**STATE LEGISLATION COUNCIL**
**Wednesday, July 22nd, 2026**
**10:00am – 12:00pm**
**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 515 7079
- **Meeting Password:** wzG7pJP3DG5
- **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=mb662fa718bdd7513b37005d7d7d83e58
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 6.

## 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 – Michelle Lau

## AGENDA

I. **ROLL CALL**

II. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).** Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on June 17th, 2026.

III. **STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item).** The City's state lobbyist will present to the Council an update on State legislative matters.

**IV.** **PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action)**. Discussion and possible action item: the Council 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**

**Agency on Human Rights**
Presenter: Denise Heitzenroder

AB 1267 (Pellerin): Marriage: prohibition on minors
***Recommended Position: Support***

This bill would update regulations to prohibit individuals under the age of 18 from receiving a marriage license.

**San Francisco Reentry Council**
Presenter: Alek Hartwick

AB 2384 (Lowenthal): Crimes: Records: Sealing
***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2384 expands access to record sealing by allowing individuals who remain conviction-free for four years after completing their sentence or following an arrest that did not result in conviction to petition the court to seal eligible criminal records. The Reentry Council recommends supporting AB 2384 because it reduces barriers to employment, housing, and economic stability while promoting successful long-term reentry.

**San Francisco Reentry Council**
Presenter: Alek Hartwick

AB 2428 (Rodriguez): Eliminating Poverty Fees
***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2428 continues California's efforts to eliminate criminal administrative fees that disproportionately burden low-income individuals and create barriers to successful reentry. The bill repeals the remaining poverty-based criminal administrative fees, including fees related to payment plans, bounced checks, community service, and access to court-ordered programs. The Reentry Council recommends supporting AB 2428 because reducing unnecessary financial obligations promotes successful reintegration, improves compliance with court requirements, and advances a more equitable justice system without compromising public safety.

**Department of Public Health**
Presenter: Sarah Neukrug

AB 2486 (Addis): Medi-Cal: Whole Child Model program
***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2486 ensures that families, providers, and stakeholders can continue to shape the California Children's Services (CCS) Program by extending the CCS Advisory Group past its current sunset date of December 31, 2026. Feedback from the Advisory Committee strengthens care coordination and improves outcomes for some of California's most medically vulnerable children participating in the program.

**San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency**
Presenter: Monique Webster

SB 741 (Blakespear): Low Carbon Transit Operations Program
***Recommended Position: Support***

SB 741 would update and streamline the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP). The LCTOP receives funding through the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) and directs millions of dollars annually to transit agencies around the state on a formula basis. These monies have allowed transit agencies to sustain and expand service, procure new zero- emission vehicle fleets, and start fare subsidy programs. Unfortunately, since its inception a decade ago, LCTOP's requirements have proven to be in some cases duplicative and overly burdensome. SB 741 would simplify Caltrans' administrative role, expand eligible uses of program funds to include transit maintenance, and eliminate redundant GHG demonstration requirements for continuing projects.

**Department of Environment**
Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

SB 936 (Blakespear and Umberg): Nitrous oxide: sales
***Recommended Position: Support***

SB 936 aims to address a growing public health, waste management, and public safety concern by prohibiting the sale of nitrous oxide in forms that, while nominally intended for legitimate, lawful purposes, are widely used for recreational inhalation. The bill also establishes penalties and other enforcement actions for violations of the new requirements.

**San Francisco Public Utilities Commission**
Presenter: Scott Ammon

SB 943 (Becker): Public utilities: electricity: retail transmission rates: industrial transition usage
***Recommended Position: Support***

The bill would establish that it is the policy of the State that transmission costs should be allocated to ratepayers based on cost-causation principles. The bill would express the intent of the Legislature that the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) take notice of the policy of the State regarding transmission cost allocation. Additionally, SB 943 would direct the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) by January 1, 2028 to request the CAISO reconsider potential reforms in the transmission access charge structure enhancements proceeding. SB 943 would direct the CPUC to submit to the CAISO recommended changes to the TAC structure to be consistent with cost-causation principles.

V. **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**. Members of the public may address the Council on items of interest that are within the Council'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. Carton 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 Council 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 Council 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.

## **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 sotf@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.

## **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.

## **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=mb662fa718bdd7513b37005d7d7d83e58
  **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:** 2660 515 7079
  - **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 Council 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.

## 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, June 17th, 2026**
**10:00am – 12:00pm**
**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:** 2662 355 8569
- **Meeting Password:** x4pAmMGJZ26
- **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=m60460c1f33c59794d4e508cc928decc3
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 8.

## 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

Meeting called to order at 10:04am.
Present: Eileen Mariano, Renil Bejoy, Andrea Bruss, Greyson Spencer, Eric Manke
Supervisor Connie Chan's Office was not present.
Assessor's Office was not present.

