



**STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2026**  
**10:00am - 11:30am**  
**City Hall, Room 288**

**OVERVIEW**

*This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above. Members of the public may view the meeting by reviewing the details below, with the video link, phone number, and other related information provided:*

- **Meeting ID:** 2660 170 7310
- **Meeting Password:** prWFbRFi757
- **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001 United States Toll (San Francisco) (Please dial “#” after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)
- **Link:**  
<https://sfpUBLIC.webex.com/sfpUBLIC/j.php?MTID=m53ac300848cbb8d9702b021cb30ba697>
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 7.

**MEMBERS**

Mayor’s Office (Chair) – Eileen Mariano  
Supervisor Connie Chan’s Office – Frances Hsieh  
Board President Rafael Mandelman’s Office – Renil Bejoy  
Assessor’s Office – Holly Lung  
City Attorney’s Office – Luis Zamora  
Controller’s Office – Greyson Spencer  
Treasurer’s Office – Eric Manke

**AGENDA**

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).** Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2026.
- III. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item).** The City’s state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

- IV. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action).** Discussion and possible action item: the Committee will review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

### **New Business**

#### **Planning Department**

Presenter: Lisa Gluckstein

SB 1258 (Wiener): Streamlined housing approvals: hazardous waste sites

***Recommended Position: Support***

SB 1258 would allow proposed residential projects on Cortese List [hazardous waste] sites to proceed with streamlined SB 423 approval, subject to clearance from an environmental regulator or active local oversight over mitigation activities throughout the permitting and construction process.

#### **PermitSF**

Presenter: Lisa Gluckstein

AB 1738 (Carrillo): Remote Virtual Inspections

***Recommended Position: Support if amended***

AB 1738 requires jurisdictions to implement a remote virtual building inspection program for specified scopes of work on residential projects by July 1, 2027. PermitSF is seeking a support if amended position and requesting that the timeline for implementation be extended.

#### **SFHSA**

Presenter: Susie Smith

AB 1660 (Schiavo): Public guardians and public administrators

***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 1660 (Schiavo) is designed to close an enforcement gap in existing California Probate law. While Public Administrators (PA), Public Guardians (PG), and Public Conservators (PC) already have legal authority to access the assets and information of their clients, many financial institutions routinely ignore or delay these requests. This bill requires a court to impose sanctions of no less than \$1,000 per violation on financial institutions and third parties—including insurance companies, retirement funds, and securities dealers—that fail to comply with existing legal requirements to provide information or surrender property.

#### **Department of Public Health**

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 1676 (Stefani): Mental health services: assisted outpatient treatment: involuntary

medication

***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 1676 strengthens California's Assisted Outpatient Treatment (AOT) program by allowing counties to seek Involuntary Medication Orders (IMOs) – court orders for the administration of psychotropic medications – as a component of AOT.

### **Department of Public Health**

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 2160 (Rodriguez): Medi-Cal: lactation services

***Recommended Position: Support***

In order to improve access to lactation services for Medi-Cal enrollees, AB 2160 requires the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to, by July 1, 2027, issue updated Medi-Cal guidance that clarifies Medi-Cal coverage for lactation services, including guidance on coverage of health education related to lactation, basic lactation support, and lactation consultation.

### **Department of Public Health**

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 2302 (Rodriguez): Food Safety: Infant Formula – Toxic Elements Testing and Disclosure

***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2302 (Rodriguez) aims to protect California babies from heavy metals in infant formula and would require formula manufacturers to test for toxic elements (aluminum, arsenic, cadmium, lead, and mercury) and make results available on their internet website.

### **Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development**

Presenter: Kyra Geithman

AB 2020 (Gabriel): Housing programs: financing

***Recommended Position: Support***

This bill would authorize the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to take prescribed action, including authorizing the transfer of excess reserves or excess operating income, as defined, from one state-funded rental housing development to another rental housing development with the same owner to stabilize at-risk projects.

### **Public Utilities Commission**

Presenter: Scott Ammon

AB 2180 (Ward): Local government: Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act: proportional cost of service

***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2180 would clarify what proportionality means in the context of water and sewer rates and would provide agencies with clearer, more predictable rules for developing and adopting rate structures. This bill allows local agencies and governments to use reasonable, proportional cost methods, including uniform or tiered rates based on customer class, rather than through some more demanding, more costly, and potentially infeasible proof standard, such as requiring exact parcel-by-parcel calculations.

## **Police Department**

Presenter: Steven Lopez

AB 1941 (Gonzalez): Organized Metal Theft

***Recommended Position: Support***

This bill would create a new crime in the penal code of organized metal theft, defined in the bill as "acting in concert with one or more persons to steal metal materials and items with the intent to sell, exchange, or return those metal materials for value, acting in concert with two or more persons to receive, purchase, or possess those metal materials knowing or believing it to have been stolen, acting as an agent of another to steal those metal materials as part of an organized plan to commit theft, or recruiting, coordinating, organizing, supervising, directing, managing, or financing another to undertake acts of theft of metal." The offense would be punishable as a misdemeanor with repeat offenses or theft exceeding \$950 in value punishable as a misdemeanor or felony.

## **Port of San Francisco**

Presenter: Devyani Jain

AB 2051 (Wicks): Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group

***Recommended Position: Support***

California faces accelerating sea level rise—projected at 1.6 to 3.1 feet by 2100 under likely scenarios, with extreme cases over 6.6 feet—which threatens communities, infrastructure, and ecosystems along the coast and in the San Francisco Bay. AB 2051: Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group addresses the need for coordinated and accelerated adaptation to sea level rise statewide. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) have estimated that more than \$110 billion will be needed by 2050 to protect Bay Area communities and infrastructure. AB 2051 builds on requirements in SB 272 (Laird, 2024) for local governments to prepare plans by 2034, based on the best available science, provide equity for vulnerable communities, and include adaptation strategies and infrastructure impact analyses, in order to remain eligible for state resilience funding.

## **Department on the Status of Women**

Presenter: Denise Heitzenroder

AB 1876 (Addis): Health Care Coverage: Nondiscrimination/Fair Care for All Act  
**Recommended Position: Support**

The proposed legislation would codify basic protections against discrimination by state-regulated health plans and insurers based on race, color, national origin, age, disability, or sex and clarifies that “sex” discrimination includes sex characteristics, pregnancy, sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex stereotypes. This bill was introduced on February 12, 2026, and was passed out of the Standing Committee on Health and re-referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### **Department on the Status of Women**

Presenter: Denise Heitzenroder

AB 1973 (Aguiar-Curry): Abortion: authorized procedures  
**Recommended Position: Support**

The bill would update existing licensing regulations under the Business and Professions Code to permit individuals with a valid and current license under Medical Practice Act, the Osteopathic Act, the Nursing Practice Act, or the Physician Assistant Practice Act to administer medication or aspiration abortions beyond the first trimester. The bill was introduced February 13, 2026 and amended March 19, 2026 and re-referred to Committee on Business and Professions.

### **Department of Environment**

Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

AB 2226 (Rubio): Reusable grocery bags  
**Recommended Position: Oppose**

In 2022, the California Legislature passed SB 1046 (Eggman), which limited stores to providing consumers with reusable, recyclable, or compostable produce bags. The law was modeled on San Francisco’s Recyclable or Compostable Pre-Checkout Bags policy last amended August 2019. AB 2226 would repeal SB 1046.

**V. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT.** Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee’s subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

## **Disability Access**

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Nathaniel Edwards, Mayor's Office, at: [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

## **Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance**

The government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at [softf@sfgov.org](mailto:softf@sfgov.org). Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at [www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm](http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm).

## **Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements**

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100 –2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: [www.sfgov.org/ethics](http://www.sfgov.org/ethics).

## **Cell Phones and Pagers**

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order

the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

### **Public Comment**

Public Comment will be taken in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

- To view the meeting via computer systems:  
<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m0ac2b903b5068e368f7095f536446c75>  
**NOTE:** Depending on your broadband/WIFI connection, there may be a 30-second to 2-minute delay when viewing the meeting live.
- To view the meeting via phone:
  - **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001
  - **Webinar ID:** 2662 272 8681
  - **NOTE:** Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press # to enter the meeting.

### **Information Regarding Providing Public Comment**

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.

Each individual may speak for up to 2 minutes; after which time the line is automatically silenced.

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: [eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org).

### **Health Considerations**

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.



**STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2026**  
**10:00am - 11:30am**  
**City Hall, Room 288**

**OVERVIEW**

*This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above. Members of the public may view the meeting by reviewing the details below, with the video link, phone number, and other related information provided:*

- **Meeting ID:** 2663 030 6464
- **Meeting Password:** iBr33mEMce3
- **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001 United States Toll (San Francisco) (Please dial “#” after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)
- **Link:**  
<https://sfpUBLIC.webex.com/sfpUBLIC/j.php?MTID=m57569ed5a57d5beb80b71a310aaebe94>
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 4.

**MEMBERS**

Mayor’s Office (Chair) – Eileen Mariano  
Supervisor Connie Chan’s Office – Frances Hsieh  
Board President Rafael Mandelman’s Office – Renil Bejoy  
Assessor’s Office – Holly Lung  
City Attorney’s Office – Luis Zamora  
Controller’s Office – Greyson Spencer  
Treasurer’s Office – Eric Manke

**AGENDA**

Meeting commenced at 10:02am.

**I. ROLL CALL**

Present: Eileen Mariano, Renil Bejoy, Holly Lung, Luis Zamora, Eric Manke  
Supervisor Chan’s Office and the Controller’s Office were not present.

