannually, a Planning for Sea Level Rise Database describing steps being taken throughout the state to prepare for, and adapt to, sea level rise. This bill would establish the Climate Adaptation Center and Regional Support Network in the Ocean Protection Council to provide local governments facing sea level rise challenges with information and scientific expertise necessary to proceed with sea level rise mitigation.

**History:**

**2020**
Jan. 13 Read first time. To print.
Jan. 14 From printer. May be heard in committee February 13.
Apr. 24 Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.
May. 4 From committee chair, with author’s amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on NAT. RES.
Read second time and amended.
May. 5 Re-referred to Com. on NAT. RES.

**Organization:** SCAG  
**Position:** Tracking

**AB 1924** (Grayson D)  **Housing development: fees.**

**Introduced:** 1/14/2020  
**Status:** 1/23/2020-Referral to Coms. on L. GOV. and H. & C.D.  
**Location:** 1/23/2020-A. L. GOV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Conf. Conc.</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Vetoed</th>
<th>Chaptered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

Would require that a fee levied or imposed on a housing development project by a local agency be proportionate to the square footage of the proposed unit or units. By imposing additional duties on local agencies that impose fees under the Mitigation Fee Act, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

**History:**

**2020**
Jan. 14 Read first time. To print.
Jan. 15 From printer. May be heard in committee February 14.
Jan. 23 Referred to Coms. on L. GOV. and H. & C.D.

**Organization:** SCAG  
**Position:** Tracking

**AB 1992** (Friedman D)  **Transportation: transportation infrastructure: climate change.**

**Introduced:** 1/27/2020  
**Last Amended:** 3/11/2020  
**Status:** 3/12/2020-Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.  
**Location:** 2/6/2020-A. TRANS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Conf. Conc.</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Vetoed</th>
<th>Chaptered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

Would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would establish a new program to fund climate change adaptation planning for transportation impacts, data collection, modeling, and training. The bill would require the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the California Transportation Commission, to update the asset management plan on or before December 31, 2022, and every 4 years thereafter, and for the updates to take into account the forecasted impacts of climate change on transportation infrastructure. The bill would require the updates to the California Transportation Plan and the Strategic Growth Council’s report to include a forecast of the impacts of climate change on transportation infrastructure and measures to address those impacts.

**History:**

**2020**
Jan. 27 Read first time. To print.
Jan. 28 From printer. May be heard in committee February 27.
Feb. 6 Referred to Coms. on TRANS. and NAT. RES.
Mar. 11 From committee chair, with author’s amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on TRANS. Read second time and amended.
Mar. 12 Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.

**Organization:** SCAG
AB 2011 (Holden D) West San Bernardino County Rail Construction Authority.
Introduced: 1/28/2020
Status: 2/14/2020-Referred to Com. on TRANS.
Location: 2/14/2020-A. TRANS.
Desk Policy Fiscal Floor Desk Policy Fiscal Floor
1st House 2nd House

Summary:
Would create the West San Bernardino County Rail Construction Authority for purposes of awarding and overseeing all design and construction contracts for completion of an extension of the Metro Gold Line light rail project from the duties of the construction authority.

History:
2020
Jan. 28 Read first time. To print.
Jan. 29 From printer. May be heard in committee February 28.
Feb. 14 Referred to Com. on TRANS.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Oppose

AB 2012 (Chu D) Free senior transit passes: eligibility for state funding.
Introduced: 1/28/2020
Status: 2/14/2020-Referred to Com. on TRANS.
Location: 2/14/2020-A. TRANS.
Desk Policy Fiscal Floor Desk Policy Fiscal Floor
1st House 2nd House

Summary:
Would require transit agencies to offer free senior transit passes to persons over 65 years of age in order to be eligible for state funding under the Mills-Deddeh Transit Development Act, the State Transit Assistance Program, and the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program. The bill would require those free senior transit passes to count as full price fares for purposes of calculating the ratio of fare revenues to operating costs.

History:
2020
Jan. 28 Read first time. To print.
Jan. 29 From printer. May be heard in committee February 28.
Feb. 14 Referred to Com. on TRANS.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 2058 (Gabriel D) Income taxes: credits: low-income housing.
Introduced: 2/4/2020
Last Amended: 5/12/2020
Status: 5/12/2020-From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on REV. & TAX. Read second time and amended.
Location: 2/14/2020-A. REV. & TAX
Desk Policy Fiscal Floor Desk Policy Fiscal Floor
1st House 2nd House

Calendar:
5/18/2020 11:30 a.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY REVENUE AND TAXATION, BURKE, Chair
Summary:
The Personal Income Tax Law and the Corporation Tax Law allow various credits against the taxes imposed by those laws. This bill, for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 2021, and before January 1, 2026, would allow a credit against those taxes to a taxpayer that is transferred, and allocated, credits pursuant to the sale of a multifamily rental housing development or mobilehome park to a qualified developer, as defined, that has received a credit reservation from the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, in specified amounts. The bill would require the credits to be reserved on a first-come-first-served basis.

History:
2020
Feb. 4 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 5 From printer. May be heard in committee March 6.
Feb. 14 Referred to Com. on REV. & TAX.
Mar. 2 From committee chair, with author’s amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on REV. & TAX.
Read second time and amended.
Mar. 4 Re-referred to Com. on REV. & TAX.
Mar. 9 In committee: Hearing for testimony only.
May. 12 From committee chair, with author’s amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on REV. & TAX.
Read second time and amended.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 2078 (Calderon D) Housing development.
Introduced: 2/5/2020
Last Amended: 3/16/2020
Status: 3/17/2020-Re-referred to Com. on H. & C.D.
Location: 3/12/2020-A. H. & C.D.

Summary:
Would require the California Housing Finance Agency to conduct a study to identify financial impediments to developing entitled properties in the state and post a report of the study on its internet website by January 1, 2022. The bill would also state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would authorize the California Housing Finance Agency to loan money to developers for the purpose of building housing units, conditioned on loan terms and the payment of interest at commercial market rates and full repayment of the loan.

History:
2020
Feb. 5 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 6 From printer. May be heard in committee March 7.
Mar. 12 Referred to Com. on H. & C.D.
Mar. 16 From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on H. & C.D.
Read second time and amended.
Mar. 17 Re-referred to Com. on H. & C.D.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 2148 (Quirk D) Climate change: adaptation: regional climate adaptation planning groups: regional climate adaptation plans.
Introduced: 2/10/2020
Last Amended: 3/5/2020
Status: 3/9/2020-Re-referred to Com. on NAT. RES.
Location: 3/5/2020-A. NAT. RES.

Summary:
Current law establishes the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program, administered by the Office of Planning and Research, to coordinate regional and local efforts with state climate adaptation strategies to adapt to the impacts of climate change, as specified. This bill would require the Strategic Growth Council, by July 1, 2021, to establish guidelines for the formation of regional climate adaptation planning groups. The bill would require the council, by July 1, 2022, to develop criteria for the development of regional climate adaptation plans.

