



**STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, May 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 – 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 April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2026.
- III. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item).** The City’s state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

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

### **New Business**

#### **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.

#### **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.

#### **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.

## **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.

## **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.

## **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.

### **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.

### **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.

### **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.

### **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.

### **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.

### **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.

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

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

## **Disability Access**

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

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

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

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

## **Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements**

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

## **Cell Phones and Pagers**

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

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

### **Public Comment**

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

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

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

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.

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

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

### **Health Considerations**

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



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

**OVERVIEW**

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

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

**MEMBERS**

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

**AGENDA**

Meeting commenced at 10:04am.

**VII. ROLL CALL**

Present: Eileen Mariano, Frances Hsieh, Renil Bejoy, Luis Zamora, Greyson Spencer  
The Assessor’s Office and the Treasurer’s Office were not present.

**VIII. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).** Discussion and possible

action to approve the minutes from the meeting on March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2026.

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

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

## **New Business**

### **Planning Department**

Presenter: Lisa Gluckstein

SB 1258 (Wiener): Streamlined housing approvals: hazardous waste sites  
***Recommended Position: Support***

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

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

### **PermitSF**

Presenter: Lisa Gluckstein

AB 1738 (Carrillo): Remote Virtual Inspections  
***Recommended Position: Support if amended***

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

Motion to support if amended: Luis Zamora  
Seconded by: Renil Bejoy  
Approved: 5-0

### **SFHSA**

Presenter: Susie Smith

AB 1660 (Schiavo): Public guardians and public administrators  
***Recommended Position: Support***

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

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

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

AB 2160 (Rodriguez): Medi-Cal: lactation services  
***Recommended Position: Support***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Presenter: Kyra Geithman

AB 2020 (Gabriel): Housing programs: financing

***Recommended Position: Support***

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

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Frances Hsieh

Approved: 5-0

## **Public Utilities Commission**

Presenter: Scott Ammon

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

***Recommended Position: Support***

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

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Luis Zamora

Approved: 5-0

## **Police Department**

Presenter: Steven Lopez

AB 1941 (Gonzalez): Organized Metal Theft

***Recommended Position: Support***

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

would be punishable as a misdemeanor with repeat offenses or theft exceeding \$950 in value punishable as a misdemeanor or felony.

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Luis Zamora

Approved: 5-0

## **Port of San Francisco**

Presenter: Devyani Jain

AB 2051 (Wicks): Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group

***Recommended Position: Support***

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

Motion to approve: Luis Zamora

Seconded by: Renil Bejoy

Approved: 5-0

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

Presenter: Denise Heitzenroder

AB 1876 (Addis): Health Care Coverage: Nondiscrimination/Fair Care for All Act

***Recommended Position: Support***

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

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Frances Hsieh

Approved: 5-0

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

Presenter: Denise Heitzenroder

AB 1973 (Aguiar-Curry): Abortion: authorized procedures

***Recommended Position: Support***

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

Motion to approve: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Frances Hsieh

Approved: 5-0

## **Department of Environment**

Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

AB 2226 (Rubio): Reusable grocery bags

***Recommended Position: Oppose***

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

Motion to oppose: Renil Bejoy

Seconded by: Greyson Spencer

Approved: 5-0

- XI. 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.

## **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 11:24am.

## **Disability Access**

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

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

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

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

## **Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements**

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

## **Cell Phones and Pagers**

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

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

### **Public Comment**

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

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

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

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.

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

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

### **Health Considerations**

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



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	May 8, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development
<b>Contact Name</b>	Kyra Geithman
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	(720) 938-8924; <a href="mailto:kyra.geithman@sfgov.org">kyra.geithman@sfgov.org</a>
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Kyra Geithman
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO    X N/A

### SB 1170

**Senator María Elena Durazo, Senate District 26, D**

**Joint powers agreements: nonprofit housing developers.**

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

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.