### II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).

Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on May 20th, 2026.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Greyson Spencer
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**

**Department of Environment**
Presenter: Joseph Piasecki and Alice Hur

SB 1283 (Ashby): Electric vehicle charging stations: installation: permits
***Recommended Position: Support***

To keep pace with the growing demand for EV charging deployment, AB 1236 (2015) streamlined the permitting and installation of electric vehicle (EV) charging stations by requiring local jurisdictions to approve these stations through a non-discretionary administrative permit process (e.g., a building permit) that did not require design review. It also prohibited jurisdictions from requiring a use permit for these charging projects unless the charging station would have a specific, evidence-backed adverse impact on health and safety. Lastly, AB 1236 required every local government to adopt, pursuant to specified deadlines, an ordinance and checklist that creates an expedited, streamlined permitting process for EV charging stations.

SB 1283 extends this administrative permit process to EV stations with a canopy, or onsite energy storage systems sized to support charging. The proposed bill also requires expansion of jurisdictions' existing EV charging streamlining ordinances and checklists to implement these changes and include certain EV supporting infrastructure (e.g., battery storage, paving, concrete pads, or utility trenches). Further, SB 1283 requires local jurisdictions to provide written notice to applicants no later than 30 days after approval, as well as identify all permits and authorizations that have been granted.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Greyson Spencer
Approved: 5-0

**Department of Public Health**
Presenter: Max Gara

AB 2135 (Kalra): Long-term health care facilities
***Recommended Position: Oppose unless Amended***

AB 2135 makes several changes to long-term health care (LTC) facility requirements when discharging a resident, including requiring that a 14-day notice is provided to residents who pose a risk to the safety of facility staff or residents before the resident is transferred or discharged.

Motion to approve: Greyson Spencer
Seconded by: Andrea Bruss
Approved: 5-0

**Film SF**
Presenter: Manijeh Fata

AB 2319 (Schultz): Personal Income Tax Law: Corporation Tax Law: credits: qualified motion picture: post-production
***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2319 would establish a standalone California Post-Production Tax Credit administered by the California Film Commission. The bill would provide a tax credit of 35% to 50% for qualified post-production expenditures incurred in California, including editing, sound design, scoring, visual effects, color correction, and other post-production services. The legislation fills a gap in California's existing Film & Television Tax Credit Program by incentivizing post-production work regardless of where principal photography occurred. Film SF recommends supporting this bill because it would help retain and attract high-wage creative and technical jobs, strengthen California's post-production industry, and generate economic activity throughout the state, particularly for post-production facilities and media-sector employment in San Francisco.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Greyson Spencer
Approved: 5-0

**Film SF**
Presenter: Manijeh Fata

AB 2403 (Elhawary and Schiavo): Income Tax: credits: Commercial Production
***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2403 would establish a California Commercial Production Tax Credit Program administered by the California Film Commission. The bill would provide tax credits for qualified commercial productions filmed in California, with enhanced incentives for productions filming outside the Los Angeles zone. Film SF recommends support because the bill would help retain and attract commercial production activity, support high-wage creative and technical jobs, generate economic activity for local businesses, and improve California's competitiveness with other states and countries that offer incentives for commercial production.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Greyson Spencer
Approved: 5-0

**Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector**
Presenter: Rebecca Loya

AB 2558 (Berman): Financial institutions: loans: interest rates
***Recommended Position: Support***

AB 2558 would extend the Military Lending Act's 36 percent annual percentage rate cap to small-dollar consumer loans and deferred deposit (payday) transactions in California.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Greyson Spencer
Approved: 5-0

**Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector**
Presenter: Rebecca Loya

SB 498 (Becker): Incarcerated Persons: Communications
***Recommended Position: Support***

SB 498 would eliminate arbitrary 15-minute limits on tablet voice calls and provide free electronic messaging services for incarcerated individuals and their loved ones, providing much-needed relief to low-income incarcerated people and their families.

Motion to approve: Greyson Spencer
Seconded by: Renil Bejoy
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 10:42am.

## Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carton 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.

## 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 sotf@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.

## 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.

## 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.

## 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, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date Submitted** | 7/10/2026 |
| **Submitting Department** | Dept. on the Status of Women |
| **Contact Name** | Denise Heitzenroder |
| **Contact Email and Phone Number** | Denise.heitzenroder@sfgov.org / 415-252-2576 |
| **SLC Meeting Presenter** | Denise Heitzenroder |
| **Reviewed and approved by Department Head?** | X YES ☐ NO |
| **Reviewed and approved by Commission?** | ☐ YES ☐ NO X N/A |

**AB 1267**
**Assemblymembers Gail Pellerin (D-28), Cottie Petrie-Norris (D-73), Diane Dixon (R-72), and Sharon Quirk-Silva (D-67)**
**Marriage: prohibition on minors**

### Recommended Position

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

### Summary

This bill would update regulations to prohibit individuals under the age of 18 from receiving a marriage license.

### Background/Analysis

Current law allows for individuals under 18 to get a marriage or domestic partnership license if approved by the courts and one parent and if the parties attend marriage counseling. California is one of three states, the other two being Mississippi and New Mexico, that allow children of any age to get married with judicial and parental consent. If passed, this legislation would bring California in line with the 16 states that ban child marriage, which includes states we share values and priorities with.

### Challenge

California should be protecting children and not leaving them vulnerable to exploitative relationships. Numerous organizations, including the U.S. State Department, Human Rights Watch, the National Education Association and numerous other consider child marriage a human rights violation. Child marriage also undermines statutory rape laws and creates a legal shield for child predators and human traffickers.

