



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**
- II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).** Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on May 20th, 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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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. 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
Wednesday, May 20th, 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:** 2664 482 6953
- **Meeting Password:** qbUbwMuz787
- **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=m16818a59e76630cc46c0087410e7acc8>
- **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 – Jen Kwart
Controller’s Office – Greyson Spencer
Treasurer’s Office – Eric Manke

AGENDA

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Eileen Mariano, Renil Bejoy, Holly Lung, Jen Kwart, Greyson Spencer, Eric Manke

Supervisor Connie Chan’s Office was not present.

- II. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).** Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on April 15th, 2026.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Greyson Spencer
Approved: 6-0

- 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

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Presenter: Kyra Geithman

SB 1170 (Durazo): Joint powers agreements: nonprofit housing developers
Recommended Position: Support

SB 1170 would authorize nonprofit housing developers to enter into joint powers agreements with public agencies for the purpose of risk pooling, including pooling self-insured claims or losses. The bill would also authorize nonprofit housing developers to provide insurance through a joint powers agreement and to be coinsured under a master policy with premiums prorated among participating entities. MOHCD recommends that the City support SB 1170 because it could help nonprofit affordable housing developers access more stable and potentially lower-cost insurance options, addressing a growing cost pressure that threatens the preservation and production of affordable housing.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Greyson Spencer
Approved: 6-0

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector

Presenter: Eric Manke

AB 2705 (Dixon): Property
Recommended Position: Support

AB 2705 establishes important consumer protections and simplifies the process for a party of interest to claim and receive the excess proceeds from the sale of a tax-defaulted property. The bill requires written agreements between private asset finder companies and claimants, mandates disclosures that the consumer may file their claim directly with the county at no cost, prohibits the collection of fees prior to

the approval and payment of a claim, and limits fees to no more than 10 percent of the excess proceeds awarded.

Motion to approve: Holly Lung

Seconded by: Renil Bejoy

Approved: 6-0

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Presenter: Hailey Gil

AB 1556 (Haney): Recovery residences: funding

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1556 (Haney, 2026), would bring clarity to state law ensuring that recovery residences are eligible for state funds and are in compliance with Housing First law.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Jen Kwart

Approved: 6-0

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Presenter: Hailey Gil

AB 1924 (Gabriel): Statewide homelessness prevention strategy

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1924 would require the California Department of Housing & Community Development to create and publish a homelessness prevention strategy applicable to certain state agencies, but also including evidence-based model homeless prevention practices.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Jen Kwart

Approved: 6-0

Department of Environment

Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

SB 1167 (Blakespear): Vehicles: Electric Bicycles

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1167 would strengthen consumer protections around how electric bicycles and higher-powered electric vehicles are marketed and sold in California. Under existing state and federal law, a legal electric bicycle must have fully operable pedals and a motor not exceeding 750 watts, and must fall within one of the three defined classes: Class 1 (pedal-assist only, up to 20 mph), Class 2 (throttle-assisted, up to 20 mph), or Class 3 (pedal-assist with a speedometer, up to 28 mph). Vehicles meeting these standards require no license, registration, or insurance. SB 1167 reaffirms and clarifies these classifications by making it explicitly illegal to advertise,

sell, or label a motor-driven cycle, moped, or other high-powered electric vehicle as an “electric bicycle” if it does not meet them — a deceptive practice that has created widespread consumer confusion about what riders are actually purchasing. Violations would constitute false advertising under California's Business and Professions Code. The bill would also require manufacturers and sellers of these higher-powered electric vehicles to provide a standard disclosure in all advertising, including online, informing consumers that the device is a motor vehicle subject to applicable registration, licensing, and insurance requirements.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Jen Kwart
Approved: 6-0

SF Public Utilities Commission

Presenter: Kellie McManamon

AB 2739 (Soria): Water: affordability and system stabilization
Recommended Position: Support