**II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).** Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2026.

Motion to approve: Holly Lung  
Seconded by: Renil Bejoy  
Approved: 5-0

- III. **STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item).** The City's state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.
- IV. **PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action).** Discussion and possible action item: the Committee will review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

### **New Business**

#### **San Francisco Public Utilities Commission**

Presenter: Scott Ammon

SB 1138 (Padilla): Load-serving entities: resource adequacy requirements  
***Recommended Position: Support***

The bill would allow load serving entities (LSEs) to transact Resource Adequacy (RA) load obligations on an hourly basis. Specifically, the bill requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to allow LSEs to demonstrate compliance with State RA requirements by transacting with other LSEs to meet up to 25 percent of their compliance obligation.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy  
Seconded by: Holly Lung  
Approved: 5-0

#### **San Francisco Public Utilities Commission**

Presenter: Scott Ammon

AB 1761 (Rogers): Electricity: calculation methodology: data disclosure  
***Recommended Position: Support***

The bill would amend the Public Utilities Code to require the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the investor-owned utilities (IOUs) to disclose all data used to calculate Power Charge Indifference Adjustment (PCIA) costs. The bill would also ensure that when parties make proposals in a proceeding to change the PCIA, they provide all the underlying data informing that proposal.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy  
Seconded by: Luis Zamora  
Approved: 5-0

## **San Francisco Human Services Agency**

Presenter: Susie Smith

AB 1734 (Stefani): Count Hunger Act

***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 1734, also known as The Count Hunger Act, will create a two-year pilot program to restore funding to the food insecurity portion of the California Health Interview Survey and expand the food insecurity screener to include households of up to 400% of the federal poverty level (FPL). AB 1734 is a direct response to recent federal actions that eliminated critical hunger data nationwide and ensures policymakers and service providers are kept informed.

Motion to approve: Eric Manke

Seconded by: Renil Bejoy

Approved: 5-0

## **San Francisco Human Services Agency**

Presenter: Susie Smith

AB 1579 (Ramos): Children's Crisis Continuum Pilot Program

***Recommended Position: Support***

The Children's Crisis Continuum Pilot Program was created with the purpose of addressing the complex needs of foster youth in California. Assembly Bill 1579 would amend existing law to expand upon the allowable program types for residential crisis services within the Pilot, allowing more flexibility to meet the needs of foster youth across the state.

San Francisco was one of just 8 entities across the State to receive a State grant (\$8.5M) to participate in this pilot designed to create a highly integrated care system for foster youth under the care of child welfare or juvenile probation experiencing acute behavioral health crises.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Luis Zamora

Approved: 5-0

## **Homelessness and Supportive Housing**

Presenter: Hailey Gil

AB 2081 (Stefani) Medi-Cal: Home and Community-Based Alternatives Waiver

***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2081 (Stefani, 2026), among other provisions, would expand the availability of the Home and Community Based Alternatives (HCBA) waiver by a minimum of 10,000 slots annually. HSH and community partners leverage HCBA waivers to provide in-home care to residents of permanent supportive housing (PSH) with intensive medical needs.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy  
Seconded by: Eric Manke  
Approved: 5-0

**City Attorney's Office**

Presenter: Luis Zamora

SB 1099 (Reyes) State and Local Public Benefits  
***Recommended Position: Support***

SB 1099 clarifies California local government's authority to provide state or local public benefits to all residents under the statutory exemption provided in the federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA).

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy  
Seconded by: Holly Lung  
Approved: 5-0

**City Attorney's Office**

Presenter: Luis Zamora

AB 2001 (Stefani) Criminal Procedure: State Summary Criminal History Information  
***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2001 would strengthen public safety tools available to cities and counties by allowing access to important criminal history information. With this legislation, city attorney's and county counsels would be able to access state summary criminal history information when they are pursuing public nuisance and red-light abatement actions. This will enable them to build stronger, evidence-based nuisance abatement cases, and take faster, more informed action to protect the public.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy  
Seconded by: Holly Lung  
Approved: 5-0

**Environment Department**

Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

AB 2313 (Berman) Home Energy Choice Act  
***Recommended Position: Support***

The Home Energy Choice Act, would require the Public Utilities Commission to require each gas corporation to offer a Gas Distribution Service Line Replacement Alternatives Program, on or before January 1, 2028. Such programs would be required to provide any gas customers served by a gas distribution service line slated for replacement with a monetary incentive to replace any gas-dependent equipment and cease gas service to avoid the gas distribution service line replacement.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy  
Seconded by: Holly Lung  
Approved: 5-0

**Environment Department**  
Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

AB 762 (Irwin) Household Hazardous Waste: Vape pens  
***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 762 would prohibit the sale, distribution, or offer for sale of disposable, battery-embedded vapor inhalation devices containing nicotine by January 1, 2028. A disposable device is defined as a non-refillable, non-rechargeable vape with an integrated battery that is not intended to be removed and is not designed for reuse. The bill authorizes local jurisdictions to enforce this prohibition and issue civil penalties ranging from \$500 for a first violation to \$2,000 for subsequent violations. The bill's intent is to reduce the proliferation of single-use vapor products to minimize the environmental, health, and public safety impacts.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy  
Seconded by: Holly Lung  
Approved: 5-0

**Environment Department**  
Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

SB 881 (McNerney) Income taxation: credits: voluntary contributions: food bank donations  
***Recommended Position: Support***

SB 881 extends two programs that aim to reduce food waste, lower greenhouse gas emissions, support farmers, and strengthen California's food banks. The bill extends the Farm to Food Bank Tax Credit and the Emergency Food for Families Voluntary Tax Contribution Fund through tax years 2032 and 2037, respectively, ensuring the programs remain available during a time of growing food insecurity and reduced federal food assistance.

Motion to approve: Eric Manke  
Seconded by: Renil Bejoy  
Approved: 5-0

**Environment Department**  
Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

SB 1048 (Becker) State Seal of Climate Literacy  
***Recommended Position: Support***

SB 1048 will establish a California Seal of Climate Literacy, a voluntary high school

diploma distinction to recognize students who demonstrate climate literacy through coursework and hands-on, experiential learning in their communities. In attaining the Seal, students will gain college and career relevant skills and experiences to understand and act on the challenges of a changing climate.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy  
Seconded by: Holly Lung  
Approved: 5-0

## **Continued Business**

### **San Francisco Environment Department**

Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

SB 222 (Wiener): Residential heat pump systems: water heaters and HVAC installations

***Recommended Position: Support***

Note: This item was continued from the February 25, 2026 meeting to allow for further research into impacts of the proposed fee structure on the Department of Building Inspection.

SB222 requires specified streamlining of local permitting for residential heat pump systems. The bill would require a city, county, or city and county, on or before July 1, 2028, to implement an online, automated permitting process that issues permits in real time to a licensed contractor for the installation of a residential heat pump water heater or residential heat pump HVAC system that meets certain criteria. For example, if the installation of a residential heat pump water heater or heat pump HVAC system would require installation of a new electrical panel or structural work, the project would not qualify for streamlining under SB222.

The bill would also require a city, county, or city and county, beginning July 1, 2027, to adopt and offer “asynchronous inspections” for installations of residential heat pump water heater or heat pump HVAC systems. This means the contractor and inspector are not required to be on-site at the same time.

This bill also makes changes to existing law concerning the Davis-Stirling Common Interest Development Act. The proposed changes would make homeowners association covenants, deed restrictions, and similar agreements among property owners that limit heat pump installations void and unenforceable.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy  
Seconded by: Luis Zamora  
Approved: 5-0

- V. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT.** Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee’s subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 10:58am.

## **Disability Access**

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Nathaniel Edwards, Mayor's Office, at: [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

## **Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance**

The government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at [softf@sfgov.org](mailto:softf@sfgov.org). Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at [www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm](http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm).

## **Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements**

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100 –2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: [www.sfgov.org/ethics](http://www.sfgov.org/ethics).

## **Cell Phones and Pagers**

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order

the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

### **Public Comment**

Public Comment will be taken in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

- To view the meeting via computer systems:  
<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m0ac2b903b5068e368f7095f536446c75>  
**NOTE:** Depending on your broadband/WIFI connection, there may be a 30-second to 2-minute delay when viewing the meeting live.
- To view the meeting via phone:
  - **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001
  - **Webinar ID:** 2662 272 8681
  - **NOTE:** Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press # to enter the meeting.

### **Information Regarding Providing Public Comment**

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.

Each individual may speak for up to 2 minutes; after which time the line is automatically silenced.

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: [eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org).

### **Health Considerations**

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.



### State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), and Nathaniel Edwards at [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	April 2, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Planning Department
<b>Contact Name</b>	Lisa Gluckstein
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Lisa.gluckstein@sfgov.org">Lisa.gluckstein@sfgov.org</a> , 628-652-7475
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Lisa Gluckstein
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

#### SB 1258 (Wiener, Senate District 11)

#### SB 1258: Streamlined housing approvals: hazardous waste sites.

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

SB 1258 would allow proposed residential projects on Cortese List [hazardous waste] sites to proceed with streamlined SB 423 approval, subject to clearance from an environmental regulator or active local oversight over mitigation activities throughout the permitting and construction process.