#### Background/Analysis

California’s Joint Exercise of Powers Act generally allows two or more public agencies to jointly exercise powers they share through a joint powers agreement. Existing law also allows certain entities, including mutual water companies and water corporations, to enter into joint powers agreements with public agencies for specified purposes, including risk pooling.

#### Challenge

Affordable housing providers have reported significant premium increases and difficulty securing coverage. The analysis cites reports that insurance costs for California affordable housing providers increased by an average of 56% between 2020 and 2022, with some providers facing increases as high as 500% between 2022 and 2024. Permanent supportive housing developments in particular have experienced disproportionately high rate increases. This issue is particularly important in San Francisco, where affordable housing developments often rely on layered public financing and long-term operating assumptions. Unexpected or rapidly escalating insurance costs can threaten the financial stability of affordable housing projects, including properties serving low-income households, seniors, people with disabilities, families, and people exiting homelessness.

---

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

---

SB 1170 would allow nonprofit housing developers to partner with public agencies through risk-pooling joint powers agreements. This could create an alternative to the private insurance market by allowing nonprofit affordable housing providers to pool risk, pursue broader or more stable coverage, and potentially reduce insurance-related costs.

The bill includes protections for participating public agencies. If a nonprofit housing developer enters into a joint powers agreement with one or more public agencies, the agreement must ensure that no participating public agency becomes responsible for the underlying debts or liabilities of the joint powers agency, and that participating public agencies are indemnified against those debts and liabilities. Further, does not mandate formation of a JPA, but creates statutory authority for nonprofit housing developers and public agencies to pursue this model.

The bill also requires that revenues generated through insurance provided to members be used only for necessary operating expenses and for technical support, continuing education, safety engineering, and operational and managerial advisory assistance to members, with the goal of reducing risk liabilities and strengthening members' technical, managerial, and financial capacity.

---

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

---

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development: MOHCD finances and supports affordable housing development and preservation in San Francisco. Lower or more stable insurance costs could improve project feasibility, strengthen operating budgets, and help preserve existing affordable housing.

Office of the City Attorney: The City Attorney may need to review any proposed JPA structure, liability protections, indemnification provisions, and any public agency participation.

Controller's Office / Office of Public Finance: Depending on the structure of any future JPA or City participation, these offices may need to review fiscal, financing, risk, or governance implications.

Risk Management / City Administrator: If the City were to participate in or evaluate a risk-pooling structure, risk management expertise may be needed to assess exposure, coverage, and operational safeguards.

---

### **Fiscal Impact**

---

To the extent SB 1170 enables more stable or lower-cost insurance options for nonprofit affordable housing developers, it could have a positive indirect fiscal impact by reducing operating cost pressures on affordable housing developments supported by MOHCD and other public funding sources. Any direct fiscal impact to San Francisco would depend on whether the City elects to participate in, support, or otherwise engage with a future JPA structure.

---

### **Support / Opposition**

---

No formal support or opposition has been submitted. However, multiple nonprofit developers that own and operate projects in San Francisco have expressed significant interest in creating this statutory authority option and are eager for this option.



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	5/7/26
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
<b>Contact Name</b>	Eric Manke
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	Eric.manke@sfgov.org; 415-350-0700
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Eric Manke
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO    X N/A

### AB 2705

#### **Assemblymember Diane Dixon, District 72, R-Newport Beach** **Property Taxation: Tax-Defaulted Property Sales: Excess Proceeds**

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

*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.*

#### Background/Analysis

*Under California law, when a tax-defaulted property sells at public auction for more than the amount of delinquent taxes owed, the excess proceeds are held by the county tax collector for a minimum of one year. During this period, parties of interest—including the former property owner, heirs, and lienholders—may file claims for their share of the excess proceeds.*

*Private asset finder companies offer a service to consumers to file these claims, on which they collect a fee, when consumers can file a claim with the county themselves free of charge. In many cases, these companies charge significant or excessive fees for what is largely an administrative process, and consumers may not be aware that they can recover these funds on their own at no cost. Additionally, there are currently no consistent statewide standards governing these practices, creating a gap in consumer protections.*