AB 2739 would establish the Water Affordability and System Stabilization Trust as a permanent, charitable trust to generate a continuous funding stream for water affordability programs in California. The Trust would be managed by the State Treasurer, with investment income distributed annually to two primary programs: the Water Rate Assistance Fund, administered by the State Water Resources Control Board, and the Community Water Affordability Program, administered by the Department of Water Resources (DWR). The bill protects the Trust by ensuring funds are not appropriated elsewhere while using investment earnings to provide both direct ratepayer assistance and grants for local water infrastructure projects that reduce long-term system costs. AB 2739 also creates a new DWR-administered grant program to fund projects that improve water supply, water quality, and energy efficiency, with the goal of lowering ratepayer costs over time.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Greyson Spencer
Approved: 6-0

SF Public Utilities Commission

Presenter: Kellie McManamon

SB 1125 (Menjivar): Water Rate Assistance Program
Recommended Position: Support

SB 1125 establishes a statewide Water Rate Assistance Program in California to help make water more affordable for low-income households. The bill creates a dedicated Water Rate Assistance Fund, administered by the State Water Resources Control Board, which upon legislative appropriation, would provide direct financial assistance through bill credits to eligible residential water customers.

The program is designed to address gaps in existing policy by implementing a

statewide affordability system. It prioritizes low-income households and allows local water agencies to either participate directly or integrate the funding into their own assistance programs.

In addition to financial assistance, SB 1125 requires the state to regularly assess water affordability needs and funding levels, helping ensure the program is responsive to rising costs and system disparities. Overall, the bill creates a structured, statewide mechanism to reduce water cost burdens while supporting equitable access to safe drinking water.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Greyson Spencer
Approved: 6-0

SF Public Utilities Commission

Presenter: Scott Ammon

SB 1098 (Pérez): Public utilities: forecast-based ratemaking
Recommended Position: Support

The bill would establish that forecast-based utility ratemaking through the General Rate Case (GRC) process is the State's preferred and primary method of establishing authorized revenue requirements for electric and gas investor-owned utilities (IOUs). The bill would limit the use of memorandum and balancing accounts to exceptional circumstances and would require cost-sharing for costs recovered through such accounts. The bill would also require a reduced rate of return for costs recovered through such accounts, clear expiration dates for individual accounts, and the transition of activities or programs covered by such accounts to the GRC process at the earliest feasible opportunity.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Jen Kwart
Approved: 6-0

Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

AB 2571 (Flora): Reimbursement for pharmacist services
Recommended Position: Support

AB 2571 aims to improve access to pharmacist-provided health services by allowing Medi-Cal and health care service plans to reimburse pharmacists enrolled as providers with the plan for medication therapy management (MTM) services beyond services within a pharmacy, such as Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHC) and clinics.

Motion to approve: Holly Lung
Seconded by: Renil Bejoy
Approved: 6-0

Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

SB 1422 (Durazo): Medi-Cal: eligibility: immigration status

Recommended Position: Support

SB 1422 would restore enrollment access to full-scope Medi-Cal for undocumented adults ages 19 and older starting January 1, 2027.

Motion to approve: Jen Kwart

Seconded by: Renil Bejoy

Approved: 6-0

Department on the Status of Women

Presenter: Denise Heitzenroder

AB 2531 (Irwin): Public health: abortion services

Recommended Position: Support

The bill would amend Sections 127632, 127633, and 127634 of the Health and Safety Code, and add Section 92 to the Military and Veterans Code. These changes would allow Medi-Cal enrolled providers to apply for grants and continuation of grants if they provide abortion and contraception services to veterans, in addition to those communities that already qualify a provider to apply: "individuals with a household income at or below 400% of the federal poverty level who are uninsured or have health care coverage that does not include both abortion and contraception and are not otherwise eligible to receive both abortion and contraception care at no cost through the Medi-Cal and Family PACT programs." It would also require bill would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to publish a link to the State Department of Public Health's abortion information internet website on the women veterans' resources page of its internet website.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Holly Lung

Approved: 6-0

San Francisco Police Department

Presenter: Steven Lopez

AB 1877 (Stefani): Domestic Violence: protective orders

Recommended Position: Support

Current law makes the second or subsequent violation of specified protective/stay away orders within a seven-year period of a prior conviction and involving an act of violence or credible threat of violence punishable by misdemeanor or felony.