### Solution/Recommended Proposal

This legislation would amend numerous provisions that provide pathways for children under 18 to enter into marriages or domestic partnerships. It establishes the minimum age for consent to marry or enter a domestic partnership at 18 years.

### Departments Impacted & Why

No anticipated impact on Departments.

**Fiscal Impact**

No costs are expected or associated with this legislation.

**Support / Opposition**

**SUPPORT**

California Commission on the Status of Women & Girls (co-sponsor)

Unchained At Last (co-sponsor)

AHA Foundation

American Atheists

Atheists United

California Catholic Conference

California Freethought Day

California National Organization for Women
CleanEarth4Kids.org

Central Valley Justice Coalition

California Women’s Law Center

County of Santa Clara

Equality Now

FFRF Action Fund

Global Girls Worldwide Women

Girls Inc. of Los Angeles

Indivisible San Jose

Love Never Fails

Muslims for Progressive Values

Protect Our Defenders

Safe House Project

Secular Student Alliance

Tahirih Justice Center

Together We Will

UltraViolet Action

Zonta International, District 9

Zonta Newport Harbor

**OPPOSITION**

ACLU California Action*

*ACLU California Action opposes blank bans on child marriage out of concern that it could push vulnerable children or those in abusive situations into the shadows or more precarious scenarios

## 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, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date Submitted** | July 9, 2026 |
| **Submitting Department** | San Francisco Reentry Council |
| **Contact Name** | Alek Hartwick |
| **Contact Email and Phone Number** | alek.hartwick@gmail.com (628) 652-2341 |
| **SLC Meeting Presenter** | Alek Hartwick |
| **Reviewed and approved by Department Head?** | ☑ YES ☐ NO |
| **Reviewed and approved by Commission?** | ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A |

**AB 2384**
**Assembly Member Lowenthal, D-69, Democrat**
**Crimes: Records: Sealing**

### Recommended Position

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

AB 2384 expands access to record sealing by allowing individuals who remain conviction-free for four years after completing their sentence or following an arrest that did not result in conviction to petition the court to seal eligible criminal records. The Reentry Council recommends supporting AB 2384 because it reduces barriers to employment, housing, and economic stability while promoting successful long-term reentry.

### Background/Analysis

California has enacted numerous criminal record relief measures in recent years to reduce collateral consequences for individuals who have successfully completed their involvement with the justice system. While automatic relief is available in some circumstances, many individuals with older convictions or arrests remain ineligible or continue to face significant barriers because their records remain publicly accessible.

AB 2384 expands eligibility for record sealing by creating a petition process for additional arrests and convictions after a sustained period without new criminal convictions.

### Challenge

Criminal records remain one of the most significant barriers to employment, housing, education, and occupational licensing. Even after individuals have completed their sentence and remained crime-free for years, publicly available criminal records can continue to limit economic opportunities and successful reintegration. For San Francisco, these barriers undermine investments in workforce development, housing stability, and reentry services by limiting opportunities for individuals who have demonstrated rehabilitation.

### Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2384 authorizes eligible individuals to petition the court to seal qualifying arrest and conviction records after four years without a new conviction following completion of their sentence or qualifying arrest.

Expanding record sealing opportunities recognizes demonstrated rehabilitation, improves access to employment and housing, and supports long-term public safety by removing unnecessary barriers to successful reentry.

This bill excludes the following offenses from the relief afforded: serious felonies, violent felonies, offenses requiring sex offender registration, felony domestic violence, DUI, DUI causing injury, and wet reckless. This bill additionally excludes any offense that may be pled and proved as a prior offense for purposes of imposing an increased sentence or enhancement upon conviction.

## Departments Impacted & Why

**Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco:** Administrative processing of record sealing petitions.

**Public Defender's Office:** May assist eligible clients seeking record relief.

## Fiscal Impact

The bill is not expected to have a significant direct fiscal impact on the City and County of San Francisco. Trial courts may experience modest administrative workload associated with processing additional record sealing petitions, which may be partially offset through reduced long-term barriers to employment and recidivism.

## Support / Opposition

Support

ACLU California Action
Californians for Safety and Justice
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Felony Murder Elimination Project
San Quentin Skunkworks
SF Public Defenders Office
Smart Justice California

Opposition

# egislation Committee Proposal Form

ld 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 and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date Submitted** | July 9, 2026 |
| **Submitting Department** | San Francisco Reentry Council |
| **Contact Name** | Alek Hartwick |
| **Contact Email and Phone Number** | alek.hartwick@gmail.com (628) 652-2341 |
| **SLC Meeting Presenter** | Alek Hartwick |
| **Reviewed and approved by Department Head?** | ☑ YES ☐ NO |
| **Reviewed and approved by Commission?** | ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A |

## AB 2428
## Assemblymember, Celeste Rodriguez, Assembly District #43, Democrat
## Eliminating Poverty Fees

### Recommended Position

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

### Summary

AB 2428 continues California's efforts to eliminate criminal administrative fees that disproportionately burden low-income individuals and create barriers to successful reentry. The bill repeals the remaining poverty-based criminal administrative fees, including fees related to payment plans, bounced checks, community service, and access to court-ordered programs. The Reentry Council recommends supporting AB 2428 because reducing unnecessary financial obligations promotes successful reintegration, improves compliance with court requirements, and advances a more equitable justice system without compromising public safety.