The bill amends the conditions for Cortese List sites to qualify for ministerial permitting (SB 423) by:

1. **Shifting the timing of site suitability determination:** Projects on the Cortese List may proceed with SB 423 entitlement provided that they receive a closure letter or determination that the site is suitable for residential use prior to the issuance of the first postentitlement phase permit, as opposed to requiring these as prior to entitlement, as is currently the case. This change allows project sponsors more time to secure documentation from the regulating agency
2. **Allowing a qualified local health agency to oversee site mitigation during the permitting and development process, provided certain requirements are met:** A local public health agency that meets heightened standards for subject matter expertise under the state Health and Safety Code (meeting the standards of AB 304, 2021) may assume limited authority over site mitigation to authorize certain Cortese sites for residential development under SB 423, subject to the following procedural guardrails:
  - a. **As part of entitlement:** The local jurisdiction imposes of conditions of approval requiring the following actions.
  - b. **Prior to submittal of any building permit application:** The applicant must complete site evaluation, including Phase I and Phase II documentation, if appropriate.
  - c. **Prior to issuance of a permit for any soil-disturbing activities:** The regulating local agency must approve a site mitigation plan completed to reflect scope of work under the permit.
  - d. **Prior to issuance of a permit for any vertical construction or change of use:**
    - i. The regulating local agency must certify the completion mitigation and/or remediation required as part of prior scopes of work.
    - ii. The applicant must update the site mitigation plan to reflect scope of work under vertical permit.

- e. **Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy:** The local agency must certify as complete any mitigation and/or remediation required in association with the project and determine that the site is appropriate for the proposed development project.

---

### **Background/Analysis**

The Cortese List, also known as the Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, is a compilation of hazardous waste and substance release sites submitted by the State Water Resources Control Board and Department of Toxic Substance Control. The Cortese list reflects various levels of hazardous waste contamination, including sites without any active contamination.

Originally, any site on the Cortese list was prohibited from using state ministerial permitting under SB 35. The “letter of suitability” requirement was added in 2021 (via AB 2668, Grayson) to allow more sites to take advantage of these programs, especially since closed cases that pose no active environmental health risk may remain on the Cortese list. However, the long process of receiving suitability letters or closure letters from the relevant state agencies is a source of delay for projects that functionally prevents them from qualifying for entitlement. Shifting the timing of the closure letter to later in the permitting process – to first construction permit – would allow projects more time to receive these letters without stalling the Planning entitlement process.

Additionally, Cortese sites may contain contaminants that are not feasible to completely remove, and often it is the completion of development, with appropriate engineering controls, that renders a site appropriate for residential use. Finally, shifting the timing of the remediation/mitigation requirement would better position projects to secure financing that allows them to proceed with site management and development.

This bill further enables jurisdictions with requisite expertise, such as San Francisco, to oversee environmental site mitigation for additional sites, including underground storage tanks (USTs), a common Cortese list site. San Francisco's oversight would be consistent with existing DPH standards under the City's Maher Ordinance.

---

### **Challenge**

This bill helps more housing projects qualify for state ministerial streamlining while ensuring that contamination on those sites is appropriately mitigated.

---

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

Planning Department: Will process more projects using SB 423 streamlining.

Department of Public Health (DPH): Will oversee site mitigation for these projects.

Department of Building Inspection (DBI): Will condition permitting on the completion of required site mitigation.

---

### **Fiscal Impact**

No significant impacts to budget. Costs will be recovered by billing the project sponsor.

---

### **Support / Opposition**

Support: SPUR, HAC, Prosperity CA



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), and Nathaniel Edwards at [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	4/8/26
<b>Submitting Department</b>	PermitSF
<b>Contact Name</b>	Lisa Gluckstein
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:lisa.gluckstein@sfgov.org">lisa.gluckstein@sfgov.org</a> ; 628.652.7475
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Lisa Gluckstein
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

### AB 1738

Asm. Carrillo, Asm. District 39, Democrat  
Remote Virtual Inspections

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR  SUPPORT  SUPPORT if amended  OPPOSE  OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

AB 1738 requires jurisdictions to implement a remote virtual building inspection program for specified scopes of work on residential projects by July 1, 2027. PermitSF is seeking a support if amended position and requesting that the timeline for implementation be extended.

#### Background/Analysis

Currently, the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) does not offer remote virtual building inspections. Rather, a permit holder requesting an inspection must contact the Department and coordinate a time that works for all relevant parties of the project team and the inspector.

Across California, 19 jurisdictions already allow some form of remote virtual inspections, including major jurisdictions such as Los Angeles County. Additionally, Texas and Florida both offer remote virtual inspection options for specified permits.

The International Code Council, the body charged with developing model codes for the country, along with the National Fire Protection Association and

the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, have issued best practices guidance for remote virtual inspections.

#### Challenge

Although DBI is able to schedule more than 90% of inspections within two business days of receiving a request, requiring the parties to be physically present can pose scheduling limitations, particularly for contractors who have ongoing work across the City or across other jurisdictions.

#### Solution/Recommended Proposal

For specified scopes of work, AB 1738 will require that a remote inspection be offered to the permit holder. This will allow more flexibility in scheduling both for building owners and for contractors. Remote inspections will be required as an option for work requiring a permit in the following circumstances in one and two-family homes:

- Water heaters
- Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems
- Re-roofing
- Minor electrical work, including:
  - Main and subservice panels
  - Rewiring
  - Whole-house fans
  - Ceiling fans
  - New electrical circuits

- Minor plumbing work, including:
  - Sewer repair and replacement
  - Replumbing of supply and drainage piping
  - Fixture replacement
- Photovoltaic and energy storage systems
- Smoke and carbon monoxide detectors
- All inspections for the permitting of an ADU or JADU under 800 square feet, except for:
  - Foundation, including but not limited to, rebar reinforcement, anchor bolts, soil preparation trench depth and utility placement
  - Framing, including but not limited to, wall and roof

- Cleanearth4kids.org
- Climate Resolve
- Fresnans Against Fracking
- Housing Action Coalition
- Menlo Spark
- Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
- Redwood Energy
- San Francisco Bay Area Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)
- Santa Cruz Climate Action Network
- South Pasadena Residents for Responsible Growth
- The Climate Center
- The Two Hundred

**Departments Impacted & Why**

---

DBI provides the inspections that will be required to be offered as virtual remote inspections. Additionally, DBI staff will be required to establish and implement a virtual remote inspection program, train inspectors on the technology and procedures, and update any relevant forms or materials.

**Fiscal Impact**

---

Although no formal fiscal analysis has been done, DBI will likely have to contract with a technology provider, procure a new system and provide training to Inspectors on how to perform remote virtual inspections.

**Support / Opposition**

---

Support:

- Permit Power (Co-Sponsor)
- SPUR (Co-Sponsor)
- 350 Bay Area Action
- 350 Humboldt: Grass Roots Climate Action
- Abundant Housing LA
- Acterra: Action for a Healthy Planet
- Activesg
- All-electric California
- California Climate Action
- California YIMBY
- Casita Coalition
- City of Pico Rivera

Opposed:

- California Building Officials



# State Legislation Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eddie McCaffrey in the Mayor's Office at [edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org](mailto:edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org) and cc Susanna Conine-Nakano at [Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org](mailto:Susanna.Conine-Nakano@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	April 3, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	SFHSA
<b>Contact Name</b>	Susie Smith
<b>Contact Email</b>	Susie.smith@sfgov.org
<b>Contact Phone</b>	
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

## AB 1660 (Schiavo)

### Recommended Position

- SPONSOR                       **SUPPORT**  
 SUPPORT if amended         OPPOSE  
 OTHER & Describe

residents—including those who die without a will or relatives, and minors or adults unable to care for themselves—is often described as outdated and unsustainable.

### Summary

AB 1660 (Schiavo) is designed to close an enforcement gap in existing California Probate law. While Public Administrators (PA), Public Guardians (PG), and Public Conservators (PC) already have legal authority to access the assets and information of their clients, many financial institutions routinely ignore or delay these requests. This bill requires a court to impose sanctions of no less than \$1,000 per violation on financial institutions and third parties—including insurance companies, retirement funds, and securities dealers—that fail to comply with existing legal requirements to provide information or surrender property.

- **Existing Authority:** Under current law, PAs, PGs, and PCs can take control of property by issuing a "certificate of authority". Financial institutions are legally required to comply without inquiring into the truth of the certification and are discharged from liability for doing so.
- **Institutional Obstruction:** Despite legal protections, some institutions delay transfers, require repeated documentation, or demand unnecessary personal identification from county administrators who are legally exempt from such requirements.
- **Tangible Harm:** Delays of six months or more are common, leading to unpaid bills, late fees, slowed probate, and disrupted care for vulnerable individuals. In documented cases, these delays have allowed financial abusers to

### Background/Analysis

The current system for managing the estates of California's most vulnerable

continue draining funds or cost individual estates between **\$7,000 and \$10,000** in unnecessary attorney and conservator fees. Delays in accessing funds have also led to the inability to place conservatees in safe, appropriate care facilities.

- **Lack of Incentive:** Finally, existing law does not expressly impose penalties for noncompliance, giving institutions little incentive to prioritize these requests or train staff on the Probate Code.

### Solution/Recommended Proposal

To address these persistent issues, AB 1660 proposes a shift from voluntary compliance to mandatory accountability through the following provisions.

**Establishment of Penalties:** It would mandate a \$1,000 minimum fine for institutions that refuse to provide information or surrender estate and conservatorship property.

**Enforcing Existing Law:** The bill does not expand authority or add new requirements; it strictly adds consequences for failing to meet existing obligations under the Probate Code.

**Strict Liability Protection:** It would also reiterate that financial institutions are specifically absolved from any liability when they comply with a PA/PG/PC request presented with a valid Certificate of Authority.

By creating pecuniary consequences for non-compliance, the bill aims to reduce institutional resistance, support efficient case administration, and protect vulnerable

clients from financial exploitation or damage to their estates.