History:
2020
Feb. 10 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 11 From printer. May be heard in committee March 12.
Mar. 5 Referred to Com. on NAT. RES. From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on NAT. RES. Read second time and amended.
Mar. 9 Re-referred to Com. on NAT. RES.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 2176 (Holden D) Free student transit passes: eligibility for state funding.
**Summary:**
Would require transit agencies to offer free student transit passes to persons attending the California Community Colleges, the California State University, or the University of California in order to be eligible for state funding under the Mills-Alquist-Deddeh Act, the State Transit Assistance Program, or the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program. The bill would also require a free student transit pass to count as a full price fare for purposes of calculating the ratio of fare revenues to operating costs.

**History:**

2020
Feb. 11 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 12 From printer. May be heard in committee March 13.
Feb. 27 Referred to Coms. on TRANS. and HIGHER ED.

**Organization:** SCAG
**Position:** Tracking

**AB 2241** (Calderon D)  
**State Air Resources Board: report.**

**Introduced:** 2/13/2020
**Status:** 2/14/2020-From printer. May be heard in committee March 15.
**Location:** 2/13/2020-A. PRINT

**Summary:**
Current law requires the State Air Resources Board to post on its internet website, at a minimum by January 1 of each odd-numbered year, information on air quality conditions and trends statewide and on the status and effectiveness of state and local air quality programs, as specified. This bill would make nonsubstantive changes to that provision.

**History:**

2020
Feb. 13 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 14 From printer. May be heard in committee March 15.

**Organization:** SCAG
**Position:** Tracking

**AB 2310** (Daly D)  
**Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account: apportionment of funds: accrued interest.**

**Introduced:** 2/14/2020
**Status:** 3/17/2020-In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.
**Location:** 2/24/2020-A. TRANS.

**Summary:**
Would continuously appropriate interest earnings derived from revenues deposited in the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account to the Department of Transportation for maintenance of the state highway system or for purposes of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program.

**History:**

2020
Feb. 14 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 15 From printer. May be heard in committee March 16.
Feb. 24 Referred to Com. on TRANS.
Mar. 17 In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.

**Organization:** SCAG
**Position:** Tracking

**AB 2580** (Eggman D)  
**Conversion of motels and hotels: streamlining.**

**Introduced:** 2/20/2020
**Last Amended:** 5/11/2020
**Status:** 5/12/2020-Re-referred to Com. on H. & C.D.
AB 2839 (Garcia, Eduardo D) California Deserts Conservancy: establishment.
Introduced: 2/20/2020
Status: 3/2/2020-Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.
Location: 3/2/2020-A. NAT. RES.

Summary:
Would establish the California Deserts Conservancy in the agency to undertake various conservation activities, as prescribed, related to the California deserts region, as defined, to protect, conserve, and restore that region's natural, cultural, archaeological, historical, and physical resources, among other functions. The bill would require the conservancy to be governed by a 13-member board of directors, as prescribed, with up to 3 additional nonvoting board members, as specified.

History:
2020
Feb. 20 Read first time. To print.
Feb. 21 From printer. May be heard in committee March 22.
Mar. 2 Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 3107 (Bloom D) Planning and zoning: general plan: housing development.
Introduced: 2/21/2020
Last Amended: 5/11/2020
Status: 5/12/2020-Re-referred to Com. on H. & C.D.
Location: 3/9/2020-A. H. & C.D.

Summary:
The Planning and Zoning Law requires that the housing element include, among other things, an
inventory of land suitable and available for residential development, as provided. If that inventory does not identify adequate sites to accommodate the need for groups of all household income levels, as specified, existing law requires the city or county to rezone those sites within specified periods. This bill, notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of a city’s or county’s general plan, specific plan, zoning ordinance, or regulation, would require that a housing development be an authorized use on a site designated in any element of the general plan for commercial if certain conditions apply. Among these conditions, the bill would require that the housing development be subject to a recorded deed restriction requiring that at least 20% of the units have an affordable housing cost or affordable rent for lower income households, as those terms are defined, and located on a site that satisfies specified criteria.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Feb. 24 Read first time.
Mar. 9 Referred to Coms. on H. & C.D. and L. GOV.
Mar. 16 In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.
May. 11 From committee chair, with author’s amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on H. & C.D.
Read second time and amended.
May. 12 Re-referred to Com. on H. & C.D.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 3122 (Santiago D) Housing element: emergency shelters, temporary housing, and supportive housing.
Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 3/16/2020-In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.
Location: 3/9/2020-A. H. & C.D.

Summary:
Current law requires that the housing element include, among other things, an inventory of land suitable for residential development and an analysis of any special housing needs, such as those of the elderly, persons with disabilities, large families, farmworkers, families with female heads of households, and families and persons in need of emergency shelter. This bill would additionally require the inventory to include an analysis of potential sites available for the development of emergency shelters, temporary housing, and supportive housing necessary to provide shelter to the locality’s homeless population.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Feb. 24 Read first time.
Mar. 9 Referred to Coms. on H. & C.D. and L. GOV.
Mar. 16 In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 3144 (Grayson D) Housing Cost Reduction Incentive Program.
Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 3/16/2020-In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.
Location: 3/9/2020-A. H. & C.D.

Summary:
Would establish the Housing Cost Reduction Incentive Program, to be administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development, for the purpose of reimbursing cities, counties, and cities and counties for development impact fee waivers or reductions provided to qualified rental housing developments. Upon appropriation, the bill would require the department to provide grants to applicants in an amount equal to 50% of the amount of development impact fee waived or reduced for a qualified rental housing development by issuing a Notice of Funding Availability for each calendar year in which funds are made available for the program, as provided. The bill would require an applicant that receives a grant under the program to use those funds solely for those purposes for which the
development impact fee that was waived or reduced would have been used.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Feb. 24 Read first time.
Mar. 9 Referred to Coms. on H. & C.D. and L. GOV.
Mar. 16 In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 3145  (Grayson D)  Local government: housing development projects: fees and exactions cap.
Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 3/9/2020-Referral to Coms. on L. GOV. and H. & C.D.
Location: 3/9/2020-A. L. GOV.

Summary:
Would prohibit a city or county from imposing a specified fee or exaction if the total dollar amount of the fees and exactions that a city or county would impose on a proposed housing development is greater than 12 percent of the city’s or county’s median home price unless approved by the Department of Housing and Community Development. The bill would authorize a city or county to seek approval from the department to impose a fee or an exaction that would result in the total dollar amount of fees and exactions exceeding that limitation by making a specified finding and submitting a completed application for a waiver.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Feb. 24 Read first time.
Mar. 9 Referred to Coms. on L. GOV. and H. & C.D.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 3148  (Chiu D)  Planning and zoning: density bonuses: affordable housing: fee reductions.
Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 3/9/2020-Referral to Coms. on H. & C.D. and L. GOV.
Location: 3/9/2020-A. H. & C.D.