### Background/Analysis

Beginning in 2020, California enacted significant criminal justice fee reform by eliminating numerous criminal administrative fees that generated little public revenue while creating substantial financial hardship for justice-involved individuals. These reforms recognized that criminal administrative fees often functioned as poverty penalties rather than meaningful public safety tools.

More recently, the California Supreme Court reinforced these principles in *People v. Kopp*, holding that courts must consider a defendant's ability to pay before imposing certain assessments. Although substantial progress has been made, several administrative fees remain in statute that continue to create financial barriers for individuals involved in the criminal legal system. AB 2428 builds upon these prior reforms by eliminating many of the remaining criminal administrative fees and further aligning California law with recent judicial and legislative efforts to reduce poverty-based barriers within the justice system.

### Challenge

Although California has eliminated many criminal administrative fees, individuals exiting the justice system continue to face financial obligations that often bear little relationship to accountability or public safety. Remaining fees associated with payment plans, bounced payments, community service, and court-ordered programs disproportionately affect individuals with limited financial means, creating additional obstacles to obtaining housing, employment, transportation, and financial stability.

For San Francisco, these financial barriers directly undermine local investments in reentry services and rehabilitation. City departments and community-based organizations devote significant resources toward helping individuals secure employment, housing, behavioral health treatment, and other stabilizing services. Continued reliance on poverty-based administrative fees can delay successful reintegration, increase financial instability, and impede long-term reductions in recidivism.

## Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2428 eliminates several remaining criminal administrative fees, including fees associated with installment payment plans, bounced checks, community service participation, and delayed enrollment in certain court-ordered programs. The bill also requires courts to vacate applicable judgments related to these fees and terminate collection activities for affected obligations.

By removing these remaining financial barriers, the legislation furthers California's transition toward a justice system that emphasizes accountability, rehabilitation, and public safety rather than generating revenue through administrative debt. Supporting AB 2428 aligns with San Francisco's longstanding commitment to evidence-based reentry practices that improve outcomes for justice-involved individuals while reducing unnecessary barriers to successful community reintegration.

## Departments Impacted & Why

**Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco**: Administrative updates to eliminate covered fees, vacate judgments, and discontinue collections.
**San Francisco Adult Probation Department**: Supports successful probation completion by reducing financial barriers to reentry.
**Public Defender's Office**: Benefits clients through reduced criminal administrative debt.

## Fiscal Impact

The bill is not expected to have a significant direct fiscal impact on the City and County of San Francisco. At the state level, the Legislative Analyst and Judicial Council anticipate minor reductions in Trial Court Trust Fund revenue, with potential General Fund backfill if necessary. Trial courts would also incur one-time administrative costs associated with vacating applicable fee judgments, ending collection activities, updating records, and providing required notices. Although the bill may increase certain civil filings by incarcerated individuals through the elimination of filing fees in limited circumstances, current revenues generated from those fees are minimal and are not considered a significant funding source for the courts. For San Francisco, any operational impacts would likely be administrative rather than fiscal and may be offset by improved reentry outcomes and reduced burdens associated with collection of low-value administrative debt.

## Support / Opposition

**Support**
California for Safety and Justice (Sponsor)
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children (Sponsor)
All of Us or None (HQ) (Sponsor)
A New Way of Life Re-entry Project
Coalition on Homelessness, San Francisco
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)
GLIDE
Grace Institute – End Child Poverty in CA
Initiate Justice
Jesse’s Place Organization
Justice2Jobs Coalition
La Defensa
Los Angeles Regional Reentry Partnership (LARRP)
Multi-Faith Action Coalition
San Francisco Public Defender
Starting Over Inc.

The Social Impact Center
Viet Voices
Western Center on Law & Poverty, Inc.

**Oppose**
None submitted

## 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, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date Submitted** | 7/10/26 |
| **Submitting Department** | Department of Public Health |
| **Contact Name** | Sneha Patil; Sneha.patil@sfdph.org |
| **Contact Email and Phone Number** | |
| **SLC Meeting Presenter** | Sarah Neukrug |
| **Reviewed and approved by Department Head?** | **X** YES ☐ NO |
| **Reviewed and approved by Commission?** | ☐ YES ☐ NO **X** N/A |

**AB-2486 Medi-Cal: Whole Child Model program**
**Assembly Member Addis, District #30, Democrat**

### Recommended Position

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


### Summary

AB 2486 ensures that families, providers, and stakeholders can continue to shape the California Children's Services (CCS) Program by extending the CCS Advisory Group past its current sunset date of December 31, 2026. Feedback from the Advisory Committee strengthens care coordination and improves outcomes for some of California's most medically vulnerable children participating in the program.