---

### Departments Impacted & Why

---

Only DAS

---

### Fiscal Impact

---

None

---

### Support / Opposition

---

- **Support:** The bill is sponsored by the California State Association of Public Administrators, Public Guardians, and Public Conservators. Other supporters include: the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), the County Behavioral Health Directors Association, and the Riverside County Sheriff's Office.
  - **Opposition (Unless Amended):** the California Bankers Association, California Credit Union League, and insurance industry groups opposes the bill unless the \$1,000 penalty is removed.
-



# State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), Aly Bonde at [aly.bonde@sfgov.org](mailto:aly.bonde@sfgov.org), and Joshua Cardenas at [Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org](mailto:Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	April 3, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Department of Public Health
<b>Contact Name</b>	Max Gara; 628-271-7517 <a href="mailto:Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org">Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org</a> Sneha Patil; <a href="mailto:Sneha.patil@sfdph.org">Sneha.patil@sfdph.org</a>
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Max Gara
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

## AB 1676

**Asm Stefani, District #19, Democrat**

**Mental health services: assisted outpatient treatment: involuntary medication.**

### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     **SUPPORT**     SUPPORT if amended  
 OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

### Summary

AB 1676 strengthens California’s Assisted Outpatient Treatment (AOT) program by allowing counties to seek Involuntary Medication Orders (IMOs) – court orders for the administration of psychotropic medications – as a component of AOT.

### Background/Analysis

California and San Francisco face a persistent behavioral health crisis of untreated or insufficiently treated mental illness, substance use disorder, and homelessness. An effective treatment tool for individuals with serious mental illness is psychotropic medication. However, individuals may not accept this highly effective gold standard treatment due to their illness.

A 2020 Systematic Review/Meta-Analysis found that 49% of patients with SMI were not adherent to their psychotropic medication, including 56% with schizophrenia.<sup>1</sup> Research shows medication treatment reduces morbidity and mortality in patients with SMI & antipsychotic use in individuals with schizophrenia reduces all causes mortality.<sup>2</sup> Studies have also shown that prompt treatment with medication has clear benefits. Psychotropic medication non-adherence can reduce the effectiveness of treatments or leave the individual less responsive to subsequent treatment.<sup>9</sup>

### Challenge

California’s AOT program provides court-ordered, outpatient mental health treatment to individuals with serious mental illness who are declining and refusing care. The program aims to prevent relapse and deterioration by allowing for earlier intervention, before a person becomes so

<sup>1</sup> Agumasie, Kwasi Torpey, Adom Manu, Nega Assefa, Gezahegn Tesfaye, and Augustine Ankomah. “Psychotropic Medication Non-Adherence and Its Associated Factors among Patients with Major Psychiatric Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.” *Systematic Reviews* 9, no. 1 (2020): 17.

<sup>2</sup> Correll, Christoph U., Amber Martin, Charmi Patel, et al. “Systematic Literature Review of Schizophrenia Clinical Practice Guidelines on Acute and Maintenance Management with Antipsychotics.” *Schizophrenia (Germany)* 8, no. 1 (2022): 5.

disabled that they qualify for hospitalization or conservatorship. While current law allows courts to include coordination of and access to medications in AOT treatment plans, it does not permit courts to order medication treatment itself.

Involuntary medications are primarily issued for individuals on time limited holds and conservatorships under the Lanterman-Petris-Short (LPS) Act. Patients must therefore be experiencing significant crisis, before they can be considered for this treatment.

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

---

Under AB 1676, county behavioral health directors can pursue an IMO for individuals in court-ordered AOT if they meet certain criteria, including:

- have a serious mental disorder;
- prescribed psychotropic medications (by a physician or nurse practitioner) that are necessary to prevent a grave disability or serious harm to themselves/others;
- refuses, or is unable to consent to, the administration of the medication;
- does not have the *capacity* to refuse treatment;
- treatment alternatives to involuntary medication unlikely to meet their needs.

If individuals refuse their ordered medication, clinicians can request that they be transported to a hospital or other appropriate facility for medication administration.

AB 1676 includes due process protections in line with those required for involuntary medications ordered under conservatorship. These protections include a court hearing before a judge, the right to counsel representation, the high evidentiary standard of “clear and convincing evidence,” and a jury trial if requested as part of the process to receive and maintain an IMO. Patients must therefore meet a high legal threshold, lack capacity, and be experiencing significant crisis, before they can be considered for this treatment tool. The bill also requires that treatment teams

prioritize seeking voluntary compliance with medication as the standard of care.

Other states with AOT programs permit court-ordered medication for individuals living in the community. New York State’s AOT law, referred to as “Kendra’s Law,” allows for court ordered medication to treat a person’s mental illness, and has demonstrated significant improvements in participant outcomes. A state evaluation found that among individuals receiving AOT, treatment adherence more than doubled, hospitalizations decreased by 77%, homelessness decreased by 74%, and incarcerations decreased 87%.<sup>3</sup> Another study found that medication possession (proxy for adherence) increased by nearly 50%.<sup>4</sup>

This bill would provide an important tool for counties and improve the ability of treatment teams to stabilize individuals in less restrictive community settings. Rather than waiting for someone to deteriorate to the point of needing conservatorship, the bill allows for the use of tools that treat an individual without the civil rights imposition that conservatorship entails.

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

---

First responder departments such as Fire and Police would be requested to provide transport of individuals under the bill, similar to their role under WIC 5150.

### **Fiscal Impact**

---

Likely cost savings to City by reducing the risk of an individual being hospitalized or incarcerated; limited cost to state to implement any regulatory changes.

### **Support / Opposition**

---

Sponsor: San Francisco Mayor Daniel Lurie

Support: NAMI SF, California State Association of Psychiatrists

Oppose: CBHDA (oppose unless amended), Public Defenders Association, Disability Rights CA and their coalition members.

---

<sup>3</sup> New York State Office of Mental Health. *Kendra’s Law: Final Report on the Status of Assisted Outpatient Treatment*. 2005. <https://my.omh.ny.gov/analyticsRes1/files/aot/AOTFinal2005.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Swartz MS, Wilder CM, Swanson JW, Van Dorn RA, Robbins PC, Steadman HJ, et al. Assessing outcomes for consumers in New York’s assisted outpatient treatment program. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2010;61(10):976–81. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.61.10.976>



# State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), Aly Bonde at [aly.bonde@sfgov.org](mailto:aly.bonde@sfgov.org), and Joshua Cardenas at [Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org](mailto:Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	March 7, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Department of Public Health
<b>Contact Name</b>	Max Gara; 628-271-7517
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org">Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org</a> Sneha Patil; <a href="mailto:Sneha.patil@sfdph.org">Sneha.patil@sfdph.org</a>
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Max Gara
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

## **AB 2160: Medi-Cal: lactation services.** **Asm Rodriguez, District #53, Democrat**

### **Recommended Position**

SPONSOR     **SUPPORT**     SUPPORT if  
 amended     OPPOSE     OTHER &  
 Describe

### **Summary**

In order to improve access to lactation services for Medi-Cal enrollees, AB 2160 requires the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to, by July 1, 2027, issue updated Medi-Cal guidance that clarifies Medi-Cal coverage for lactation services, including guidance on coverage of health education related to lactation, basic lactation support, and lactation consultation.

### **Background/Analysis**

Breast feeding conveys significant and enduring health benefits to both the mother and baby. Currently, new mothers on Medi-Cal primarily receive professional lactation support while they are in the hospital after delivering.

Learning a new and complicated skill such as breast feeding can be difficult in the 24-48 hours after giving birth. Many breast-feeding challenges arise once a new mother has been discharged, at

which point it can be difficult to access lactation support. This results in premature cessation of breastfeeding and transition to formula despite public health recommendations to breastfeed exclusively for 6 months.

Wealthier families often engage private lactation specialists to do home visits given how uncomfortable travel can be in the immediate post-partum period. Lower income families, such as those on Medi-Cal, often cannot access this resource making it more likely they will transition to formula feeding. According to the California Department of Public Health’s Maternal and Infant Health Assessment (MIHA) survey, rates of exclusive breastfeeding for parents in San Francisco County are 34.7% three months after delivery, which is slightly higher than the California state average of 30.8%.<sup>1</sup> Healthy People 2020, identifies exclusive breastfeeding as a national public health priority, and aims to increase the percent of women who exclusively breastfeed for 3 months 46.2 percent.

In San Francisco, there are significant inequities in the rates of exclusive breastfeeding, which vary by mother’s age, race-ethnicity, education, income

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Public Health, Center for Family Health, Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Division, Breastfeeding Intention and Duration Dashboard, Last

level, and parity. Under 30% of Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic women exclusively breastfed at 3 months, compared to 50% of White women. Almost half of women with an income over 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level exclusively breastfed their infant at 3 months, compared to about 15% of women with lower income.<sup>2</sup>

### Challenge

---

New parents face multiple challenges with receiving lactation services under the Medi-Cal program which contribute to low and inequitable breastfeeding rates in California and San Francisco. These challenges generally fall into two categories - provider access and service limitations:

- **Provider access:** The most significant hurdle is how lactation experts are integrated into the Medi-Cal system. The primary experts in this field, International Board-Certified Lactation Consultants (IBCLCs), historically haven't been allowed to enroll or bill as independent Medi-Cal providers - services are often billed only when provided under a sponsoring licensed provider or not billed at all. This lack of providers leads to challenges accessing lactation services in outpatient settings once patients are discharged from the hospital.
- **Service Limitations:** Medi-Cal covers "comprehensive lactation services," but the *definition* of what that includes is often left up to individual Managed Care Plans (MCPs), leading to inconsistent care. Providers often use a patchwork of codes (or bill under another clinician), which leads to denials, inconsistent reimbursement, and lack of data on service use. There are further challenges with administrative delays due to requirements for prior authorization, prescriptions, and referral requirements for lactation supplies like hospital-grade pumps, which are considered durable medical equipment (DME).