Summary:
Would require a city, county, special district, water corporation, utility, or other local agency, except a school district, to reduce an impact fee or other charges imposed on the construction of a deed restricted affordable housing unit that is built pursuant to a density bonus, to amounts that are, depending on the affordability restriction on the unit, a specified percentage of the impact fee or other charge that would be imposed on a market rate unit within the development. The bill would exempt from these provisions units that are required to be affordable pursuant to a local inclusionary housing ordinance. The bill would define “impact fee” for purposes of these provisions. By imposing requirements on local agencies with respect to density bonuses, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Feb. 24 Read first time.
Mar. 9 Referred to Coms. on H. & C.D. and L. GOV.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 3153  (Rivas, Robert D)  Parking and zoning: parking credits.
Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 5/12/2020-Action From L. GOV.: Do pass as amended. To APPR.

Location: 5/12/2020-A. APPR.

Summary:
Would require a local jurisdiction, as defined, notwithstanding any local ordinance, general plan element, specific plan, charter, or other local law, policy, resolution, or regulation, to provide, if requested, an eligible applicant of a residential development with a parking credit that exempts the project from minimum parking requirements based on the number of nonrequired bicycle parking spaces or car-sharing spaces provided subject to certain conditions, as specified.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Feb. 24 Read first time.
Mar. 9 Referred to Coms. on L. GOV. and H. & C.D.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

**AB 3213** (Rivas, Luz D) High-Speed Rail Authority: high-speed rail service: priorities.
Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 5/5/2020-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 15. Noes 0.) (May 4). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Location: 5/4/2020-A. APPR.

Summary:
Current law establishes the High-Speed Rail Authority within the state government with various powers and duties related to developing and implementing high-speed passenger rail service. Current law requires the authority to direct the development and implementation of intercity high-speed rail service that is fully integrated with specified forms of transit. This bill would require the authority, in directing the development and implementation of intercity high-speed rail service, to prioritize projects based on specified criteria.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Feb. 24 Read first time.
Mar. 9 Referred to Com. on TRANS.
May. 5 From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 15. Noes 0.) (May 4). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

Introduced: 2/21/2020
Last Amended: 5/4/2020
Status: 5/7/2020-Measure version as amended on May 4 corrected.
Location: 4/24/2020-A. NAT. RES.

Calendar:
5/13/2020 10 a.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202  ASSEMBLY NATURAL RESOURCES, FRIEDMAN, Chair

Summary:
Would enact the Wildfire Prevention, Safe Drinking Water, Climate Resilience, Drought Preparation, and Flood Protection Bond Act of 2020, which, if approved by the voters, would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of $6,980,000,000 pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law to finance projects for a wildfire prevention, safe drinking water, climate resilience, drought preparation, and flood protection program.

History:
2020
AB 3279 (Friedman D) California Environmental Quality Act: administrative and judicial procedures.

Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 4/24/2020-Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.
Location: 4/24/2020-A. NAT. RES.

Summary:
The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. Among other changes, this bill would repeal certain obsolete and duplicative provisions from CEQA and make nonsubstantive changes to certain other provisions.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Feb. 24 Read first time.
Apr. 24 Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.
May. 4 From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on NAT. RES.
Read second time and amended.
May. 7 Measure version as amended on May 4 corrected.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

AB 3300 (Santiago D) Homelessness: California Access to Housing and Services Act.

Introduced: 2/21/2020
Last Amended: 5/4/2020
Status: 5/5/2020-Re-referred to Com. on H. & C.D.
Location: 3/9/2020-A. H. & C.D.

Summary:
By executive order, the Governor required the Department of Finance to establish the California Access to Housing and Services Fund, administered by the State Department of Social Services, to provide funding for additional affordable housing units, providing rental and operating subsidies, and stabilizing board and care homes. This bill, the California Access to Housing and Services Act, would establish the California Access to Housing and Services Fund in the State Treasury and continuously appropriate moneys in the fund solely for the purpose of implementing and administering the bill’s provisions.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To print.
Feb. 22 From printer. May be heard in committee March 23.
Feb. 24 Read first time.
Mar. 9 Referred to Com. on H. & C.D.
May. 4 From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on H. & C.D.
Read second time and amended.
May. 5 Re-referred to Com. on H. & C.D.

**Organization:** SCAG  
**Position:** Tracking

**ACA 1**  
(Aguiar-Curry D) Local government financing: affordable housing and public infrastructure: voter approval.

**Introduced:** 12/3/2018  
**Last Amended:** 3/18/2019  
**Status:** 8/19/2019-Read third time. Refused adoption. Motion to reconsider made by Assembly Member Aguiar-Curry.

**Location:** 5/20/2019-A. RECONSIDERATION

**Summary:**
The California Constitution prohibits the ad valorem tax rate on real property from exceeding 1% of the full cash value of the property, subject to certain exceptions. This measure would create an additional exception to the 1% limit that would authorize a city, county, city and county, or special district to levy an ad valorem tax to service bonded indebtedness incurred to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing, or the acquisition or lease of real property for those purposes, if the proposition proposing that tax is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, or city and county, as applicable, and the proposition includes specified accountability requirements.

**History:**
2018
Dec. 3 Read first time. To print.
Dec. 4 From printer. May be heard in committee January 3.

2019
Mar. 18 Referred to Coms. on L. GOV. and APPR. From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on L. GOV. Read second time and amended.
Mar. 19 Re-referred to Com. on L. GOV.
Mar. 28 Coauthors revised. From committee: Be adopted, and re-refer to Com. on APPR. Re-referred. (Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (March 27). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Apr. 24 In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.
May. 20 Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
Aug. 19 Read third time. Refused adoption. (Ayes 44. Noes 20. Page 2758.) Motion to reconsider made by Assembly Member Aguiar-Curry.

**Organization:** SCAG  
**Position:** Watch

**ACA 13**  
(Obernolte R) Local sales taxes: online sales.

**Introduced:** 3/26/2019
**Status:** 3/28/2019-Introduced measure version corrected.

**Location:** 3/26/2019-A. PRINT

**Summary:**
Would provide that, on and after January 1, 2021, for the purpose of distributing the revenues derived under a sales tax imposed pursuant to the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law, the retail sale of tangible personal property by a qualified retailer, as defined, that is transacted online is instead consummated at the point of the delivery of that tangible personal property to the purchaser's address or to any other delivery address designated by the purchaser.

**History:**
2019
Mar. 26 Read first time. To print.
Mar. 27 From printer. May be heard in committee April 26.
Mar. 28 Introduced measure version corrected.