### Background/Analysis

The California Children's Services (CCS) Program is essential to the health and wellbeing of California's most medically complex, low-income families. The CCS program provides diagnostic and treatment services, medical case management, and physical and occupational therapy health care services to children under 21 years of age with CCS-eligible conditions (e.g., severe genetic diseases, chronic medical conditions, infectious diseases producing major sequelae, and traumatic injuries) from families unable to afford catastrophic health care costs. A child eligible for CCS must be a resident of California, have a CCS-eligible condition, and must generally be income eligible. Approximately 181,000 children are in CCS; of those, roughly 94% are also in Medi-Cal and 6% are in the CCS-only program. California local health departments, such as San Francisco Department of Public Health, administer the California Children's Services Program on behalf of DHCS. In 2025, 1,560 children were in enrolled in San Francisco's CCS program.

In over 30 counties, CCS services are covered and paid for by Medi-Cal Managed Care plans rather than on a fee-for-service basis (referred to as the CCS "carve out" programs). These programs are referred to as CCS Whole Child Model program and were established with the goal of improved care coordination for primary, specialty, and behavioral health services for CCS and non-CCS conditions. Currently, about 29,000 children of the 181,000 are served through WCM, while the rest are served through "Classic CCS".

### Challenge

The CCS Advisory Group was established to advise the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) is essential to ongoing management, coordination, and improvement of the CCS program. Families and support organizations depend upon the Advisory Group for ongoing quality improvement process that keeps complex medical care costs low and improves care for these most vulnerable families. Despite these benefits, there are several challenges with the Advisory Group that limit its impact (both now and in the future):

- Under current law, the CCS Advisory Group is scheduled to sunset December 31, 2026.
- The group was established to support CCS Whole Child Model Counties and not CCS Independent Counties, of which San Francisco County is one. This scope limits the ability of San Francisco, other Counties and CCS Stakeholders to provide feedback regarding the delivery of CCS statewide and ensuring consistency across models of CCS delivery.
- The current advisory group is missing key stakeholders, including families from diverse language and ethnic communities, people with disabilities, immigrant families, caregivers of fee-for-service CCS kids, etc.

The CCS Advisory Group must continue beyond its sunset date for CCS to continue to function for the good of Medi-Cal families with medically complex children. Further, the scope of the group must be better aligned with the different CCS programs across the entire state, and include the diverse stakeholders associated with the program.

**Solution/Recommended Proposal**

AB 2486 would make multiple changes to the CCS Advisory Group, including:

- Renames the Advisory Group from “Whole Child Model program stakeholder advisory group” to the CCS Advisory Group;
- Expands its membership to include representatives of CCS clients not in managed care, former clients, and their caregivers;
- Extends the operation of the Advisory Group for another 10 years;
- Requires DHCS to consult with the Advisory Group on the implementation of both the Whole Child Model and the traditional CCS Classic program, and to consider its recommendations for monitoring and outcome measures.
- Requires DHCS to submit biennial reports to the Legislature on its progress and actions related to the CCS program, incorporating feedback from the CCS advisory group.

These changes would prevent the sunsetting of an important advisory body and would expand its eligible stakeholders to be more representative of the population receiving services and administering care. For example, the expansion would enable San Francisco CCS representatives to apply to be on the CCS Advisory Group. It would also allow Family Voices of California, which is the primary source of family feedback to CCS, a seat on the CCS Advisory Group.

The bill would also better ensure the DHCS oversight of the CCS program is better aligned with program activities occurring across the various counties. Currently, the CCS Advisory Group is one of the only forums available for counties to provide Monitoring & Oversight implementation feedback to the state. Inclusion of Independent CCS Counties/ non-Whole Child Model counties, such as San Francisco, will enable SFDPH to provide more direct feedback on issues that impacts our CCS program. Further, DHCS would be required to consult the CCS Advisory Group and consider its recommendations on monitoring and outcome measures. DHCS has, in the past, requested Monitoring & Oversight data that is not relevant to Independent CCS Counties or that are only available to Medi-Cal Managed Care Plans, making it difficult to comply with oversight requirements. The proposed changes in AB 2486 will ensure DHCS puts forward requirements that are more feasible for counties to implement and thereby reduces the chance of Monitoring & Oversight penalties being applied.

For these reasons, we recommend a support position on the bill.

**Departments Impacted & Why**

No other department would be impacted

**Fiscal Impact**

Local: No direct fiscal impact to San Francisco.

State: Analysis for the bill estimate the cost associated with the bill is likely less than $150,00 per year for DHCS to maintain the advisory group and produce a report every two years.

**Support / Opposition**

**Support**: Children Now (sponsor); Children's Hospital Association; County Health

Executives Association of California; Disability Rights CA; Health Officers Association of California; Western Center on Law & Poverty, Inc.

**Oppose**: None on file.

## 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, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date Submitted** | July 9, 2026 |
| **Submitting Department** | MTA |
| **Contact Name** | Monique Webster |
| **Contact Email and Phone Number** | monique.webster@sfmta.com |
| **SLC Meeting Presenter** | Monique Webster |
| **Reviewed and approved by Department Head?** | X YES ☐ NO |
| **Reviewed and approved by Commission?** | ☐ YES ☐ NO X N/A |

**SB 741**
**Senator Blakespear, District 38, Democrat**
**Low Carbon Transit Operations Program**
**Recommended Position**

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

### Summary

SB 741 would update and streamline the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP). The LCTOP receives funding through the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) and directs millions of dollars annually to transit agencies around the state on a formula basis. These monies have allowed transit agencies to sustain and expand service, procure new zero- emission vehicle fleets, and start fare subsidy programs. Unfortunately, since its inception a decade ago, LCTOP's requirements have proven to be in some cases duplicative and overly burdensome. SB 741 would simplify Caltrans' administrative role, expand eligible uses of program funds to include transit maintenance, and eliminate redundant GHG demonstration requirements for continuing projects.