### Solution/Recommended Proposal

---

To address issues with accessing lactation services and better integrate service providers into the Medi-Cal program, AB 2160 would require

DHCS to update the Medi-Cal guidance by July 1, 2027 to provide the following:

- Clarify Medi-Cal coverage of the continuum of lactation services, including health education related to lactation, basic lactation support, and lactation consultation.
- Clarify standard procedures for billing and reimbursement for lactation services covered by Medi-Cal.
- Clarify Medi-Cal managed care plans' responsibility to cover lactation services
- Specify lactation services are not subject to prior authorization and do not require a prescription or referral.
- Allow for lactation consultants certified by nationally or internationally recognized certification bodies to enroll as Medi-Cal providers and bill for lactation services
- Clarify that managed care plans may credential and reimburse lactation consultants.

To further address access and coverage issues, the bill could be strengthened by adding lactation support adequacy standards and requirements for coordination with local WIC programs.

If passed, these changes will positively and directly impact the Department, strengthen lactation supports and widen access to these services to families. Specifically, the bill would have the following impacts to DPH:

- **Revenue:** Opens a direct Medi-Cal billing pathway for IBCLCs already on staff at WIC, ZSFG and DPH clinics. Currently there such no mechanism to bill for IBCLC services directly.
- **Reduced administrative burden:** Eliminates prior authorization and referral requirements, saving clinical staff time and reducing patient dropout
- **Workforce sustainability:** IBCLC roles become revenue-generating, making it easier to justify and expand lactation staffing
- **Broader service coverage:** Clarifies that the full continuum such as health education, basic support and full consultation is covered, not just select services
- **Equity alignment:** Directly benefits SFDPH's Medi-Cal patient population, including Black,

---

<sup>2</sup> [Breastfeeding – SFHIP](#)

AIAN, and Pacific Islander birthing people who face the highest breastfeeding disparities

- **Aligns with existing DPH investments** :SFDPH currently runs the Lactation Support Collaborative and ZSFG is Baby-Friendly certified; this bill backs those commitments with payment infrastructure.

---

#### **Departments Impacted & Why**

No other departments are impacted by this bill.

---

#### **Fiscal Impact**

Increased utilization of lactation services will raise near-term Medi-Cal expenditures for lactation visits, equipment (pumps), and reimbursement to new providers. Some savings may offset costs, but the timing differs.

---

#### **Support / Opposition**

California WIC Association – co-sponsor



# State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), Aly Bonde at [aly.bonde@sfgov.org](mailto:aly.bonde@sfgov.org), and Joshua Cardenas at [Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org](mailto:Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	March 26, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Department of Public Health
<b>Contact Name</b>	Max Gara; 628-271-7517
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org">Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org</a> Sneha Patil; <a href="mailto:Sneha.patil@sfdph.org">Sneha.patil@sfdph.org</a>
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Max Gara
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

## AB 2302: Asm. Celeste Rodriguez, AD-53, Democrat Food Safety: Infant Formula – Toxic Elements Testing and Disclosure

### Recommended Position

**SPONSOR**     **SUPPORT**     **SUPPORT if amended**  
 **OPPOSE**     **OTHER & Describe**

### Summary

AB 2302 (Rodriguez) aims to protect California babies from heavy metals in infant formula and would require formula manufacturers to test for toxic elements (aluminum, arsenic, cadmium, lead, and mercury) and make results available on their internet website.

### Background/Analysis

Infant formulas are a federally regulated food product subject to oversight by the FDA. However, FDA regulations have historically focused on nutritional adequacy, microbiological safety, and good manufacturing practices, not heavy metal contamination. To date, the FDA has not established specific action levels, regulatory limits, or tolerances for toxic elements in infant formula. In March 2025, the agency launched “Operation Stork Speed” to strengthen formula oversight and announced plans to release a study of heavy metals testing results in April 2026.

At the state level, California has been a national leader in oversight of infant related consumer products. AB 899 (Muratsuchi, 2023) required

testing and disclosure for baby foods, and SB 646 (Weber Pierson, 2025) extended these requirements to prenatal vitamins.

### Challenge

Despite robust federal oversight of infant formulas’ nutritional content and microbiological safety, there are currently no federal safety thresholds for heavy metals in infant formulas. Research consistently shows that there is no safe level of lead exposure in children, and that even low-level exposures to lead, arsenic, cadmium, and mercury can impair brain development, reduce IQ, increase cancer risk, and cause lasting neurological harm. Aluminum, while less harmful in typical dietary doses, remains under study.

This issue has clear racial equity dimensions. Breastfeeding initiation and duration rates are lower among communities of color and low-income families in California, largely due to systemic inequities including workplace barriers, hospital practices, and historical targeting of formula marketing to communities of color. In San Francisco, there are significant inequities in the rates of exclusive breastfeeding, which vary by mother’s age, race-ethnicity, education, income level, and parity. Under 30% of Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic women exclusively breastfed at 3 months, compared to 50% of White women. Almost half of women with an income

over 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level exclusively breastfed their infant at 3 months, compared to about 15% of women with lower income.<sup>1</sup> As a result, Black, Latino, and low-income families are more likely to rely on infant formula as a primary nutrition source, making them disproportionately exposed to any contaminants in these products. A Consumer Reports investigation of 41 powdered infant formulas found that roughly half contained potentially harmful levels of at least one contaminant, highlighting the scope of the problem. In San Francisco, these same communities already face elevated environmental exposures to toxins from housing, air quality, and industrial sources. The compounding effect of toxic elements in infant formula adds an additional, preventable burden. Parents and caregivers currently have no consistent, accessible way to know whether the formula they purchase has been tested or what levels of toxic elements it contains.

---

#### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

AB 2302 extends the transparency framework already established for baby food (AB 899, 2023) and prenatal vitamins (SB 646, 2025) to infant formula by requiring formula manufacturers to:

- (1) test each production batch for five toxic elements - aluminum, arsenic, cadmium, lead, and mercury - at least once per month using an accredited laboratory;
- (2) post test results publicly on their website in English and Spanish; and
- (3) label product with a QR code linking consumers to test results and FDA guidance on health effects if a product is tested for a toxic element subject to an FDA action level, regulatory limit or tolerance.

The bill also prohibits the sale or distribution in California of infant formulas that do not comply with these requirements. The bill puts actionable safety information directly in the hands of parents enabling informed purchasing decisions without requiring scientific expertise. Further, it creates market incentives for manufacturers to reduce contaminant levels, as Consumer Reports found

that large manufacturers are already capable of producing low-contaminant formula.

A potential unintended consequence raised by formula manufacturers (Infant Nutrition Council of America) is that labeling products with “toxic element” language could alarm parents into abandoning formula for unsafe alternatives such as homemade formula. This concern can be addressed via consumer communication guidance or educational materials provided alongside disclosure requirements. The bill’s QR code mechanism, which links to FDA guidance, helps provide appropriate context for test results.

The Department recommends a support position on the bill, as infant formula is a critical nutrition source for many San Francisco infants, and research confirms that no safe level of lead exposure exists for children. For San Francisco, the gap in formula regulation is especially concerning because many residents particularly Black, Latino, and low-income families disproportionately rely on infant formula due to structural barriers to breastfeeding.

---

#### **Departments Impacted & Why**

DPH may be indirectly impacted by the bill, as it may be called upon to provide public education and community outreach on infant formula safety, particularly in communities that disproportionately use formula. Changes in how formula is labeled or perceived may require staff to counsel clients/patients on interpreting QR code results and understanding what test disclosures mean for product safety.

---

#### **Fiscal Impact**

There is no direct fiscal impact anticipated for the City and County of San Francisco, as all testing, disclosure, website maintenance, and labeling costs are borne by infant formula manufacturers. At the state level, the California Department of Public Health may incur some administrative costs to respond to requests for test result access from authorized agents and to conduct any enforcement activities. These costs are currently unknown and unquantified.

---

#### **Support / Opposition**

**Support (as of March 2026):** Children Now (sponsor); American Nurses Association;

---

<sup>1</sup> [Breastfeeding – SFHIP](#)

California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice; California WIC Association; Center for Community Action & Environmental Justice; Center for Environmental Health; Environmental Working Group; Safe Passages; San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility; many others

**Oppose Unless Amended:** Infant Nutrition Council of America (INCA),



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), and Nathaniel Edwards at [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	April 3, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development
<b>Contact Name</b>	Kyra Geithman
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	628-652-5835; kyra.geithman@sfgov.org
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Kyra Geithman
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO    X N/A

### AB 2020

**Asm. Jesse Gabriel, CA-46, D**  
**Housing programs: financing.**

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

This bill would authorize the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to take prescribed action, including authorizing the transfer of excess reserves or excess operating income, as defined, from one state-funded rental housing development to another rental housing development with the same owner to stabilize at-risk projects.

#### Background/Analysis

HCD provides construction loans for 100% affordable housing projects built by nonprofit developers. The loan agreements between the developer and HCD stipulate repayment requirements, often through excess operating income, excess reserves, and/or residual receipts (the amount that gross revenue generated from rental income exceeds annual operating expenses). Developers must meet minimum loan repayments or default, facing foreclosure. Projects must maintain reserves as part of regulatory agreements with HCD and the City.

#### Challenge

San Francisco’s existing affordable housing portfolio is experiencing significant cost increases, especially for insurance and operating costs. Insurance premiums are escalating, and nonprofit housing developers are struggling to balance project budgets.