**Organization:** SCAG
SB 45


Introduced: 12/3/2018
Last Amended: 1/23/2020
Status: 1/30/2020-In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.
Location: 1/29/2020-A. DESK

Summary:
Would enact the Wildfire Prevention, Safe Drinking Water, Drought Preparation, and Flood Protection Bond Act of 2020, which, if approved by the voters, would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of $5,510,000,000 pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law to finance projects for a wildfire prevention, safe drinking water, drought preparation, and flood protection program.

History:
2018
Dec. 3 Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.
Dec. 4 From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 3.

2019
Jan. 16 Referred to Coms. on N.R. & W., EQ., and GOV. & F.
Feb. 20 Set for hearing March 12.
Mar. 5 From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on N.R. & W. March 12 hearing postponed by committee.
Mar. 13 Set for hearing March 26.
Re-referred to Com. on EQ.
Mar. 28 Set for hearing April 3.
Apr. 4 Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on GOV. & F.
Apr. 12 Set for hearing April 24.
Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Apr. 30 Set for hearing May 6.
May. 1 May 6 set for first hearing canceled at the request of author.
Aug. 30 From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Sep. 5 From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Sep. 10 Senate Rule 29.3(b) suspended. (Ayes 29. Noes 8. Page 2746.) From committee with author’s amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

2020
Jan. 27 Read second time. Ordered to third reading.
Jan. 30 In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Watch

SB 278

(Beall D) Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

Introduced: 2/13/2019
Last Amended: 3/28/2019
Location: 1/27/2020-A. DESK

Summary:
The Metropolitan Transportation Commission Act creates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission
as a local area planning agency to provide comprehensive regional transportation planning for the
region comprised of the 9 San Francisco Bay area counties. The act requires the commission to continue
to actively, on behalf of the entire region, seek to assist in the development of adequate funding
sources to develop, construct, and support transportation projects that it determines are essential.
This bill would also require the commission to determine that those transportation projects are a
priority for the region.

History:
2019
Feb. 13 Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.
Feb. 14 From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 16.
Feb. 21 Referred to Com. on RLS.
Mar. 28 From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to
Com. on RLS.
Apr. 10 Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.
2020
Jan. 8 Set for hearing January 14.
Jan. 14 From committee: Do pass and re-referral to Com. on APPR. with recommendation: To consent
calendar. (Ayes 9. Noes 0. Page 3087.) (January 14). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
Jan. 15 Set for hearing January 21.
Jan. 21 From committee: Be ordered to second reading pursuant to Senate Rule 28.8 and ordered to
consent calendar.
Jan. 22 Read second time. Ordered to consent calendar.
Jan. 27 Ordered to special consent calendar. Read third time. Passed. (Ayes 38. Noes 0. Page 3154.)
Ordered to the Assembly. In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.

Organization: SCAG

Introduced: 1/6/2020
Last Amended: 5/6/2020
Status: 5/12/2020-Referral to Com. on Housing and ED. rescinded due to the shortened 2020
Legislative Calendar.
Location: 5/11/2020-S. HOUSING

Summary: Would continuously appropriate the sum of $10,000,000,000 from the General Fund for expenditure
over the 2020–21 fiscal year and each of the 4 following fiscal years. Of that amount, the bill would
require the Controller to allocate for each of those fiscal years $1,805,000,000 among various housing
programs administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development, the Homeless
Housing, Assistance, and Prevention program, and for distribution by the California Workforce
Development Board among local agencies to participate in, invest in, or partner with new or existing
preapprenticeship training programs established as specified. The bill would require the Business,
Consumer Services, and Housing Agency to establish deadlines for applications and submitting final
reports under the Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention program with respect to moneys
allocated to that program under the bill.

History:
2020
Jan. 6 Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.
Jan. 7 From printer. May be acted upon on or after February 6.
Jan. 15 Referred to Coms. on GOV. & F., HIHOUSING, and ED.
Apr. 2 From committee with author’s amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to
Com. on GOV. & F.
May. 6 From committee with author’s amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to
Com. on GOV. & F.
May. 11 Withdrawn from committee. Re-referred to Com. on RLS. Re-referred to Com. on HOUSING.
May. 12 Referral to Com. on Housing and ED. rescinded due to the shortened 2020 Legislative
Calendar.

Attachments:
Support Letter

Organization: SCAG
Position: Support
**SB 899**  
**Wiener D**  
Planning and zoning: housing development: nonprofit hospitals or religious institutions.  
Introduced: 1/30/2020  
Last Amended: 3/5/2020  
Status: 5/12/2020-Referral to Coms. on EQ., and GOV. & F., rescinded due to the shortened 2020 Legislative Calendar.  
Location: 5/12/2020-S. E.Q.  

**Summary:**  
The Planning and Zoning Law requires each county and city to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for its physical development, and the development of certain lands outside its boundaries, that includes, among other mandatory elements, a housing element. That law allows a development proponent to submit an application for a development that is subject to a specified streamlined, ministerial approval process not subject to a conditional use permit if the development satisfies certain objective planning standards. This bill would require that a housing development project be a use by right upon the request of a nonprofit hospital, nonprofit diagnostic or treatment center, nonprofit rehabilitation facility, nonprofit nursing home, or religious institution that partners with a qualified developer on any land owned in fee simple by the applicant if the development satisfies specified criteria. The bill would define various terms for these purposes.  

**History:**  
2020  
Jan. 30 Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.  
Jan. 31 From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 1.  
Feb. 12 Referred to Com. on RLS.  
Mar. 5 From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on RLS.  
Mar. 16 Re-referred to Coms. on HOUSING, EQ., and GOV. & F.  
May. 12 Referral to Coms. on EQ., and GOV. & F., rescinded due to the shortened 2020 Legislative Calendar.  

**Organization:** SCAG  
**Position:** Tracking  

**SB 902**  
**Wiener D**  
Planning and zoning: neighborhood multifamily project: use by right: density.  
Introduced: 1/30/2020  
Last Amended: 3/9/2020  
Status: 3/18/2020-March 31 hearing postponed by committee.  
Location: 2/12/2020-S. HOUSING  

**Summary:**  
Current law, until January 1, 2026, authorizes a development proponent to submit an application for a multifamily housing development that satisfies specified planning objective standards to be subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process, as provided, and not subject to a conditional use permit. This bill would provide that a neighborhood multifamily project is a use by right in zones where residential uses are permitted if the project is not located in a very high fire severity zone, does not demolish sound rental housing or housing that has been placed on a national or state historic register, follows specified local objective criteria, and meets specified density requirements.  

**History:**  
2020  
Jan. 30 Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.  
Jan. 31 From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 1.  
Feb. 12 Referred to Com. on HOUSING.  
Mar. 9 From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on HOUSING.  
Mar. 12 Set for hearing March 31.  
Mar. 18 March 31 hearing postponed by committee.  