This bill would make the willful and knowing violation of specified criminal

protective/restraining orders punishable by a misdemeanor or felony offense if the restrained party was arrested for, charged with, or convicted of a felony for the conduct upon which the order was based. The bill makes a second or subsequent violation of specified criminal protective orders a felony offense, punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for 16 months to 3 years. Lastly, if the violation of a specified order alleges a physical injury, the bill would require a court to consider the violation and alleged injury when considering the seriousness of the offense charged and bail for the defendant.

Public comment in support by Denise Heitzenroder of the Department on the Status of Women.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy
Seconded by: Jen Kwart
Approved: 6-0

- 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 11:12am.

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.

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. 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	June 11, 2026
Submitting Department	ENV
Contact Name	Joseph Piasecki and Alice Hur
Contact Email and Phone Number	Joseph.piasecki@sfgov.org ; Alice.hur@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Joseph Piasecki and Alice Hur
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 1283

Senator Ashby, District 8, Democrat

Electric vehicle charging stations: installation: permits

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

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.

Background/Analysis

This action will reduce the administrative and regulatory burden to help San Francisco meet its transportation electrification goals through public EV charging set forth in Environment Code Chapter 9 and the 2026 Climate Action Plan. It makes approvals for EV stations with canopies or onsite energy storage systems faster, more consistent, and allows jurisdictions to more rapidly expand EV charging infrastructure to meet growing demand.

Challenge

This bill is intended to further streamline the deployment of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in support of the state's efforts to decarbonize the transportation sector. While prior legislation streamlined the

permitting and installation of charging stations through ministerial approvals, ambiguities in existing law have prevented local jurisdictions from streamlining essential additions to EV charging stations such as canopies and on-site energy storage systems. The bill would address certain local review processes that can impede the installation of EV charging facilities, helping to accelerate the expansion of accessible charging infrastructure throughout California.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill addresses additional discretionary approval processes and permits around EV charging by extending ministerial permitting to associated canopies, supporting infrastructure, and energy storage. This state-mandated streamlining measure also requires the formalization of these amendments in existing local ordinances and checklists, ensuring that additional, discretionary local approvals and permitting processes are not integrated into the approval mechanism for these EV charging projects.

Departments Impacted & Why

Impacted departments are the Planning Department, which has oversight of several discretionary permitting processes, as well as the Department of Building Inspection, which issues building permits for EV charging stations in San Francisco.

Fiscal Impact

None. Updating the ordinance and checklist fits within the existing clean transportation scope of work for the Environment Department.

Support / Opposition

Support: Electric Vehicle Charging Association, California Electric Transportation Coalition, ChargePoint INC, Coalition for Clean Air, Electrify America, LLC Ionna Scout Motors INC. Tesla Motors, INC.

Opposition: California State Association of Counties, League of California Cities, Rural County Representatives of California.



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	6/5/26
Submitting Department	Department of Public Health
Contact Name	Max Gara; 628-271-7517
Contact Email and Phone Number	Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org Sneha Patil; Sneha.patil@sfdph.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Max Gara
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2135: Long-term health care facilities
Asm Karla, District #24, Democrat

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended
 OPPOSE **OTHER & Describe: Oppose unless Amended**

Summary

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.

Background/Analysis

California has approximately 1,166 skilled nursing facilities (SNF) with 108,000 beds. SNF residents often have high medical needs and rely on care from their facility to receive rehabilitation, get assistance with activities of daily living, or sustain their life. Federal and state law include important protections for residents of nursing homes, including written notice requirements for facility-initiated transfers or discharge as well as requiring that information be communicated to residents in a manner that they can understand.