Nonprofit housing organizations are limited in how much they can raise rents on low-income households, so they have to pay these cost increases via financing from public sector programs, drawing down reserves, or redirecting dollars from other budget line items—like critical repairs, security improvements, and on-site staffing. This is not sustainable in the long term, and this practice puts projects at considerable risk of long-term insolvency and default.

#### Solution/Recommended Proposal

Nonprofit housing organizations often own multiple buildings but are unable to use funds from buildings that are doing well financially to support buildings at risk of insolvency. Authorizing nonprofit housing organizations to work with HCD to create flexibility within their portfolio can stabilize projects with increasing costs. By stabilizing buildings across their portfolio, organizations will not have to draw down reserves or make difficult budget decisions that negatively impact residents.

---

#### **Departments Impacted & Why**

MOHCD: The change would have a potential positive impact on MOHCD funding for affordable housing. As the regulatory agency for 100% affordable housing projects, MOHCD is often the first stop for nonprofit housing organizations seeking additional funding for at-risk projects. If their organizational budgets were more flexible, it could decrease their requests to MOHCD.

---

#### **Fiscal Impact**

If passed, AB 2020 would have a positive fiscal impact on MOHCD and on nonprofit housing organizations operating in San Francisco. The legislation would reduce financial pressures on the City to fund financially vulnerable projects, and it would give nonprofit housing organizations financial flexibility to respond to urgent issues.

---

#### **Support / Opposition**

No formal support or opposition has been submitted. However, nonprofit affordable housing developers and related advocacy organizations have signaled intent to support.



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), Aly Bonde at [aly.bonde@sfgov.org](mailto:aly.bonde@sfgov.org), and Joshua Cardenas at [Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org](mailto:Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	04/03/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
<b>Contact Name</b>	Scott Ammon
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	sammon@sfgwater.org
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Scott Ammon
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO    X N/A

### AB 2180

#### Assembly Member Christopher Ward, District 78, Democrat-San Diego

#### Local government: Proposition 218 Omnibus Implementation Act: proportional cost of service.

##### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended  
 OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

##### Summary

AB 2180 would clarify what proportionality means in the context of water and sewer rates and would provide agencies with clearer, more predictable rules for developing and adopting rate structures. This bill allows local agencies and governments to use reasonable, proportional cost methods, including uniform or tiered rates based on customer class, rather than through some more demanding, more costly, and potentially infeasible proof standard, such as requiring exact parcel-by-parcel calculations.

More specifically, in setting water or sewer rates, the bill would confirm that a local government is not required to provide an exact measure of the cost of the service at each parcel and may instead set uniform or tiered rates to parcel or customer classes that are defined based on common characteristics indicative of likely water or sewer use. The bill would provide that the proportional cost of service within each tier of water service may be substantiated by using any reasonable basis for allocating costs attributed to the tier, as described.

This would clarify agencies' responsibilities in rate setting and would ensure greater legal certainty for funding critical infrastructure and for continuing to provide high-quality utility service at lower cost to San Francisco's utility customers.

The SFPUC recommends a Support position for AB 2180.

##### Background/Analysis

Passed in 1996, Proposition 218 (also known as the 'Right to Vote on Taxes Act'), added Articles XIII C and XIII D to the California Constitution. These articles apply to property-related fees and charges set by public agencies, which include water and sewer service charges for City residents and businesses.

As a result, public water and sewer agencies are held to Constitutional restrictions when setting or increasing rates. These substantive limits include that revenue from ratepayers' fees cannot exceed the funds required to provide the water or sewer service, that fee revenues must be used only for the service for which the fee is charged, and that the amount charged to any parcel must not exceed the proportional cost of the service attributable to that parcel.

Courts have used these Constitutional provisions to scrutinize tiered rates that are used to offset costs attributed to higher-usage customers. In 2025, the most recent decision by a California appellate court, *Dreher v. LADWP (Dreher)*, provided a framework that is the most consistent with how public water agencies generally set rates. The intent of AB 2180 is to provide clarity and consistency to water agencies and their customers in setting proportional rates consistent with the holdings in *Dreher*.

---

### **Challenge**

Courts evaluate the validity of water rates using their independent judgment. However, several key provisions of Proposition 218 are undefined and unclear, leaving utilities and courts unsure how to demonstrate compliance. Before *Dreher*, two other recent lawsuits named *Coziahr v. Otay Water District* and *Patz v. San Diego* decided that reasonableness is not the appropriate standard of proof but failed to specify what the appropriate standard should be, further increasing ambiguity. With no statewide law in place to codify *Dreher*'s outcome, water and sewer utilities face unnecessary uncertainty as to whether their rates may be overturned when challenged. This would leave public utility agencies across California, including San Francisco, more susceptible to lawsuits when they set their rates, and there would be a lack of a cohesive state law that supports with agencies' best practices in rate-setting.

---

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

The SFPUC recommends a support position for AB 2180.

---

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

This bill would benefit the SFPUC and its ratepayers by clarifying how SFPUC can set rates indicative of water and sewer use. Additionally, city departments pay water rates, so the City, itself, would benefit from the increased clarity and certainty that this bill provides.

---

### **Fiscal Impact**

This bill could save the City and County of San Francisco from paying potential litigation costs. Aside from that, there are no predicted fiscal impacts to the SFPUC.

---

### **Support / Opposition**

---

#### **Support (\*Sponsor)**

Association of California Water Agencies\*  
Bear Valley Water District  
Bella Vista Water District  
Burbank Water and Power  
Calaveras County Water District  
California Coastkeeper Alliance  
California Council for Environmental & Economic Balance  
California Municipal Utilities Association  
California Special Districts Association  
California State Association of Counties  
California Water Efficiency Partnership  
Camrosa Water District  
City of Roseville  
City of Ventura  
Coachella Valley Water District  
Coastside County Water District  
Contra Costa Water District  
Crescenta Valley Water District  
Crestline-Lake Arrowhead Water Agency  
Cucamonga Valley Water District  
Desert Water Agency  
Eastern Municipal Water District  
El Dorado Irrigation District  
El Toro Water District  
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District  
Helix Water District  
Irvine Ranch Water District  
Jurupa Community Services District  
Kings River Conservation District  
Kings River Water Association  
Laguna Beach County Water District  
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District  
League of California Cities  
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts  
Marin Water  
Marina Coast Water District  
McKinleyville Community Services District  
McMullin Area Groundwater Sustainability Agency  
Mission Springs Water District  
Monte Vista Water District  
Monterey County Water Resources Agency  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  
North Marin Water District  
Olivenhain Municipal Water District  
Otay Water District  
Orange County Sanitation District  
Padre Dam Municipal Water District  
Palmdale Water District  
Paradise Irrigation District

Regional Water Authority  
Rio Linda Elverta Community Water District  
Rowland Water District  
San Diego County Water Authority  
San Joaquin Valley Water Collaborative Action  
Program  
San Juan Water District  
Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency  
Santa Fe Irrigation District  
South Tahoe Public Utility District  
Stockton East Water District  
Tahoe City Public Utility District  
Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District  
Three Valleys Municipal Water District  
Tri-County Water Authority  
Union Public Utility District  
Valley Center Municipal Water District  
Vista Irrigation District  
Walnut Valley Water District  
West Valley Water District  
Western Municipal Water District

Opposition

California Association of Realtors  
California Building Industry Association  
California Taxpayers Association  
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association



**State Legislation Committee Proposal Form**

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), and Nathaniel Edwards at [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	April 2, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	San Francisco Police Department
<b>Contact Name</b>	Steven Lopez
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org">Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org</a>
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Steven Lopez
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

**[AB 1941]**

**[Assemblyman Mark Gonzalez, Assembly District# 54, Democrat – Los Angeles]**

**[Organized Metal Theft]**

**Recommended Position**

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

**Summary**

*This bill would create a new crime in the penal code of organized metal theft, defined in the bill as “acting in concert with one or more persons to steal metal materials and items with the intent to sell, exchange, or return those metal materials for value, acting in concert with two or more persons to receive, purchase, or possess those metal materials knowing or believing it to have been stolen, acting as an agent of another to steal those metal materials as part of an organized plan to commit theft, or recruiting, coordinating, organizing, supervising, directing, managing, or financing another to undertake acts of theft of metal.” The offense would be punishable as a misdemeanor with repeat offenses or theft exceeding \$950 in value punishable as a misdemeanor or felony.*

**Background/Analysis**

*Organized metal theft is surging all throughout the State of California. Driven by the high prices of copper and other valuable metals used in construction, criminals have increasingly targeted public assets such as streetlights, bridges, rail systems, telecommunication lines, electrical infrastructure and even utility covers to strip and sell stolen metal.*

*The targeting of vital infrastructure has caused widespread public safety hazards such as power outages, road and sidewalk hazards and disruptions to critical services such as public transportation and emergency communications. These incidents also result in significant repairs costs and service delays that directly impact residents.*

*San Francisco has attempted to remedy this problem once before in 2012 by way of an Ordinance creating a stricter permitting system for buyers and sellers of junk materials. However, despite these efforts the problem persists. AB 1941 provides a more direct way to address the widespread issue of organized metal theft without placing additional burdens on law abiding businesses.*

---

### **Challenge**

*Under current law, instances of metal theft are prosecuted under existing theft statutes, which may not fully account for the organized nature of these crimes or the disproportionate harm caused when critical infrastructure is targeted. As a result, theft that results in significant public safety or service impacts is often treated similarly to lower level, non-organized theft offenses.*

---

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

*AB 1941 creates a new criminal offense that specifically addresses organized metal theft while also creating a flexible framework to prosecute individuals who engage in coordinated efforts. The first two convictions within a 12 month period under this bill would be punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for a period not exceeding one year.*