**Organization:** SCAG  
**Position:** Tracking  

**SB 992**  
**Beall D**  
Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017: reporting website.  
Introduced: 2/12/2020  
Status: 2/20/2020-Referred to Com. on TRANS.
SB 1291  (Committee on Transportation)  Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program: submissions

Introduced: 2/21/2020
Last Amended: 4/3/2020
Status: 5/11/2020-Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.
Location: 5/11/2020-S. TRANS.

Calendar:
5/29/2020  9 a.m. - Senate Chambers  SENATE TRANSPORTATION, BEALL, Chair

Summary:
Current law requires each metropolitan planning organization and transportation planning agency, not later than October 1 of each even-numbered year, to submit its Federal Transportation Improvement Program to the Department of Transportation for incorporation into the Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, which current law requires the department to submit to the United States Secretary of Transportation by not later than December 1 of each even-numbered year. This bill would provide that a metropolitan planning organization or transportation planning agency is not required to submit a Federal Transportation Improvement Program to the department, and the department is not required to submit the Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program to the secretary, for 2020.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.
Feb. 24 From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 25. Read first time.
Mar. 5 Referred to Com. on RLS.
Mar. 26 From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on RLS.
Apr. 3 From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on RLS.
May. 11 Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.
Attachments:
   Support Letter

Organization:  SCAG
Position:  Support

SB 1299  (Portantino D)  Housing development: incentives: rezoning of idle retail sites.

Introduced: 2/21/2020
Last Amended: 4/1/2020
Status: 5/11/2020-Re-referred to Com. on HOUSING.
Location: 5/11/2020-S. HOUSING

Summary:
Current law establishes, among other housing programs, the Workforce Housing Reward Program, which requires the Department of Housing and Community Development to make local assistance...
grants to cities, counties, and cities and counties that provide land use approval to housing developments that are affordable to very low and low-income households. This bill, upon appropriation by the Legislature, would require the department to administer a program to provide incentives in the form of grants allocated as provided to local governments that rezone idle sites used for a big box retailer or a commercial shopping center to instead allow the development of workforce housing. The bill would define various terms for these purposes. In order to be eligible for a grant, the bill would require a local government, among other things, to apply to the department for an allocation of grant funds and provide documentation that it has met specified requirements.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.
Feb. 24 From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 25. Read first time.
Mar. 5 Referred to Com. on RLS.
Apr. 1 From committee with author’s amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on RLS.
May. 11 Re-referred to Com. on HOUSING.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

SB 1363  (Allen D) Regional transportation plans: sustainable communities strategies: greenhouse gas emission and vehicle miles traveled reduction targets.
Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 5/12/2020-Referral to Coms. on TRANS., and HOUSING, rescinded due to the shortened 2020 Legislative Calendar.
Location: 5/12/2020-S. TRANS.

Summary:
Would also require the State Air Resources Board to provide, no later than December 31, 2022, each affected region with greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for the automobile and light truck sector for 2045 and 2050, and with vehicle miles traveled reduction targets for 2035, 2045, and 2050, and to release, no later than September 30, 2022, a draft of those targets, as specified.

History:
2020
Feb. 21 Introduced. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.
Feb. 24 From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 25. Read first time.
Mar. 12 Referred to Coms. on EQ., TRANS., and HOUSING.
Mar. 13 Set for hearing April 1.
Mar. 18 April 1 hearing postponed by committee.
May. 12 Referral to Coms. on TRANS., and HOUSING, rescinded due to the shortened 2020 Legislative Calendar.

Organization: SCAG
Position: Tracking

SB 1389  (Allen D) Public investment authorities.
Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 5/12/2020-Referral to Com. on ED. rescinded due to the shortened 2020 Legislative Calendar.
Location: 5/12/2020-S. ED.

Summary:
Current law authorizes the legislative body of a city or a county to designate a proposed enhanced infrastructure financing district, with a governing body referred to as the public financing authority, by adopting a resolution of intention to establish the proposed district and requires the public financing authority to direct the preparation of and adopt an infrastructure financing plan and adopt a resolution to form the district, as provided. Current law provides for the participation of an affected taxing entity, as defined, in the district, but prohibits the participation of a county office of education, school district, or community college district in the district. This bill would recast these provisions to instead authorize the legislative body of a city or county, or of 2 of more cities acting jointly, to propose the formation of a public investment authority under these provisions and the adoption of a community investment and financing plan.

History:
SB 1390  (Portantino D)  Montclair to Ontario Airport Construction Authority.

Introduced: 2/21/2020
Status: 3/12/2020-Referred to Com. on TRANS.
Location: 3/12/2020-S. TRANS.

Summary:
Would create the Montclair to Ontario Airport Construction Authority for purposes of awarding and overseeing all design and construction contracts for completion of an extension of the Metro Gold Line light rail project from the City of Montclair to the Ontario International Airport. The bill would prescribe the powers and duties of the construction authority.

History:
2020
Feb. 21Introduced. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.
Feb. 24 From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 25. Read first time.
Mar. 12 Referred to Com. on GOV. & F. and ED.
May. 12 Referral to Com. on ED. rescinded due to the shortened 2020 Legislative Calendar.

Organization:  SCAG
Position:  Tracking

Total Measures: 44
Total Tracking Forms: 44
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Support

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Since the onset of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, there have been four federal stimulus bills passed through Congress that have become law to provide emergency assistance to impacted communities. However, Congress has not included direct fiscal relief for counties and cities below a 500,000 population threshold. Local governments continue to be on the front lines responding to the pandemic while at the same time leading the economic recovery. Negotiations continue between congressional leaders and the White House over details of a fifth COVID-19 aid package. This report outlines several policy proposals under consideration that would assist state and local governments. Staff recommends that the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) forward a “support” position recommendation to the Regional Council on policy proposals one, two, four, and five.

BACKGROUND:
The COVID-19 pandemic has had deep impacts to public health and local economies prompted by an abrupt shutdown of workplaces across the country to reduce exposure to the virus. This has caused unemployment, which as recently as February 2020 had been at 3.5 percent, to skyrocket to 14.7 percent in April 2020. This is the highest level since the Great Depression. In just eight weeks, nearly 36.5 million people filed new jobless claims.

A recent survey of approximately 2,400 cities and towns released by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities showed that, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, 88 percent of cities expect a revenue shortfall this year. It also revealed that without federal support, 55 percent
of cities with populations of 50,000 to 500,000 will be forced to furlough employees. Furthermore, the survey found that 52 percent of all cities expect police and public safety services to be impacted since they account for a large portion of local budgets.