Federal law generally requires that notice of transfer and discharge be provided to SNF

residents a minimum of 30 days prior to facility-initiated transfer or discharge. However, there are important exceptions that enable the facility to provide the notice as soon as practicable, such as when the safety of individuals in the facility is endangered due to the clinical or behavioral status of the resident.¹

San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) owns and operates Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH), which is a 769-bed skilled nursing. LHH is one of the largest skilled nursing facilities in the United States and represents one of the most extensive commitments by any city or county to therapeutic care for seniors and adults with disabilities. LHH is fully committed to the safety and health of both its residents and staff. When a resident endangers staff or other residents, LHH takes multiple steps to address the problem behavioral prior to initiating a facility discharge. Specifically, LHH will undertake the following:

1. Have the Behavioral Emergency Response Team (BERT) meet with the resident and engage them in their aggressive behaviors to mitigate issues/concerns.
2. Engage Behavioral Health Services to support the resident and engage them in a variety of therapy methods.

¹ [42 CFR 483.15](#)

3. Provide Patient Safety contracts indicating the expectations and policies of the facility.
4. Engage the Ombudsman.
5. Assess if other care plan interventions would be helpful.
6. Assess if the resident would be better suited or prefer a different facility.
7. Assess if there are loved ones who can engage with the resident.

Challenge

State and federal regulations for skilled nursing facility transfer or discharges aim to prevent unsafe and unnecessary transfers, which can have serious consequences for residents' health and well-being. Despite these rules, according to the California Department of Aging Office of the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman 2025 National Ombudsman Reporting System, since 2018, California nursing homes have received more than 2,500 federal deficiencies related to improper discharge practices. Advocates argue that protections for nursing homes residents must be strengthened to prevent these improper discharge practices.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2135 makes several changes to long-term health care (LTC) facility requirements when discharging a resident, including certain requirements when transferring or discharging residents who pose a risk to the safety of facility staff or residents.

While we recognize the bill's intent to strengthen protections for residents of nursing homes, AB 2135 is inconsistent with federal law and eliminates critical flexibility intended to protect staff and resident safety. Specifically, we are concerned with the requirement that only allows the transfer or discharges of a resident whose behavior endangers the health and safety of individuals in the facility if the facility can transfer the individual to a facility that is expected to "address the resident's endangerment to the health and safety of individuals". This requirement assumes that the reason someone would be a danger to others is related to an unmet healthcare need. The discharging facility is responsible for safely discharging residents and ensuring they receive the health services and care they need at the discharge location. It is not the discharging

facility's responsibility to ensure the safety of others from that person when they go to another facility. This is the responsibility of the discharge location, and it is not reasonable, nor within federal regulations, to put that burden on the discharging facility.

This requirement would impose a significant burden on facilities like Laguna Honda Hospital that potentially endanger residents and staff. LHH takes a comprehensive approach when addressing dangerous resident behavioral prior to initiating a transfer or discharge. As a result, LHH has very rarely had to discharge a patient in this manner. As such, the Department recommends an **Oppose Unless Amended (OUA)** position on AB 2135. Specifically, we request that the bill be amended to align the notice periods with federal law or to clarify that the 14-day minimum notice period would not apply under specified situations such as when a resident poses a risk to the facility residents or staff.

Departments Impacted & Why

No other department would be impacted by the bill.

Fiscal Impact

State: Costs of an unknown, but likely minor and absorbable amount, to CDPH. No costs to the Department of Justice and the Department of Health Care Services.

Support / Opposition

Support/Cosponsor: California Advocates for Nursing Home Reform ; California Long-Term Care Ombudsman Association; California Council of the Blind; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund

Oppose Unless Amended: California Association of Health Facilities; LeadingAge California; California Hospital 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, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	6/5/2026
Submitting Department	Film SF Film Commission
Contact Name	Manijeh Fata
Contact Email and Phone Number	Manijeh.fata@sfgov.org 415-554-6241
SLC Meeting Presenter	Manijeh Fata
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2319

Assemblymember Nick Schultz {D} D-44

Personal Income Tax Law: Corporation Tax Law: credits: qualified motion picture: post-production

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

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.