#### Challenge

*San Francisco's Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector administers the excess proceeds process for tax-defaulted properties sold in the City and County. When the Office conducts tax-defaulted property sales, excess proceeds are retained and made available to parties of interest for at least one year. During this period, the Office has observed that asset finder companies frequently contact claimants—often heirs or family members of deceased property owners—offering to assist with filing claims in exchange for a fee, even when claimants are eligible to file directly with the county at no cost.*

*Without clear statewide standards, these practices can undermine the integrity of the excess proceeds process and reduce the funds ultimately returned to rightful claimants. Claimants may not be aware that they can file a claim directly with the county at no cost, making them particularly vulnerable to excessive fees for what is largely an administrative process.*

---

**Solution/Recommended Proposal**

*AB 2705 would protect consumers by establishing a uniform statewide framework for agreements to locate, recover, deliver, or assist in filing excess proceeds claims. The bill would require written agreements between the parties, mandate disclosures that the consumer may file their claim directly with the county for no cost and information on how to do so, prohibit the collection of fees prior to the approval and payment of a claim, and limit fees to no more than 10 percent of the excess proceeds awarded for those who do choose to file their claim with the assistance of another party.*

*These provisions are modeled after existing safeguards in state unclaimed property law, providing a tested and balanced framework to protect consumers while still allowing legitimate service providers to operate. Counties across California are required to conduct tax-defaulted property sales, meaning this issue impacts every county and a wide range of taxpayers.*

---

**Departments Impacted & Why**

*The Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector is responsible for conducting tax-defaulted property sales and administering the excess proceeds claims process in the City and County of San Francisco.*

---

**Fiscal Impact**

*None.*

---

**Support / Opposition**

*Support:*

*California Association of County Treasurers and Tax Collectors (CACTTC)*

*California State Association of Counties*

*Rural County Representatives of California*

*Urban Counties of California*

*Opposition:*

*Global Discoveries, Ltd. (unless amended)*



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	5/8/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Homelessness and Supportive Housing
<b>Contact Name</b>	Hailey Gil
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Hailey.gil@sfgov.org">Hailey.gil@sfgov.org</a> / 415-926-9264
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Hailey Gil
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

### AB 1556

#### Assemblymember Haney, Asm. District 17, (D)

#### Recovery residences: funding.

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR    SUPPORT    SUPPORT if amended    OPPOSE    OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

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.

#### Background/Analysis

Over the past decade, California has faced a devastating addiction crisis that has taken thousands of lives and deeply impacted communities across our state. In San Francisco, we are seeing more people experiencing homelessness also struggling with substance use disorders and seeking recovery-oriented services. We need a full continuum of options to meet people where they are, including recovery-focused housing for those actively seeking sobriety.

AB 1556 is important because it would clarify that local governments can use state funding to support recovery residences. That flexibility matters. We know this model can make a difference. According to the Benioff Center for Homelessness and Housing at UCSF, 46 percent of homeless Californians—roughly 86,000 people—report substance use as currently leading to health, legal, social, or financial problems. Between 2011 and 2020, overdose deaths among homeless Californians surged 488 percent. We also know recovery housing is associated with decreased substance use, reduced likelihood of return to use, lower rates of incarceration, increased employment and income, and stronger family relationships.

We have already seen the promise of this model locally. San Francisco recently opened two new recovery focused transitional housing sites, and both filled quickly. Their early success shows there is real demand for these spaces and real value in having recovery-oriented housing as part of a broader homelessness response. With greater state funding flexibility, we would like to be able to do more of this.

AB 1556 is a practical step that would help save lives, support recovery, and give local governments another important tool to respond to the overlapping crises of homelessness and substance use.