In March 2020, Congress approved three emergency funding packages (H.R. 6074; H.R. 6201; and H.R. 748) directing aid to businesses, hospitals, workers and local governments with populations over 500,000. On April 23, 2020, President Donald Trump signed a fourth relief package (H.R. 266) for small businesses, hospitals and to expand testing. To date, Congress has not passed direct emergency fiscal assistance for cities with populations lower than 500,000. Local governments continue to be on the front lines responding to the pandemic while at the same time leading the economic recovery. At the moment, negotiations continue between congressional leaders and the White House over details of a fifth COVID-19 aid package. Below is a list of policy proposals under consideration that would assist state and local governments.

Federal Policy Proposals

Policy Idea 1: The Coronavirus Community Relief Act (H.R. 6467)

Representative Joe Neguse (D-CO) introduced H.R. 6467 to provide $250 billion in funding to local governments with fewer than 500,000 residents. This bill is supported by the National League of Cities and has bipartisan support from 149 Members of Congress, including the following Members from the SCAG region:

- Rep. Salud Carbajal
- Rep. Gilbert Cisneros
- Rep. Grace Napolitano
- Rep. Ted Lieu
- Rep. Katie Porter
- Rep. Alan Lowenthal
- Rep. Mike Levin
- Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard
- Rep. Tony Cardenas
- Rep. Adam Schiff

- Rep. Nanette Diaz Barragan
- Rep. Harley Rouda
- Rep. Judy Chu
- Rep. Julia Brownley
- Rep. Mark Takano
- Rep. Linda Sanchez
- Rep. Raul Ruiz
- Rep. Luis Correa
- Rep. Juan Vargas

Senator Martin Heinrich (D-NM) introduced companion legislation, S. 3623, in the Senate and is cosponsored by:

- Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA)
- Sen. Doug Jones (D-AL)
- Sen. Tom Udall (D-NM)

- Sen. Kamala Harris (D-CA)
- Sen. Patty Murray (D-WA)
- Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-MN)
Similarly, the U.S. Conference of Mayors called for $250 billion in direct financial assistance for cities to cover a wide range of critical activities relating to the coronavirus response. Although the U.S. Conference of Mayors does not have a specific support position on H.R. 6467, they have a similar funding request indicating possible collaboration to move this legislation forward.

H.R. 6467 contains no other provisions aside from the creation of the Coronavirus Relief Fund for units of government with a population of 500,000 or less. The legislation defines a unit of local government as a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level.


On May 12, 2020, House Democrats introduced the HEROES Act, which would provide $3 trillion in emergency funding to help with the coronavirus response effort. The bill includes $915 billion in revenue-replacing funds for states and local governments. The National Association of Counties (NACo) and the National League of Cities have expressed support for this legislation. This is also in line with a request that Governor Gavin Newsom made on April 8, 2020 for $1 trillion in direct and flexible relief to state and local governments. A similar request was made on May 11, 2020 by the Legislative and Executive branches of the Western State Pact, which cover California, Colorado, Oregon, Nevada, and Washington.

Specifically, the HEROES Act would allocate the following to aid with the fiscal impacts from the public health emergency caused by COVID-19:

- $500 billion in funding to assist state governments;
- $375 billion in funding to assist local governments. This total would be split in two separate, equal funds of $187.5 billion for counties and cities;
- $20 billion in funding to assist Tribal governments; and
- $20 billion in funding to assist governments of the Territories.

City and county governments would receive $250 billion within 30 days of the legislation being signed into law. Of that, $125 billion would go to counties based on population, $87.5 billion would target municipalities with populations of at least 50,000, and $37.5 billion would go to
municipalities with populations of less than 50,000. One year after the package is enacted, local governments would receive another $125 billion. In addition to the assistance for state, local, and tribal governments, among the HEROES Act’s 1,800 pages are numerous provisions outside the scope of SCAG’s traditional area of expertise and responsibility.

The House is expected to vote on the HEROES Act on Friday, May 15, 2020. This action sets forth the House’s priorities for negotiating the fifth COVID-19 aid package with the Senate and White House.

**Policy Idea 3: State and Municipal Aid for Recovery and Transition (SMART) Fund**

Senators Bill Cassidy (R-LA) and Bob Menendez (D-NJ) released bill language proposing a $500 billion SMART fund for state and local governments to use in response to the coronavirus pandemic. The fund would build on the $150 billion fund already allocated in the previous CARES Act. Funding eligibility would be expanded to include counties and cities with populations of 50,000 or greater with the aim of replacing lost revenue due to COVID-19.

Funding would be distributed in three equal pots based on population size, infection rates, and state revenue losses. No state would receive less than $2.5 billion. The National League of Cities points out that the bill would exclude cities under the 50,000 population threshold, including 98 cities in the SCAG region. Also, funds would be allocated based on COVID-19 infection rates, but there is no uniform way of reporting or tracking at the national level.

**Policy Idea 4: COVID-19 Cost-Share Adjustment Relief Act of 2020**

This proposal would require the Federal government to pay 100 percent of the costs of COVID-19-related Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) assistance under emergency and major disaster declarations. The intent is to take the financial burden off state, local, tribal, and territorial governments. Typically, local governments pick up 25 percent of the costs, but this will be difficult because of expected budget shortfalls since tax revenues will be down.

The bill was introduced by:

- Chair of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Peter DeFazio (D-OR)
- Chair of the House Committee on Appropriations Nita Lowey (D-NY)
- Chair of the House Committee on Homeland Security Bennie G. Thompson (D-MS)
- Chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Economic Development, Emergency Management, and Public Buildings Dina Titus (D-NV)
- Chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security Lucille
Roybal-Allard (D-CA)

- Chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications

Donald Payne, Jr. (D-NJ)

This follows a letter from 27 Democrat and Independent Senators to President Trump asking that he direct FEMA to waive all cost-share requirements for states responding to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Policy Idea 5: Supporting State and Local Leaders Act (H.R.6643)

Representative Brad Schneider (D-IL) introduced H.R. 6643 to repeal the prohibition against granting federal, state, and local governments a tax credit for paid sick and paid family and medical leave. The bill would make public-sector employers eligible for the payroll tax credits that were enacted as part of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act, which was signed into law in March 2020. This bill is supported by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA), the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National League of Cities, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors and has bipartisan support from 108 Members of Congress, including the following Members from the SCAG region:

- Rep. Harley Rouda
- Rep. Grace Napolitano
- Rep. Salud Carbajal
- Rep. Ted Lieu
- Rep. Alan Lowenthal
- Rep. Linda Sanchez
- Rep. Julia Brownley
- Rep. Judy Chu
- Rep. Juan Vargas

Senator Tina Smith (D-MN) introduced companion legislation in the Senate and is cosponsored by:

- Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA)
- Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-MN)
- Sen. Chris Van Hollen (D-MD)
- Sen. Dick Durbin (D-IL)
- Sen. Michael Bennet (D-CO)
- Sen. Tim Kaine (D-VA)

Policy Idea 6: County and City Federal Funds / Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Representative Lowey (D-NY) outlined a proposal with two separate pots of funding for counties and cities. The county fund would be awarded directly to counties on the basis of population, with all counties receiving an award. The city fund would be awarded to cities using a modified CDBG formula. 70 percent would be awarded directly to cities with a population of 50,000 or more using the CDBG formula. The remaining 30 percent would be awarded to municipalities with populations less than 50,000 on the basis of population so that all municipalities benefit. Additionally, there is Congressional support to increase the CDBG program as a stand-alone proposal because it serves
localities with a lower population threshold of at least 50,000. CDBG directly funds states and communities for job training and food assistance programs like Meals on Wheels.