### Background/Analysis

The LCTOP was established by the Legislature with the passage of SB 862 in 2014. The primary purpose of the program is to provide operating and capital assistance for transit agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The program is currently administered by the Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Air Resources Board, and State Controller's Office.

The program's guidelines, established by statute, include using funding for enhanced/expanded transit service, operational expenditures that increase transit mode share, and zero-emission buses. Eligible recipients are transportation planning agencies and transit operators eligible for State Transit Assistance (STA) funds per Public Utilities Code 99313 or 99314. The State Controller's Office annually releases a list of LCTOP allocations.

In recent years, the SFMTA has benefitted from over $20 million annually in LCTOP funding with the vast majority going toward Muni’s free and reduced fare program for seniors, youth, and disabled riders.

## Challenge

For more than a decade, LCTOP has provided dedicated investments for low carbon transit operations and specified capital improvements. Transit agencies across the state rely on funding from the program; however, over time its administrative requirements have become increasingly burdensome for transit agencies seeking to use funding toward otherwise eligible uses. Currently, transit agencies must navigate an administrative process involving multiple state agencies, complex data requirements, and extensive modeling to verify expenditures that the state has already determined to reduce emissions. Additionally, program restrictions, such as limiting operational expenses to only certain years, can make planning difficult and interrupt successful initiatives of growing ridership.

## Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 741 streamlines the LCTOP administrative process by requiring a recipient agency to submit a list of qualified expenditures to Caltrans. Caltrans would then submit a list of qualified requests to the Controller for apportionment. A recipient agency would be required to report specified information to Caltrans for each fiscal year that funding is expended.

Specifically, this bill:

1) Authorizes transit agencies to expend LCTOP funds on the following:
    - a) Maintenance or expansion of bus, rail, or ferry services, including, but not limited to, equipment acquisition, vehicles, fueling, maintenance, and other costs to operate bus, rail, and ferry services.
    - b) Transit fare subsidies, including, but not limited to, discounted and free student transit passes.
    - c) Network and fare integration technology improvements.
2) Repeals the requirement for transit agencies to expend LCTOP funds on:
    - a) Expenditures that directly enhance or expand transit service by supporting new or expanded bus or rail services, new or expanded waterborne transit, or expanded intermodal transit facilities, and may include equipment acquisition, fueling, and maintenance, and other costs to operate those services or facilities.
    - b) Operational expenditures increase transit mode share.
    - c) Expenditures related to the purchase of zero-emission buses, including electric buses, and the installation of the necessary equipment and infrastructure to operate and support these zero-emission buses.
3) Repeals the requirement for transit agencies to expend 50% of their total funds on projects that benefit disadvantaged communities, as identified with guidance developed by State Air Resources Board (CARB).
4) Requires transit agencies to submit to the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) a list of services or programs proposed to be funded with the funds prior to receiving the funds. The list of services or programs proposed to be funded by the program may be for a single year or for multiple years. The list of services or programs proposed to be funded with the funds shall include a description and location of each proposed service or program.
5) Requires Caltrans to report to the Controller a recipient transit agency has submitted a list of services or programs and is eligible for funding for the applicable fiscal year.

6) Requires a transit agency to submit documentation to Caltrans that includes a description and the location of each completed service or program on an annual basis.

## Departments Impacted & Why

SFMTA

## Fiscal Impact

This bill would streamline how transit agencies receive LCTOP funds, making overall funding obligations more efficient and saving hours of City staff time each year.

## Support / Opposition

SUPPORT
California Transit Association (CTA) – SPONSOR
Sunline Transit Agency
San Diego MTS
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Orange County Transportation Authority
North County Transit District
Foothill Transit
Streets For All

OPPOSE
None on file

**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, Aly Bonde at aly.bonde@sfgov.org, and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date Submitted** | 7/10/2026 |
| **Submitting Department** | ENV |
| **Contact Name** | Chris Lester |
| **Contact Email and Phone Number** | Christopher.Lester@sfgov.org |
| **SLC Meeting Presenter** | Joseph Piasecki |
| **Reviewed and approved by Department Head?** | YES ☐ NO |
| **Reviewed and approved by Commission?** | ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A |

**Senate Bill 936**
**Senator Catherine Blakespear, Senate 38th District, D-Encinitas; and, Senator Tom Umberg, Senate 34th District, D-Santa Ana**
**Nitrous oxide: sales.**

**Recommended Position**

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

**Summary**

SB 936 aims to address a growing public health, waste management, and public safety concern by prohibiting the sale of nitrous oxide in forms that, while nominally intended for legitimate, lawful purposes, are widely used for recreational inhalation. The bill also establishes penalties and other enforcement actions for violations of the new requirements.