#### Challenge

Variations of this proposal have been introduced in the Assembly, but the Governor ultimately vetoed each. The Governor vetoed AB 255 (Haney, 2025) stating that the bill sought out to do something already permitted by State Law. Since then, the Governor's Office has reneged that determination and issued guidance on recovery residences and housing first law.

---

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

---

The bill sponsors drafted AB 1556 in close collaboration with the Governor's Office, and addresses key policy considerations including the process for ensuring housing security for those clients who relapse while residing in a recovery residence, and compliance with Housing First.

---

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

---

- The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH)

---

### **Fiscal Impact**

---

This bill would pose no additional cost to the City but would make recovery residences eligible for state funding.

---

### **Support / Opposition**

---

No opposition on file.

Support:

- Mayor Daniel Lurie
- Bay Area Council
- California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals
- Dignity Moves
- National Association of Minority Contractors NorCal
- San Rosa YIMBY



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	5/8/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Homelessness and Supportive Housing
<b>Contact Name</b>	Hailey Gil
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Hailey.gil@sfgov.org">Hailey.gil@sfgov.org</a> / 415-926-9264
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Hailey Gil
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

### AB 1924

#### **Assemblymember Gabriel, Asm. District 46, (D)** **Statewide homelessness prevention strategy.**

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR    SUPPORT    SUPPORT if amended    OPPOSE    OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

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.

#### Background/Analysis

The most effective way to address homelessness in our community is to prevent it all together. By supporting people before they lose their housing, targeted prevention programs reduce the need for shelter or other crisis services. We know that homelessness prevention is a wise investment

#### Challenge

There is currently no statewide homelessness prevention strategy.

#### Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1924 (Gabriel) would provide stronger direction to homelessness prevention systems by creating a comprehensive statewide homelessness prevention strategy. The legislation would also identify best practices to help guide local programs and agencies in their work to address the state's homelessness crisis. The bill is supported by a broad coalition of housing and homelessness organizations and would better support California's most vulnerable residents, stop homelessness before it occurs, and preserve California's limited resources

#### Departments Impacted & Why

- The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH)

#### Fiscal Impact

This bill would pose no additional cost to the City

## Support / Opposition

---

No opposition on file.

Support:

All Home (Co-Sponsor)  
Inner City Law Center (Co-Sponsor)  
Active San Gabriel Valley  
Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment  
Being Alive/people With Aids Action Coalition  
Bet Tzedek Legal Services  
Community Corp. of Santa Monica  
Community Health Project Los Angeles  
Compass Family Services  
Corporation for Supportive Housing  
DAP Health  
Destination: Home  
Housing California  
LA Forward Institute  
League of California Cities  
MidPen Housing Corporation  
National Alliance to End Homelessness  
Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California  
Para Los Ninos  
Restoration Diversion Services  
Safe Place for Youth  
Safehouse San Francisco  
Steinberg Institute  
SV@Home Action Fund  
The People Concern  
The Sidewalk Project  
Union Station Homeless Services



### State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	5/8/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	ENV
<b>Contact Name</b>	Joseph Piasecki
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Joseph.piasecki@sfgov.org">Joseph.piasecki@sfgov.org</a> 415-519-4877
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Joseph Piasecki
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO    X N/A

#### SB 1167

**[Sen. Blakespear, District 38, Democrat]**

**Vehicles: Electric Bicycles**

#### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

#### Summary

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.

#### Background/Analysis

Existing law defines an electric bicycle as a bicycle equipped with fully operable pedals and an electric motor not exceeding 750 watts of power and classifies electric bicycles into three classes with different speed and operational restrictions. Existing law prohibits certain vehicles that do not meet the definition of an electric bicycle from being advertised, sold, offered for sale, or labeled as an electric bicycle. Existing law also prohibits local jurisdictions from requiring bicycle registration, in part due to documented concerns about the use of registration requirements as a pretext for discriminatory enforcement. Despite these protections, higher-powered electric motorcycles, commonly called "e-motos", are increasingly being marketed and sold as e-bikes, creating widespread consumer confusion and safety risks.