**Policy Idea 7: $500 Billion Fund Proposed by Stakeholders**

Given the fiscal needs of states around the country, the National Governors Association (NGA) is pushing for state fiscal relief. NGA Co-chairs Larry Hogan, Governor of Maryland, and Andrew Cuomo, Governor of New York, have called for $500 billion in direct federal aid for states to replace lost revenue, as well as an increase in the federal matching rate for covering state Medicaid costs.

Separately, on May 5, 2020, the National League of Cities launched the Cities Are Essential campaign to request $500 billion in direct federal aid for local governments, regardless of size, over the next two years. Their research estimates that up to one million municipal employees could face layoffs or furloughs due to plummeting revenues.

**Policy Idea 8: Nixon-Era State and Local Aid Program Proposal**

In a call with mayors, House Ways and Means Chairman Richard Neal (D-MA) discussed resurrecting a federal revenue-sharing program for cities and states that was popular in the 1970s and 1980s. The initiative would be part of a Democratic push to help states and local governments that are losing revenues. A program known as general revenue sharing, which offered largely unconditional grants to states and local governments, began under the Nixon administration in 1972 and was extended several times as its popularity grew. By the time it expired in 1986, the program had transferred about $83 billion from the federal government to state and local governments, according to the Congressional Research Service (CRS). The CRS calculated that this level of assistance would equate to about $313 billion over 15 years in 2008 dollars, which was the last time this program was considered.

**Staff Recommendation**

Of the eight policy ideas, staff recommends support for policy ideas one, two, four, and five consistent with Regional Council-adopted policy and legislative priorities that support increased funding for critical federal programs that local governments depend on to expand economic opportunity for residents in Southern California. Additionally, the Regional Council supports regional equity considerations for any funding source to ensure Southern California receives its fair share of funding based upon population, burden, and other quantifiable measures. Although Governor Newsom formally declared a State of Emergency in response to the rapid spread of COVID-19 at the beginning of March 2020, cases continue to rise, mostly in Southern California. Local governments in the SCAG region require additional federal resources in proportion to population size, infection rates, and tax revenues losses.
The Coronavirus Relief Fund authorized in the CARES Act was an important first step in providing $150 billion in emergency fiscal assistance for state and local governments, but limited it to communities with populations over 500,000 residents. In the SCAG region, five of the six counties were eligible, but only one city, the City of Los Angeles, met the population threshold.

Policy idea one, the Coronavirus Community Relief Act (H.R. 6467), would provide $250 billion in funding to local governments with fewer than 500,000 residents, removing the arbitrary population threshold. In the SCAG region, 190 cities and one county would be eligible to receive these flexible funds. This bill also offers significant funding to assist local governments respond to the COVID pandemic. Therefore, staff recommends support for policy idea one.

Policy idea two, the HEROES Act, provides $187.5 billion for cities and $187.5 billion for counties, distributed as outlined above. Although the HEROES Act contains several provisions outside of SCAG’s area of expertise, at the center of this legislation is almost $1 trillion in direct and flexible aid to state and local governments of all sizes to be used for the COVID-19 response or to backfill lost tax revenue. Additionally, local governments would receive $250 billion within the first month of the bill being enacted into law and another $125 billion one year after, recognizing that cities will need assistance with a second budget cycle. Prompted by an in-depth discussion at April’s LCMC meeting, on May 14, 2020, President Bill Jahn, Chair Jan Harnik, Rancho Cucamonga Mayor L. Dennis Michael, and Executive Director Kome Ajise virtually met with Congressman Pete Aguilar (D-31), who is Vice Chair of the House Appropriations Committee and an influential member of the Southern California congressional delegation. Congressman Aguilar acknowledged that the bill is not perfect, however, it does provide a substantial amount of flexible aid to local governments. Therefore, staff recommends support for policy idea two.

Policy idea three extends the SMART Fund to local governments with populations of 50,000 or greater. The next interim emergency coronavirus package must include dedicated funding for cities, counties, tribes, and other local governments that serve all communities in the SCAG region. Policy idea three would exclude nearly half the cities in the SCAG region, therefore staff does not recommend support for this proposal.

For the first time in our nation’s history, every state in the union has been issued a major disaster declaration, accompanied by a national emergency declaration signed by President Trump on March 13, 2020. These issuances give FEMA the ability to assist and empower states responding to the pandemic. Policy idea four, the COVID-19 Cost-Share Adjustment Relief Act, would increase FEMA’s cost-share to the full 100 percent. State and local governments across the country are currently assuming overwhelming costs for the COVID-19 response, while coping with massive reductions in revenue due to economic slowdown. The intent of this legislation is to take the financial burden off state, local, tribal, and territorial governments through additional support from the federal government. Therefore, staff recommends support for this proposal.
The Families First Coronavirus Response Act required many public and private employers to provide paid leave for workers affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. That law provides tax credits to private-sector employers to cover the costs of paid leave, but the package did not extend those tax credits to public-sector employers. This is putting a financial strain on state and local governments at a time when many are grappling with additional costs brought on by the pandemic.

Policy idea five, Supporting State and Local Leaders Act (H.R. 6643), would make state, local, and tribal governments eligible for paid leave payroll tax credits in the same manner that private sector employers are. This bill would be very helpful for local governments and all public agencies, like SCAG, that currently shoulder the full cost of leave benefits required by the Families First Coronavirus Response Act. H.R. 6643 would help to ease the liquidity crunch many public agencies are facing and would serve as a bridge during the crisis so they can meet other, more critical obligations now. Therefore, staff recommends a support position for policy idea five.

Policy ideas six, seven, and eight, while helpful in their own right, either do not include the relief for the 98 cities in the SCAG region with populations under 50,000 or they have not been introduced by any Member of Congress. Therefore, staff does not recommend support for these proposals at this time.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Work associated with the staff report on COVID-19 Request Update and Legislation is contained in the Indirect Cost budget, Legislation 810-0120.10.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. SCAG Letter to Congress - Coronavirus Relief
2. SCAG Region City Population Table
April 27, 2020

The Hon. Mitch McConnell  The Hon. Nancy Pelosi
Senate Majority Leader Speaker of the House
Washington, DC 20510 Washington, DC 20515

The Hon. Charles E. Schumer  The Hon. Kevin McCarthy
Senate Minority Leader House Minority Leader
S-221, The Capitol H-204, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20510 Washington, DC 20515

Subject: Coronavirus Relief for all cities and counties regardless of population size

Dear Majority Leader McConnell, Speaker Pelosi, Minority Leader Schumer, and Minority Leader McCarthy:

On behalf of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the nation’s largest federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and in full support of all the 191 cities and six counties in the Southern California region, I am writing today to strongly urge the United States Congress to provide direct emergency funding for local cities and counties in any future relief legislation related to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID–19).