**Background/Analysis**

Nitrous oxide (“nitrous”) is a colorless gas commonly used in dentistry and clinical settings to manage pain and anxiety. It also has legitimate uses in food preparation and industrial applications. Nitrous is also commonly misused as a recreational drug because inhalation produces short-lived euphoric and dissociative effects. Recreational users typically consume nitrous from balloons filled from small canisters designed for whipped cream dispensers or, increasingly, from larger-capacity cylinders.

Existing law makes it a misdemeanor to sell or distribute nitrous to anyone under 18. It also criminalizes dispensing nitrous to a person the provider knows – or should know – intends to use it for intoxication and later causes serious bodily injury or death. Additionally, sellers must document each transaction, including verifying the purchaser’s age. Despite these requirements, recreational nitrous misuse has increased in recent years, particularly among teens and young adults, due to its low cost and widespread availability online and in grocery stores, convenience stores, gas stations, and tobacco or vape retailers. Although often viewed as harmless, frequent or high-volume use can cause severe neurological, cardiovascular, and psychiatric harm, including hallucinations, delusions, seizures, coma, and death.

Recreational nitrous misuse also creates waste management and public safety challenges due to the resulting waste. Empty containers are frequently discarded in parks, at music festivals, and in other public spaces, contributing to litter and requiring additional cleanup by local agencies. Larger cylinders – which have become increasingly popular with recreational users – pose an especially significant challenge from a waste management standpoint. Even when they appear empty, these cylinders often retain residual pressurized gas, creating a hazard because pressurized containers can rupture if crushed or heated. Nitrous oxide is also a strong oxidizer that can intensify fires if released near an ignition source. Waste cylinders that are improperly disposed of in the trash or recycling can explode during waste collection or sorting, endangering workers and damaging equipment. These hazards make larger cylinders extremely costly to manage. For example, Recology San Francisco's vendor charges approximately $130 per cylinder to process and dispose of the item, more than the purchase price of a new cylinder.

Momentum is building across the Bay Area and elsewhere in California to restrict nitrous sales. San Francisco Supervisor Sauter recently introduced an ordinance to restrict retail sales of nitrous. San Jose has already enacted an emergency ban on nitrous sales in smoke shops and tobacco retailers, and San Mateo County unanimously approved drafting an ordinance to prohibit retail sales in unincorporated areas.

## Challenge

The widespread availability of nitrous and the waste resulting from recreational misuse have created significant public health, waste management, and public safety challenges in San Francisco. Recreational misuse is associated with a range of severe health impacts. After use, nitrous waste is often improperly discarded in parks and other public spaces, requiring additional cleanup by City agencies and adding high disposal costs that are ultimately borne by the City's General Fund or refuse ratepayers. They also pose safety hazards to sanitation and waste management workers when placed in the trash or recycling.

## Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 936 seeks to reduce recreational nitrous misuse by prohibiting the sale of nitrous – both in-person and via online or other digital methods – in the forms that are most commonly associated with non-medical inhalation. Specifically, SB 936 prohibits the sale or distribution of: (1) nitrous oxide in containers with greater than 8 grams; (2) nitrous oxide in a container that allows for direct inhalation; (3) nitrous that has the taste or flavor of any food; (4) devices that facilitate nitrous inhalation. The bill also establishes penalties for violations of these requirements. By limiting access – particularly among young people – the bill may help reduce related public health harms. The bill would also help decrease the volume of discarded nitrous containers, reducing litter, protecting sanitation and waste management workers, and lowering cleanup and disposal costs for City departments, event venues, and refuse ratepayers.

## Departments Impacted & Why

If passed, SB 936 is expected to provide the following benefits:

- Public Works and the Recreation and Parks Department would see a reduction in the volume of nitrous waste discarded in parks, streets, and other public areas they manage, lowering cleanup and related disposal costs.

- City departments – along with all other refuse ratepayers – could also benefit from a reduction in the amount of nitrous waste entering the waste stream, which would help lower related handling and disposal costs that contribute to future rate increases.

## Fiscal Impact

SB 936 is expected to have minimal fiscal impacts for San Francisco. Public Works and the Recreation and Parks Department will likely experience reduced cleanup and disposal costs due to lower volumes of discarded nitrous waste. Local enforcement agencies such as the Department of Public Health and the Police Department may incur increased costs from conducting inspections and other compliance activities at impacted retailers to enforce the new requirement. At the state level, the California Department of Public Health may also experience increased enforcement-related costs.