The consequences of this misclassification are already visible in other states: in New Jersey, e-moto-related incidents drove passage of sweeping legislation that, because it failed to distinguish legal e-bikes from e-motos, imposed registration, licensing, and insurance requirements on all e-bike riders, leading national advocacy organizations to warn the law would make New Jersey the least e-bike-friendly state in the country. Without the definitional clarity SB 1167 provides, California risks a similar dynamic, where e-moto incidents fuel blunt regulatory responses that burden law-abiding riders and undermine programs like Electrify My Ride."

---

### **Challenge**

In San Francisco, e-bikes are an important tool for reducing car trips and expanding access to transportation for lower-income residents, workers, and families. These low-carbon modes of transportation also support the City's recently updated climate action goals and strategies. However, current classification ambiguities threaten both public safety and the broader goal of e-bike adoption. The 18-fold increase in e-bike-related injuries between 2018 and 2023 has largely been driven by high-powered electric motorcycles and mopeds — commonly referred to as 'e-motos' that are being falsely marketed and sold as electric bicycles. Because these devices exceed the legal definition of an e-bike but are labeled and sold as one, consumers, parents, and law enforcement lack clear tools to distinguish them from legal Class 1, 2, and 3 e-bikes.

A 2025 observational study at several Bay Area schools found that 88% of electric two-wheeled devices on campuses were not legal e-bikes but mislabeled e-motos. Injuries and accidents associated with misclassified e-motos inflate concerns around e-bike safety, even though research shows that a significant share of reported e-bike incidents are not actually associated with legal pedal-assist bikes. Misclassified e-motos create confusion, contribute to overregulation, and hamper widespread adoption of e-bikes, negatively affecting the City's climate action goals and initiatives such as Electrify my Ride.

---

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

By making it explicitly illegal to market or sell high-powered electric motorcycles and mopeds as electric bicycles; requiring e-bike classification labels to be installed by e-bike retailers and bicycle repair shops only; and narrowly applying off-highway motor vehicle identification requirements to e-motos, SB 1167 targets the root cause of the e-bike safety crisis without burdening the everyday San Franciscans — including commuters, delivery workers, seniors, and low-income riders — who rely on legal e-bikes for clean, affordable transportation. The bill preserves e-bikes as an accessible alternative to car trips while giving consumers, retailers, and law enforcement the clear legal distinctions needed to hold bad actors accountable.

---

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

SB 1167 would create new consumer protection and false advertising enforcement obligations around the marketing and sale of electric bicycles and higher-powered electric devices statewide. SF Environment's Clean Transportation team would help share information on the updated e-bike definitions and consumer protections through its outreach and education programs, helping San Francisco residents make informed purchasing decisions and understand the distinction between legal e-bikes and e-motos. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) may also be impacted, as clearer legal definitions of e-bikes versus motor vehicles could inform local enforcement practices and infrastructure planning on San Francisco streets and shared paths.

---

### **Fiscal Impact**

SB 1167 will be implemented and enforced at the state level through California's existing consumer protection and false advertising framework under the Business and Professions Code and will not have a direct fiscal impact on the City and County of San Francisco.

## Support / Opposition

---

### SUPPORT:

California Bicycle Coalition (sponsor)

People for Bikes (sponsor)

Streets are for Everyone (sponsor)

Streets for All (sponsor)