Background/Analysis

California's Film & Television Tax Credit Program has successfully attracted and retained film and television production activity. However, current incentives primarily focus on principal photography and do not adequately incentivize projects to complete post-production work in California if principal photography occurs elsewhere or if the project does not qualify for the state's production incentive program. As a result, significant post-production work—including editing, visual effects, sound design, and scoring—has migrated to competing states and countries that offer standalone post-production incentives. Jurisdictions such as New York, New Jersey, New Mexico, Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom have established competitive post-production incentive programs that have successfully attracted this work away from California.

Challenge

California remains home to a world-class post-production workforce and infrastructure, but the state is increasingly losing projects to jurisdictions that provide targeted incentives for post-production services. While productions may still choose California for creative, logistical, or talent-related reasons, post-production work is often relocated to other states or countries to take advantage of standalone incentives. This trend threatens thousands of skilled jobs, including editors, assistant editors, sound designers, mixers, composers, visual effects artists, and post-production facility staff. For San Francisco, the loss of post-

production activity impacts local creative workers, small businesses, and the broader media ecosystem that supports film and television production.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2319 would create a dedicated post-production tax credit program administered by the California Film Commission. The bill would provide incentives for qualified post-production expenditures performed in California, including visual effects work, regardless of where a project was filmed. By establishing a standalone incentive, California would become more competitive with other jurisdictions that currently attract post-production work. The legislation would help retain existing jobs, attract new projects, support California-based post-production facilities, and strengthen the state's overall creative economy.

Departments Impacted & Why

Film SF (San Francisco Film Commission): Positive impact. The legislation supports San Francisco's film and media workforce by helping retain and attract post-production projects, businesses, and jobs.

Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD): Positive impact. The bill supports workforce development, small businesses, and employment in the creative economy.

Fiscal Impact

The bill does not have a direct fiscal impact on the City and County of San Francisco. However, increased post-production activity in California may generate indirect economic benefits for San Francisco through job creation, business activity, and local spending by creative professionals and production companies.

At the state level, the bill would establish a new tax expenditure program administered by the California Film Commission and authorize up to \$100 million annually in tax credits for qualified post-production expenditures. While the program would reduce state tax revenues through the issuance of tax credits, supporters argue that the resulting economic activity, employment, and business growth would offset a portion of those costs through increased economic output, tax generation, and the retention of high-wage creative and technical jobs in California.

Support / Opposition

Support

- California Post Alliance (CAPA)
- Motion Picture Editors Guild
- Entertainment industry stakeholders and post-production professionals

Opposition

- Assemblymember Carl DeMaio
- Assemblymember Diane Dixon Ellis
- Assemblymember James Gallagher



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	6/5/2026
Submitting Department	Film SF Film Commission
Contact Name	Manijeh Fata
Contact Email and Phone Number	Manijeh.fata@sfgov.org 415-554-6241
SLC Meeting Presenter	Manijeh Fata
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2403

Assemblymember Sade Elhawary {D} D-57 and Assemblymember Pilar Schiavo {D} D-40 Income Tax: credits: Commercial Production

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

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.

Background/Analysis

California's Film and Television Tax Credit Program has historically focused on feature films, television series, and other long-form content. Commercial productions are currently ineligible for California's production tax credit programs despite representing a significant source of employment for crew members, vendors, equipment rental companies, locations, hotels, caterers, transportation providers, and post-production facilities.

Over the past decade, commercial production has become increasingly mobile, with advertisers and agencies choosing to film in states and countries that offer dedicated incentives. As a result, California has lost a substantial share of commercial production activity despite its unmatched workforce, infrastructure, and locations.

Challenge

Commercial production is an important component of San Francisco's film and media economy. The city has historically been a leading destination for commercial production due to its iconic locations, skilled workforce, and concentration of creative industries. However, commercial producers increasingly choose competing jurisdictions that offer financial incentives, resulting in lost jobs and economic activity for local workers and businesses.

The decline in commercial production impacts a broad range of San Francisco businesses, including production companies, equipment rental houses, hotels, restaurants, transportation providers, post-production facilities, and other small businesses that support production activity. Reduced commercial production also limits opportunities for local crew members and creative professionals.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2403 would create a dedicated commercial production tax credit to encourage advertisers, agencies, and production companies to conduct commercial shoots in California. By reducing the cost differential between California and competing jurisdictions, the bill would help retain existing commercial production activity and attract new projects to the state.