As you know, the CARES Act established the $150 billion Coronavirus Relief Fund to provide direct federal financial assistance to all fifty states and some units of local government to cover the necessary expenditures incurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This funding is essential and I thank you for your leadership in this regard.

While all states receive a minimum level of funding from the Coronavirus Relief Fund, the legislation establishes an arbitrary cap for units of local government, providing assistance only to those jurisdictions with a population of 500,000 or greater. In the SCAG region, five of our six counties are eligible for assistance under the Coronavirus Relief Fund. Of the 191 cities in the SCAG region, however, only one city is eligible, meaning that 78.9% of the population of the nation’s largest MPO region does not live in a city which is eligible for funding assistance. The current distribution favors relief to large, urban regions which are dominated by a single large city rather than to those such as Southern
California which are composed mostly of small and medium-sized cities which work together as an integrated economy.

All local government agencies are on the front lines of fighting the COVID-19 pandemic. The extraordinary measures that cities and counties are taking to protect residents from ill health and fiscal decline are unbudgeted and incredibly costly. Utility disconnect prohibitions, eviction moratoriums, stop work orders, and fine and fee waiving are among the necessary and appropriate actions being taken locally. At the same time, lost revenue from these actions cannot be recouped through local sources given the substantial decline in sales taxes, hotel bed taxes, parking fees, and others. Without emergency funding, Southern California’s cities will be required to suspend or drastically curtail essential services, the consequences of which would be dire.

For this reason, SCAG offers the following proposals for consideration in any future COVID-19 relief legislation.

(1) Create a separate, dedicated fund of $250 billion for units of local government (cities and counties) with a population of less than 500,000 people to receive funds directly from the Treasury Department instead of applying to the State as a sub-grantee. This will ensure needed funds will get to smaller local governments more quickly.

The California Department of Finance’s 2019 population estimate for the SCAG region is 19,155,405 and the estimated population for the City of Los Angeles, the only city in the SCAG region eligible for assistance under the Coronavirus Relief Fund, is 4,040,079. Some 15,115,326 people in the SCAG region live in unincorporated areas (2,017,250 persons) or in city or county with a population less than 500,000 (13,098,076 persons), representing 78.9% of the SCAG region’s total population.

(2) Create a separate, dedicated fund for units of local government with a population of less than 50,000 people to receive funds directly from the Treasury Department instead of applying to the State as a sub-grantee. This will ensure needed funds will get to smaller local governments more quickly.

Some 2,429,547 people in the SCAG region live in jurisdictions with a population less than 50,000, representing 12.6% of the SCAG region’s total population.

(3) To the extent that the Department of the Treasury would be overwhelmed by the large number of cities and counties across the United States that would eligible for the funding requested above, SCAG proposes to allow federally designated MPOs to request direct funding from the CARES Act, or future Coronavirus Relief legislation, on behalf of their cities and counties.

SCAG and numerous other federally designated MPOs have experience administering federal grants and the capacity to accept and then sub-allocate resources to our member
jurisdictions. While direct allocations to the service deliverer would be preferable, we recognize the opportunity to use nation’s more than 400 MPOs to create an efficiency in this area.

Please consider all cities as you continue to negotiate additional relief measures relating to the COVID-19 pandemic. Again, thank you for your leadership during this unprecedented public health crisis. I appreciate your consideration of the ideas outlined above. If you have any questions or require additional information on them, I remain available at (213) 236-1835.

Sincerely,

Bill Jahn
President
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwindale</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Hills</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>2,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needles</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>5,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bear Lake</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>5,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Wells</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>5,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Habra Heights</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>5,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Park</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>5,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtville</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>6,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojai</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>7,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calipatria</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>7,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>8,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlake Village</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>8,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calimesa</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>8,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Lake</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>10,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>11,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>11,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>11,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Terrace</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>12,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malibu</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>12,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>13,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>13,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palos Verdes Estates</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>13,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>14,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>15,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Palma</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>15,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Woods</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>16,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>16,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesia</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>16,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>18,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Mirage</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>18,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>18,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>19,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>19,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>20,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada Flintridge</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>20,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South El Monte</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>20,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agoura Hills</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>21,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuca Valley</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>21,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>22,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hueneme</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>22,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Beach</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>23,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>24,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>24,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>24,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>24,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Linda</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>24,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Beach</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>24,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>25,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norco</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>26,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twentynine Palms</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>26,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brawley</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>26,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>28,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>29,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>30,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Paula</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>30,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banning</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>31,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Hills</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>31,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>33,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawndale</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>33,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Point</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>33,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>34,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelanto</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>34,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>34,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>35,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildomar</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>35,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>35,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>36,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>36,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>36,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>36,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorpark</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>36,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>38,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>39,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>39,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>40,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>40,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Quinta</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>40,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calexico</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>40,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>41,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>42,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>42,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>44,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachella</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>45,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>45,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>46,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>47,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>47,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santa Margarita</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>48,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>49,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>49,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>49,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>49,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>50,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliso Viejo</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>50,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>50,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>52,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>52,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colton</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>53,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucaipa</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>54,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>54,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral City</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>54,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>54,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>55,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Valley</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>56,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>57,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>57,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Park</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>59,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>60,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>61,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>62,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Elsinore</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>62,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>63,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>64,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastvale</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>64,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Clemente</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>65,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Niguel</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>66,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>67,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>68,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camarillo</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>69,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>69,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>71,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Valley</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>74,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>75,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perris</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>75,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellflower</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>76,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>76,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>79,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino Hills</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>80,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemet</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>81,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>82,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>83,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>84,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>84,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>86,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>87,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>87,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>88,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indio</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>88,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menifee</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>90,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>93,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>93,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>93,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperia</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>94,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Viejo</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>96,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>98,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>100,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>101,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>105,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>105,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rialto</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>106,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>107,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Buenaventura</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>109,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temecula</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>111,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>113,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Mesa</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>114,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>114,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>114,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrieta</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>114,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorville</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>123,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>127,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Oaks</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>131,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>140,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>142,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>143,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>147,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>155,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>157,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>158,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>167,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>174,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Grove</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>176,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cucamonga</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>177,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>197,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>201,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno Valley</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>206,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>207,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>212,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>216,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>216,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>267,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>326,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>341,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>358,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>480,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>4,041,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>