*After a third conviction committed within a 12 month period of the first conviction or when the value of the materials stolen exceeds \$950, the offense can be punishable as a misdemeanor once again or a felony punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for 16 months to 3 years. By distinguishing organized metal theft from general theft offenses, this bill provides law enforcement and prosecutors with a more targeted tool to address a uniquely harmful category of crime.*

---

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

*This bill will impact all agencies involved in the criminal justice system such as: SFPD, The District Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office and the San Francisco Sheriff's Department due to the creation of a new criminal offense and corresponding enforcement, prosecution and imprisonment responsibilities.*

---

### **Fiscal Impact**

*We expect this bill to result in increased court and imprisonment costs related to individuals engaged in organized metal theft. However, these costs may be offset by reductions in repairing damaged infrastructure, responding to service disruptions, and mitigating public safety hazard caused by organized metal theft.*

---

### **Support / Opposition**

*This bill is being supported by the following organizations: City of San Jose (Co-Sponsor), Advance Sf, Arcadia Police Officers' Association, Asian Pacific American Community Center, AT&T, Bizfed Central Valley, Brea Police Association, Burbank Police Officers' Association, City of Burbank/burbank Redevelopment Agency, Calbroadband, Calcom Association, California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce, California Association of School Police Chiefs, California Coalition of School Safety Professionals, California Narcotic Officers' Association, California Police Chiefs Association, California Reserve Peace Officers Association, California State Sheriffs' Association, Cameron House, Central City Association of Los Angeles, Central Valley Business Federation, Chamber San Mateo County, Chinese Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, City of Hidden Hills, City of Pico Rivera, Claremont Police Officers Association, Corona Police Officers Association, County of Yolo, CTIA - the Wireless Association, Culver City Police Officers' Association, Curry Senior Center, Fairfield-Suisun Chamber of Commerce, Fremont Chamber of Commerce, Fresno Chamber of Commerce, Fullerton Police Officers' Association, Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce, Hayward Chamber of Commerce, Joint Venture Silicon Valley, City of Lakewood, League of California Cities, Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Los Angeles School Police Management Association, Los Angeles School Police Officers Association, City of Los Angeles, Mayor Matt Mahan, City of San Jose, Milpitas Chamber of Commerce, Mission Bit, Monterey Bay Economic Partnership, Monterey County Board of Supervisors, Monterey County District Attorney's Office, Monterey County Farm Bureau, Murrieta Police Officers' Association, Napa Chamber of Commerce, Napa County Farm Bureau, Newport Beach Police Association, Oakland Chamber of Commerce, Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce, Palos Verdes Police Officers Association, Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association, Pomona Police Officers' Association, Port of Redwood City, Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center, Riverside Police Officers Association, Riverside Sheriffs'*

*Association, Sacramento Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce, San Bruno Education Foundation, San Francisco African American Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco Police Officers Association, San Francisco Tech Council, San Jose Downtown Association, San Mateo County Economic Development Association (SAMCEDA), San Rafael Chamber of Commerce, Santa Cruz Area Chamber of Commerce, Santa Rosa Metro Chamber, Self-help for the Elderly, Sf.citi, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, United States Telecom Association DbA Ustelecom - the Broadband Association, Wireless Infrastructure Association*

*This bill is being opposed by the following organizations: ACLU California Action, California Public Defenders Association, Californians United for a Responsible Budget, Community Works West, Initiate Justice, Justice2jobs Coalition, LA Defensa, Legal Services for Prisoners with Children, San Francisco Public Defenders Office, Smart Justice California, Vera Institute of Justice.*



### State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), and Nathaniel Edwards at [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	March 25, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Port of San Francisco
<b>Contact Name</b>	Brad Benson, Devyani Jain
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:brad.benson@sfport.com">brad.benson@sfport.com</a> , devyani.jain@sfport.com
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES    X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

**[AB 2051]**

**[Asm Wicks, Sen/Asm District 15 in the East Bay, Democrat]  
[Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group]**

**Recommended Position**

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

**Summary**

*[Provide high-level summary of the bill in question and brief explanation of recommended position.]*

California faces accelerating sea level rise—projected at 1.6 to 3.1 feet by 2100 under likely scenarios, with extreme cases over 6.6 feet—which threatens communities, infrastructure, and ecosystems along the coast and in the San Francisco Bay. AB 2051: Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group addresses the need for coordinated and accelerated adaptation to sea level rise statewide. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) have estimated that more than \$110 billion will be needed by 2050 to protect Bay Area communities and infrastructure. AB 2051 builds on requirements in SB 272 (Laird, 2024) for local governments to prepare plans by 2034, based on the best available science, provide equity for vulnerable communities, and include adaptation strategies and infrastructure impact analyses, in order to remain eligible for state resilience funding. ‘=

AB 2051 proposes a coordinated, statewide collective effort to develop measures to streamline permitting for coastal resilience projects. This includes developing reforms to address the complexity and delays associated with coastal resilience project permitting due to overlapping and sometimes duplicative federal and state authorities; requirements for project-specific studies; limited regulatory agency staffing; interagency coordination needs; and inconsistency and uncertainty regarding mitigation requirements. The reforms would aim to reduce permitting timelines, increase predictability, and incentivize best practices for resilience and environmental protection. For this purpose, AB 2051 directs the Natural Resources Agency, in consultation with CalEPA, to convene a Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group composed of multiple state and federal regulatory agencies and stakeholders to develop a Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap by 2028, including potential future legislative reforms. The regulatory agencies in the Working Group include the Coastal Commission, CalEPA, the San Francisco Bay, North Coast, and Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Boards, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Governor’s Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation, NRA, the Ocean Protection Council, BCDC, the State Coastal Conservancy, the State Historical

Resources Commission, the State Lands Commission, the State Office of Historic Preservation, and the State Water Resources Control Board. The Working Group would also include representatives of government agencies that seek permits and interested members of the public to identify permitting challenges and review and comment on permitting reforms.

The Working Group would recommend steps to streamline permitting, standardize mitigation practices and publish standard construction measures (SCMs) for in-water construction techniques. It would also recommend future administrative and legislative reforms to reduce permitting delays caused by overlapping jurisdictions, inconsistent mitigation requirements, and limited staff capacity, issues similar to those addressed in prior permit streamlining efforts such as SB 1082 (Calderon, 1992), AB 525 (Chiu, 2021), and the State’s recent Cutting Green Tape initiatives. Required analysis for this effort includes (i) exploring unified or consolidated permit pathways; (ii) standardized mitigation practices; (iii) improved interagency coordination modeled on examples like the BRRIT (Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team, a team of state and federal regulatory agencies dedicated to efficiently permitting habitat restoration projects in and around San Francisco Bay); (iv) potential pilot permitting programs to evaluate the effectiveness of recommended reforms; and (v) regulatory agencies workforce assessment to ensure adequate regulatory staffing. BCDC and the Coastal Commission would also be required to convene advisory groups of local governments, Tribes, infrastructure agencies, environmental and EJ organizations, and other stakeholders to identify permitting challenges and provide feedback on proposed reforms.

AB 2051 also envisions evaluation of the benefits of consolidated coastal resilience permits similar to that provided for in Public Resources Code Division 20 for offshore wind projects. The overall goal of AB 2051 is to accelerate delivery of essential coastal resilience projects—such as flood protection, wetland restoration, and shoreline adaptation, particularly for low-income and frontline communities disproportionately exposed to climate impacts. Importantly, the bill does not weaken any environmental or cultural resources protections; instead, it provides a structured, expert-driven process to modernize and coordinate permitting.

The Port recommends supporting AB 2051 because this bill’s proposed permit streamlining suite of measures would benefit efficient the implementation of a number of projects under the Waterfront Resilience Program, including the USACE-Port San Francisco Flood Study Recommended Plan. Additionally, AB 2051’s permit streamlining measures would also benefit SFO’s Shoreline Protection Project.

### **Background/Analysis**

---

*[Provide history of the issue in question and/or a description of the law as it currently stands.]*

California faces accelerating sea level rise—projected at 1.6 to 3.1 feet by 2100 under likely scenarios, with extreme cases over 6.6 feet—which threatens communities, infrastructure, and ecosystems along the coast and in the San Francisco Bay. This bill, **AB 2051: Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group**, is expected to address the need for coordinated and accelerated adaptation to sea level rise statewide. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) have estimated that more than \$110 billion will be needed by 2050 to protect Bay Area communities and infrastructure. This is an urgent need; therefore, AB 2051 will help efficiently permit much-needed coastal resilience projects statewide.

### **Challenge**

---

*[Describe the challenge or problem that this bill is trying to solve for and the impacts to San Francisco.]*

Coastal resilience projects face significant complexity and delays associated with their permitting due to the overlapping and sometimes duplicative federal and state authorities, requirements for project-specific studies, limited regulatory agency staffing, interagency coordination needs, and inconsistency and uncertainty regarding mitigation requirements.

### Solution/Recommended Proposal

---

*[Describe the solution the bill is proposing, and/or the new policy it creates to help San Francisco.]*

AB 2051: Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group addresses the need for coordinated and accelerated adaptation to sea level rise statewide. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) have estimated that more than \$110 billion will be needed by 2050 to protect Bay Area communities and infrastructure. AB 2051 builds on requirements in SB 272 (Laird, 2024) for local governments to prepare plans by 2034, based on the best available science, provide equity for vulnerable communities, and include adaptation strategies and infrastructure impact analyses, in order to remain eligible for state resilience funding.