## Support / Opposition

**Support**: County of Orange (Co-Sponsor); National Stewardship Action Council (Co-Sponsor); Rural County Representatives of California (Co-Sponsor); San Diego County District Attorney's Office (Co-Sponsor); California Behavioral Health Planning Council; California Cannabis Operators Association; California CUPA Forum; California Medical Association; California Narcotic Officers' Association; California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice; California Product Stewardship Council; Californians Against Waste; City of Carlsbad; City of Ventura; County of Santa Barbara; County of Santa Clara; Del Norte Solid Waste Management Authority; Dental Board of California; Good Farmers Great Neighbors; Health Officers Association of California; League of California Cities; Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts; Recology; Republic Services; Resource Recovery Coalition of California; RethinkWaste; San Francisco Marin Medical Society; StopWaste; SWANA California Chapters Legislative Task Force; Tehama County Solid Waste Management Agency; Urban Counties of California; Western Placer Waste Management Authority; Zero Waste Marin

**Oppose**: ACLU California Action

(based on Assembly Committee on Business and Professions analysis dated 6/16/2026)

## 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, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date Submitted** | 7/6/2026 |
| **Submitting Department** | San Francisco Public Utilities Commission |
| **Contact Name** | Scott Ammon |
| **Contact Email and Phone Number** | sammon@sfwater.org; 415-407-5208 |
| **SLC Meeting Presenter** | Scott Ammon |
| **Reviewed and approved by Department Head?** | **X** YES ☐ NO |
| **Reviewed and approved by Commission?** | ☐ YES ☐ NO **X** N/A |

**SB 943**
**Senator Josh Becker, District #13, Democrat**
**Public utilities: electricity: retail transmission rates: industrial transition usage.**

### Recommended Position

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

### Summary


The bill would establish that it is the policy of the State that transmission costs should be allocated to ratepayers based on cost-causation principles. The bill would express the intent of the Legislature that the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) take notice of the policy of the State regarding transmission cost allocation. Additionally, SB 943 would direct the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) by January 1, 2028 to request the CAISO reconsider potential reforms in the transmission access charge structure enhancements proceeding. SB 943 would direct the CPUC to submit to the CAISO recommended changes to the TAC structure to be consistent with cost-causation principles.

The SFPUC recommends a Support position for SB 943.


### Background/Analysis

The Transmission Access Charge (TAC) is the primary fee electricity customers in the CAISO balancing authority area must pay to fund the high-voltage electric transmission grid in California. The TAC covers both the cost of access to the transmission grid and infrastructure maintenance costs. In 2017, the CAISO considered potential changes to the TAC structure through the Transmission Access Charge Structure Enhancements Initiative which would have more equitably allocated the costs of owning, operating, and maintaining transmission facilities under the CAISO's operational control. However, in 2018, the CAISO tabled consideration of these reforms to focus on other emerging priorities.[1]

### Challenge

The current TAC structure fails to equitably allocate costs proportional to electric customers' actual system utilization, particularly during congested periods. The TAC is currently based on a volumetric-only approach which reflects the amount of energy delivered. However, this volumetric-only approach does not account for the cost of energy delivery benefits occurring during the highest usage peak hours. As a result, the current TAC structure does not equitably allocate costs to entities responsible for driving periods of peak congestion, which is a primary driver of transmission investment and costs.

### Solution/Recommended Proposal

[1] Initiative: Transmission Access Charge Structure Enhancements. *California Independent System Operator*. https://stakeholdercenter.caiso.com/StakeholderInitiatives/Transmission-access-charge-structure-enhancements

The SFPUC recommends a Support position for SB 943.

### Departments Impacted & Why

By encouraging the CAISO to consider reforms to its existing TAC structure to better reflect cost-causation of transmission investments, the bill would promote more equitable cost allocation. As a result, the bill would reduce transmission costs allocated to ratepayers of Hetch Hetchy Power while ensuring that entities with high coincident peak demand pay their fair share of transmission costs.

### Fiscal Impact

This bill would encourage the CAISO to more equitably allocate transmission costs based on cost-causation principles. SB 943 would thereby reduce transmission costs allocated to ratepayers of load-serving entities with high load factors, or less "peaky" demand on the transmission system, such as Hetch Hetchy Power.

### Support / Opposition

*Support*
350 Humboldt
Amy's Kitchen
Antora Energy, INC.
Asian Pacific Environmental Network
Bellwether Coffee
Bluegreen Alliance
Brightline Defense
California Large Energy Consumers Association
California Solar & Storage Association
Carbon Free Silicon Valley
Center for Community Action & Environmental Justice
Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy
Clean Earth 4 Kids
Climate Action California
Climate Action California (UNREG)
Climate Action Campaign
Climate Action Campaign At the Humboldt Uu Fellowship
Climate Reality Project, Orange County Chapter
Democrats of Greater Irvine
Fresnans Against Fracking
Industrious Labs
Long Beach Alliance for Clean Energy
Long Duration Energy Storage Council
Menlo Spark
Natural Resources Defense Council
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
Net-zero California
Project 203
Project Green Home
Redeemer Community Partnership
Renewable Thermal Collaborative (RTC)
Rondo Energy
Rondo Energy, INC.
Sandiego350 Santa Cruz Climate Action Network Sierra Club California
Sierra Nevada Brewing Company
Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action
Skyven Technologies
St. George Spirits
State Water Contractors
Sunflower Alliance
The 2035 Initiative At UC Santa Barbara
The Climate Reality Project Los Angeles Chapter The Climate Reality Project Orange County Chapter
The Climate Reality Project San Diego Chapter
The Climate Reality Project, Sacramento Chapter The Climate Reality Project, San Fernando Valley CA Chapter
Usgbc California
Women for American Values and Ethics (WAVE)

*Opposition*
None on file.