For San Francisco, the legislation would strengthen the city's ability to compete for commercial projects, support local businesses that depend on production activity, increase employment opportunities for crew members and creative professionals, and reinforce California's position as a global center for media production.

Departments Impacted & Why

Film SF (San Francisco Film Commission): Positive impact. The bill would support Film SF's mission to attract and retain film, television and commercial in San Francisco and could increase commercial filming activity within the city.

Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD): Positive impact. Increased commercial production activity would support workforce development goals, small business growth, and employment opportunities in the creative economy.

Fiscal Impact

The bill does not have a direct fiscal impact on the City and County of San Francisco. However, increased commercial production activity may generate indirect economic benefits through job creation, local spending, hotel occupancy, business activity, and utilization of local production vendors and facilities.

At the state level, AB 2403 would establish a new Commercial Production Tax Credit Program administered by the California Film Commission and authorize up to \$15 million annually in tax credits for qualified commercial productions. While the program would reduce state tax revenues through the issuance of tax credits, supporters contend that the resulting production spending, job creation, and economic activity would offset a portion of those costs through increased economic output and tax generation.

Support / Opposition

Support

- Film Liaisons in California Statewide (FLICS)
- California Production Coalition
- Motion Picture Association
- Entertainment Union Coalition

Opposition

- None



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.

Date Submitted	6/5/2026
Submitting Department	Treasurer and Tax Collector
Contact Name	Rebecca Loya
Contact Email and Phone Number	Rebecca.loya@sfgov.org ; 628-652-6946
SLC Meeting Presenter	Rebecca Loya
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2558

Asm. Berman, Assembly District 23, Democrat Financial institutions: loans: interest rates.

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

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.

Background/Analysis

California regulates small-dollar consumer credit through two principal statutes: the California Financing Law (CFL), which governs loans made by licensed finance lenders, and the California Deferred Deposit Transaction Law (CDDTL), which governs payday loans. In 2019, AB 539 (Limón) capped interest rates on CFL loans of \$2,500 to \$10,000 at 36 percent plus the federal funds rate but left two significant gaps. First, CFL still allows tiered rates on loans under \$2,500 that can produce APRs substantially above 36 percent. Second, CDDTL still allows fees of up to 15 percent of the face amount of a customer's check, translating to APRs approaching 400 percent on a typical two-week loan.

The federal Military Lending Act caps the all-in Military Annual Percentage Rate on consumer credit extended to servicemembers and their dependents at 36 percent. This standard has been adopted by nineteen states and the District of Columbia.

Challenge

Those rates are set in state law, and current state law leaves a wide opening for predatory lending. Under the CDDTL, any check casher or other CDDTL licensee that originates a deferred deposit transaction may charge a fee of up to 15 percent of the face value of the customer's check, which works out to an annual percentage rate approaching 400 percent on a typical two-week loan. Under the California Financing Law (CFL), small-dollar installment loans of less than \$2,500 fall outside the 36 percent rate cap that the Legislature applied to larger consumer loans through AB 539 (Limón). The result is a two-tier system in which the smallest loans, taken out by the borrowers least able to absorb the cost, carry the highest rates.

The California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation found that payday lenders charged California borrowers \$246 million in fees in 2024, at an average APR of 364 percent.

Further, as of April 2025, there are 92 fringe financial storefronts in San Francisco alone—including payday lenders, pawn brokers, auto title lenders, and check cashers. These businesses are primarily located in low-income areas like the Tenderloin, Mission, and Excelsior. In 2023, even though only 4.3% of San Franciscans were unbanked, 13.7% of those with bank accounts still rely on payday lenders, check cashers, and other alternative financial services to meet ordinary financial needs.