#### Link to Leginfo:

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billStatusClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202520260AB2051](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billStatusClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260AB2051)

### Departments Impacted & Why

---

*[List any departments that may be impacted by the legislation and explain the impact. We recommend consulting with affected departments for their perspective before submitting this proposal form.]*

Port, SFO

The Port has consulted with SFO. SFO has similar coastal resilience projects, such as Shoreline Protection Project, as the Port of SF's Waterfront Resilience Program, which would benefit from the AB 2051 permit streamlining efforts.

### Fiscal Impact

---

*[If any, describe the fiscal impact of the legislation, especially as it relates to San Francisco and your department in particular. Please include any analysis completed that summarizes fiscal impact to the State.]*

Unknown at this time (but some fiscal impact is anticipated).

### Support / Opposition

---

*[List the entities, elected officials, organizations that either support and/or oppose this bill. This information can be found at <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/> and going to "Bill Information" / searching the bill / "Bill Analysis." The list of supporters and/ opposition is typically included on the analysis listed.*

McFadden Finch Holdings Company

#### **SUPPORT**

Bay Area Council

Bay Planning Coalition

Port of San Francisco

San Francisco International Airport

California State Association of Counties

Exploratorium

Kiewit Infrastructure West Co.

Wareham Development

#### **UNDER CONSIDERATION**

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

**OPPOSITION**

None as of March 25, 2026



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), and Nathaniel Edwards at [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	4/3/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Department on the Status of Women
<b>Contact Name</b>	Denise Heitzenroder
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	Denise.heitzenroder@sfgov.org/415-252-2576
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Denise Heitzenroder
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO    X N/A

### AB 1876

#### Assemblymember Dawn Addis (D, AD-30)

#### Health Care Coverage: Nondiscrimination/Fair Care for All Act

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

*The proposed legislation would codify basic protections against discrimination by state-regulated health plans and insurers based on race, color, national origin, age, disability, or sex and clarifies that “sex” discrimination includes sex characteristics, pregnancy, sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex stereotypes. This bill was introduced on February 12, 2026, and was passed out of the Standing Committee on Health and re-referred to the \_\_\_\_\_ Committee on \_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ Judiciary.*

#### Background/Analysis

*Challenges and inconsistencies in healthcare protections at the federal level have left women, gender non-confirming individuals, immigrants and non-English speakers vulnerable to loss of healthcare coverage or substandard coverage. AB 1876 would codify federal nondiscrimination protections from Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) into California state law. These protections prohibit health care providers receiving federal funds from denying care based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability.*

*These safeguards are essential for communities that have historically faced discrimination in health care, including LGBTQIA+ people, immigrants, non-English speakers, and people seeking reproductive health care.*

*By placing these protections into California law, AB 1876 ensures that they remain in place even if federal protections are weakened.*

#### Solution/Recommended Proposal

*The legislation would ensure that healthcare equity measures and protections remain intact for women, communities of color, the LGBTQIA+ community and immigrants regardless of changes at the federal level.*

#### Departments Impacted & Why

*The Department of Public Health and Department of Human Resources: These protections would help keep vulnerable populations insured and therefore not reliant on City and County resources, including low and no-*

cost clinics, emergency care and other safety nets. Ensuring access to preventative care, culturally competent care and timely care keeps communities safe and healthy.

---

#### **Fiscal Impact**

---

*This bill has not been reviewed by the fiscal committee but there are no anticipated fiscal costs. Expanding options for provider facilitated abortion procedures in emergency situations would likely lead to cost savings and improved health outcomes for patients.*

---

#### **Support / Opposition**

---

*The bill is co-sponsored by Assemblymember Mia Bonta.*

*Organizational Sponsors (as of March 31th) include Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California, ACLU California Action, Advocates for Trans Equality, Alliance for Transyouth Liberation, American Academy Of Pediatrics, California, Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California, California LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network California Federation Of Teachers, California LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network, California Pan - Ethnic Health Network, California Psychological Association, City of West Hollywood, Courage California, El/La Para TransLatinas, Equality California, Families United for Trans Rights, Eastbay Chapter, Gender Affirming Professionals, Gender Health Center, Gender Justice LA, Health Access California, Invisible T Men, Justice in Aging, LGBTQ Connection, Los Angeles LGBT Center, Lyon-Martin Community Health Services, Mirror Memoirs, a Project of Community Partners, National Health Law Program, ParivarBayArea, PFLAG Fresno, PFLAG Oakland-East Bay, PFLAG San Deigo County, PFLAG San Jose/Peninsula, Placer LGBTQ+ Center, Sn Francisco Aids Foundation, Saturns Wish, The Children's Partnership, San Deigo LGBT Community Center, The TransLatin@ Coalition, Training In Early Abortion For Comprehensive Healthcare (TEACH), Transfamily Support Services, Western Center on Law & Poverty,.*

*It is opposed by the California Family Council, Lesbians Advocating for a Resilient Future, Our Duty, Women's Declaration International USA, Inc., Women Are Reak, SFV Alliance, Cause Californians United for Sex-Based Evidence in Policy and Law and LGB Courage Coalition.*



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), and Nathaniel Edwards at [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	4/3/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Department on the Status of Women
<b>Contact Name</b>	Denise Heitzenroder
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	Denise.heitzenroder@sfgov.org/415-252-2576
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

### AB 1973

**Assemblymember Cecilia Aguiar-Curry (D, CA-4)**

**Abortion: authorized procedures.**

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

*The bill would update existing licensing regulations under the Business and Professions Code to permit individuals with a valid and current license under Medical Practice Act, the Osteopathic Act, the Nursing Practice Act, or the Physician Assistant Practice Act to administer medication or aspiration abortions beyond the first trimester. The bill was introduced February 13, 2026 and amended March 19, 2026 and re-referred to Committee on Business and Professions.*

#### Background/Analysis

*Existing laws, including the Medical Practice Act, the Osteopathic Act, the Nursing Practice Act, or the Physician Assistant Practice Act regulate the licensure of abortion care providers. Currently, providing abortion care without a valid license could result in a fine and/or imprisonment. An exception allows those licensed under the Medical Practice Act, the Osteopathic Act, the Nursing Practice Act, or the Physician Assistant Practice Act to provide a medication or aspiration abortion in the first trimester.*

#### Challenge

*In many areas it is challenging for pregnant people to find timely access to abortion care. Delays in care can result in health risks, increased costs and other strains. Many people may not even know they are pregnant until 10-12 weeks of pregnancy.*

#### Solution/Recommended Proposal

*Expanding the pool of certified providers that can administer abortion medication and aspiration abortions, which are safe and effective, beyond the first trimester, would improve access to care for those that need it, and allow patients, in many circumstances, to be able to seek care from their existing providers.*

#### Departments Impacted & Why

*We consulted with the Department of Public Health and they have no concerns, and no impact to City & County Departments is anticipated.*

---

**Fiscal Impact**

*No anticipated fiscal impact locally.*

---

**Support / Opposition**

*No support or opposition from interest groups has been recorded yet.*



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at [Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), and Nathaniel Edwards at [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

<b>Date Submitted</b>	4/3/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	ENV
<b>Contact Name</b>	Hilary Near
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Hilary.Near@sfgov.org">Hilary.Near@sfgov.org</a> , 415 355 3772
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Joseph Piasecki
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

### AB 2226

**Assembly Member Blanca Rubio, District 48, Democrat**

#### Reusable grocery bags

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

In 2022, the California Legislature passed SB 1046 (Eggman), which limited stores to providing consumers with reusable, recyclable, or compostable produce bags. The law was modeled on San Francisco’s Recyclable or Compostable Pre-Checkout Bags policy last amended August 2019. AB 2226 would repeal SB 1046.

#### Background/Analysis

SB 1046 requirements became effective January 1, 2025 and grocers appear to have complied with the requirement throughout California, switching from conventional plastic film bags (some green tinted) to compliant compostable bags that were 15” wide to be repurposed to collect household food scraps or paper bags.

#### Challenge

AB 2226 repeals SB 1046, moving the state backwards towards a marketplace once again flooded with traditional plastic pre-checkout bags that contaminate waste streams and harm aquatic ecosystems. We fear repealing high-profile plastics laws will hinder our ability to advance more aggressive plastics policies in California and other states.

#### Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2226 would dismantle progress towards plastic reduction and support for composting collection programs. SB 1046 was passed in response to many traditional plastic produce bags used for fresh fruits and vegetables ending up in compost waste streams and contaminating municipal compost facilities.

Plastic film is the most significant contaminant in our recycling and composting process. It wraps around the mechanisms at our materials recovery facility at Pier 96, causing costly delays and employee safety risks as they regularly dislodge plastic film manually from the mechanisms. Plastic film is the primary contaminant of concern in our composting, where our collector and processor Recology must landfill tons of source-separated organics to successfully remove associated plastic film and produce a marketable compost product. Conventional plastic film and the ubiquity of plastic produce bags given out freely at our grocery stores poses risks throughout our refuse infrastructure, not to mention the impacts when they become litter.

---

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

Environment Department is impacted in our stewardship of the City's refuse generation and landfill reduction goals. Plastic film comprises about 5% of our total landfilled material, which has an outsized environmental and operational impact for the reasons described above.

---

### **Fiscal Impact**

Grocers impacted by the statewide requirements currently spend more on the compliant compostable or recyclable pre-checkout bags. Repealing SB 1046, as proposed by AB 2226, may provide some fiscal relief to the biggest grocers. San Francisco grocery stores have been required to provide compostable or recyclable pre-checkout bags since July 1, 2020.

---

### **Support / Opposition**

No formal support or opposition has been recorded yet. And, Californians Against Waste is in opposition and has organized a coalition letter to be submitted prior to its hearing at the Assembly on Natural Resources.