These products disproportionately serve Black, Latino, and immigrant borrowers. A single deferred deposit transaction often turns into a cycle of repeat borrowing in which fees can exceed the original principal within a few months, pushing families further from financial stability.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2558 aligns California's rate cap with the long-standing federal protection that Congress extended to active-duty servicemembers and their families through the Military Lending Act, closes the loopholes left in current law, and brings California in line with the nineteen states and the District of Columbia that already prohibit triple-digit interest rates on small-dollar consumer loans. Ab 2558 would:

- Apply the federal Military Lending Act 36 percent APR cap to small CFL loans: AB 2558 amends California law to prohibit a CFL licensee that lends less than \$2,500 from contracting for or receiving charges at a rate exceeding the Military Annual Percentage Rate, as in effect on January 1, 2026.
- Apply the same cap to deferred deposit transactions: AB 2558 amends California law to cap the total amount any CDDTL licensee may charge for a deferred deposit transaction at the same 36% MAPR, replacing the current 15-percent-of-face-value fee structure for deferred deposit transactions, which produces APRs approaching 400% on a typical two-week loan. The cap applies to all CDDTL licensees, including check cashers and payday lenders.
- Close the gap left by AB 539 (Limón, 2019): Together, the two amendments establish a single, uniform 36 percent APR ceiling on small-dollar consumer credit in California, completing the rate-cap framework that the Legislature began with AB 539.
- Preserve responsible access to credit: A 36 percent APR is sufficient to support sustainable lending. Banks, credit unions, and community development financial institutions in California already lend at or below this rate, and similar caps in other states have not eliminated access to small-dollar credit for working families.

Departments Impacted & Why

None. AB 2558 regulates non-depository consumer lenders licensed by the California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation. It does not impose new operational requirements on the City and County of San Francisco.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impact to the City and County of San Francisco.

Support / Opposition

The following list of support and opposition comes from the Assembly Committee on Banking Finance hearing on April 23, 2026.

Support:

- Alliance for Boys and Men of Color

- Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
- Black Californians United for Early Care and Education
- Black Ece
- CA League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
- California Coalition for Community Investment (CCCI)
- California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO
- California Immigrant Policy Center
- California Low-income Consumer Coalition
- California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
- California Women's Law Center
- Cameo - California Association for Micro Enterprise Opportunity
- Cameo Network
- Center for Responsible Lending
- City of Lemon Grove
- Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations
- Community Legal Aid Social
- Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
- Consumer Federation of America
- Consumer Federation of California
- Consumer Reports
- Consumer Watchdog
- Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety
- Courage California
- Dolores Huerta Foundation
- East Bay Community Law Center
- Economic Security California Action
- Economic Security Project Action
- El/la Para Trans Latinas
- End Child Poverty CA
- End Poverty in California (EPIC)
- Freefrom
- Giving Credit
- Glide Foundation
- Haven Services
- Housing and Economic Rights Advocates (HERA)
- Law Foundation of Silicon Valley
- Legal Aid Society of San Diego
- Legal Assistance for Seniors
- Mbolden Change (formerly My New Red Shoes)
- Mypath
- National Consumer Law Center
- National Council of Jewish Women Los Angeles
- Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County
- Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services INC
- Nextgen California
- One Fair Wage
- Orange County United Way
- Public Counsel
- Rise Economy

- Sage Financial Solutions
- Small Business Majority
- The Academy of Financial Education
- The Community College Foundation
- The Greenlining Institute
- United Parents and Students
- Ventures
- Wealth Reclamation Academy of Practitioners (WRAP)
- Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.
- Western Center on Law and Poverty
- Women's Foundation California
- Women's Foundation of California
- Young Invincibles

Opposition

- California African American Chamber of Commerce
- California Financial Service Providers
- Cb Communications
- Community Choice Financial
- Continental Currency Services, INC.
- Designed by Duchess
- Faith in the Valley
- Kc Sports & Entertainment
- Memorable Moments Travel
- National Action Network Sacramento
- National Action Network Western Region
- Online Lenders Alliance
- Pacific Rim Alliance Corporation - Checkmate
- Purpose Financial

Note from committee analysis: A large number of unverified individual OPPOSE letters were submitted but cannot be reliably tallied due to the letters being submitted by three or four of the same individuals on behalf of other people, many with no city and zip code information, and some duplicate submissions.



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.

Date Submitted	6/5/2026
Submitting Department	Treasurer and Tax Collector
Contact Name	Rebecca Loya
Contact Email and Phone Number	Rebecca.loya@sfgov.org ; 628-652-6946
SLC Meeting Presenter	Rebecca Loya
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 498

Senator Josh Becker, Senate District 13, Democrat Incarcerated Persons: Communications

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

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.

Background/Analysis

Maintaining contact with family is extremely important for reducing recidivism and ensuring public safety. Research consistently shows that incarcerated individuals who maintain strong ties with their support networks have higher success rates and lower rates of re-offending upon release. For many families, especially those with young children or those living in poverty, phone calls and messages are the only viable way to maintain these bonds. However, the current "cutoff" policy forces families to endure four abrupt disconnections per hour, wasting roughly 10% of their communication time on reconnection and causing emotional distress to children. Furthermore, charging for electronic messages extracts millions of dollars from Black and Brown communities, who are disproportionately impacted by the costs of incarceration.

San Francisco has been a national leader in reducing the financial burdens of incarceration to ensure that these high costs do not drain the pockets of low-income communities. In 2020, San Francisco became the first county in the nation to make all jail phone calls free and eliminate markups on jail store items, saving families an estimated \$1.7 million annually. In 2023, San Francisco launched the nation's first fully free jail tablet program.

Challenge

In 2022, SB 1008 (Becker) was signed into law making voice communications free of charge for incarcerated persons and their loved ones. In the implementation of this bill, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) has stated there is no limit on the number of phone calls an incarcerated person may place. Additionally, CDCR has begun providing wireless tablets to incarcerated individuals throughout the state. These tablets remain in the possession of the incarcerated person and are used primarily for voice communication and electronic messaging.

These advancements at the state level have dramatically increased opportunities for families to stay connected, however barriers remain. This issue is particularly important for San Franciscans, where an estimated 18,000 children have an incarcerated parent. Because telephone access for incarcerated people has historically been limited to wall phones with finite supply, CDCR policy limits the duration of phone calls to 15 minutes. The 15-minute time limit is also enforced on wireless tablets. However, tablets remain in possession of the incarcerated person at all times and are not shared. As a result, conversations are halted and callers must hang up and immediately re-dial to continue the conversation. These interruptions exist at the detriment of fostering beneficial relationships, especially between incarcerated persons and their children.

Text messaging in CDCR facilities costs \$0.05 cents per message, which presents barriers to an important communication channel for incarcerated people and their loved ones. This burdensome cost drains millions of dollars from low-income communities of color each year.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill closes the "technology gap" in California's communication laws by making two critical changes:

- Prohibits Arbitrary Disconnections: SB 498 stipulates that voice calls made via individual tablets cannot be disconnected solely based on duration. This ensures that a mother can read a book to her child or a person can engage in reentry planning without being cut off every 15 minutes.
- Ensures Free Messaging: It expands the "free of charge" mandate to include electronic messaging (texting). This recognizes that messaging is the primary way modern families stay connected and ensures that no family is forced into debt to send a simple "goodnight" or "I love you" text to an incarcerated loved one.

Departments Impacted & Why

None.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impact to the City and County of San Francisco.

Support / Opposition

There has not been a formal hearing in the state legislature yet on SB 498, so there has been no formal recording of support and opposition. The below list of supporters comes from sponsors of the bill.

Support:

- San Quentin Skunkworks (Sponsor)
- Bridges of Hope (Sponsor)
- Empowering Women Impacted by Incarceration (Sponsor)
- The Change Parallel Project (Sponsor)
- Restoring Hope CA (Sponsor)
- Jesse's Place Organization (Sponsor)
- Legal Services for Prisoners with Children / All of Us or None (Sponsor)
- Western Center on Law and Poverty (Sponsor)
- Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (Sponsor)

Opposition

- No known opposition