350 Sacramento, AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah Abate of California, Motorcyclists Rights & Safety Organization, Active San Gabriel Valley, Auto Club of Southern California (AAA) , Bicycling Monterey, Bike East Bay, Bike LA, Bike Temecula Valley, California Association of Bicycling Organizations, California District Attorneys Association, California Emergency Nurses Association, California Orthopedic Association, Chico Velo, Bicycle Advocates, Circulate San Diego, City of Carlsbad, City of Vista, Claremont Streets for People, Day One Festival, Trail LA, Critical Mass, Livable Communities Initiative, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, Move LA, Move San Mateo, Move Santa Barbara County, Napa County Bicycle Coalition (napa Bike), Oceanside Unified School District, City of Oceanside, Rails to Trails Conservancy, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, San Diego County District Attorney's Office, San Dieguito Union High School District, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, Sandiego350, Santa Monica Safe Streets Alliance, Santa Monica, Spoke Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition, South Pas Active Streets Street, Racing Kills, Sunnyvale Safe Streets, Transbay Coalition, Transform, Walk Bike Berkeley, Walk Bike Cupertino, West Hollywood Bicycle Coalition

OPPOSITION: None received



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	05/7/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
<b>Contact Name</b>	Kellie McManamon
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:kmcmamon@sfgwater.org">kmcmamon@sfgwater.org</a> , 628-249-0574
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Kellie McManamon
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO    X N/A

### AB 2739

#### Assemblymember Soria, District 27, Democrat-Merced.

#### Water: affordability and system stabilization.

##### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended  
 OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

##### Summary

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.

The SFPUC recommends a Support position for AB 2739.

##### Background/Analysis

Water affordability has become an increasingly urgent issue in California due to rising infrastructure costs, climate change impacts, and stricter water quality regulations. The state formally established the human right to water through AB 685 (2012), which declared that all Californians are entitled to safe, clean, and affordable water. However, for more than a decade, the state has struggled to enact actual affordability.

Many small and disadvantaged communities in particular face disproportionately high-water rates relative to income, while also lacking the financial capacity to invest in needed system upgrades. Recognizing this challenge, the Legislature has taken steps in recent years to address affordability. For example, SB 200 (Monning, 2019) established the Safe and Affordable Drinking Water Fund to support drinking water projects in underserved communities, and SB 998 (Dodd, 2018) implemented protections against water shutoffs for low-income households. More recently, SB 222 (Dodd, 2024) sought to establish a statewide water rate assistance program but was vetoed by the Governor.

AB 2739 builds on these prior efforts by creating a long-term, self-sustaining funding mechanism

rather than relying solely on annual appropriations or bond funding. By establishing a protected Trust Fund with investment-generated revenue, the bill aims to provide stable and predictable funding for ratepayer assistance.

### **Challenge**

AB 2739 would work to address the challenges of rising costs associated with infrastructure modernization, climate resilience, regulatory compliance, and energy usage that places pressure on water systems. These challenges are especially difficult for households living at or near poverty. AB 2739 would respond to this set of growing and interconnected challenges facing California's water systems and ratepayers. California lacks a stable, dedicated funding source, and this creates gaps in assistance and uncertainty for both water systems and customers. The absence of a coordinated approach, focused on smaller and disadvantaged communities, is a real problem facing this state's affordability needs. AB 2739 addresses these challenges by establishing a permanent funding mechanism that supports both direct ratepayer assistance and infrastructure investments designed to reduce costs over time, helping to stabilize water rates and improve affordability across California.

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

The SFPUC recommends a support position for AB 2739.

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

This bill impacts the SFPUC and its ratepayers by creating an affordability framework through the state that both ratepayers and utilities can apply to and benefit from. No other departments are impacted.

### **Fiscal Impact**

There will be no negative fiscal impact for SFPUC.

### **Support / Opposition**

#### Co-sponsors

Irvine Ranch Water District  
Rancho California Water District

#### Support

Association of California Cities, Orange County  
Association of California Water Agencies

California Chamber of Commerce  
California Water Association  
City of Roseville  
City of Sacramento  
Clean Water Action  
Eastern Municipal Water District  
El Toro Water District  
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability  
Orange County Business Council  
The Honorable Bryan Osorio, Councilmember,  
City of Delano  
The Honorable Gregorio Gomez, Councilmember,  
City of Farmersville  
The Honorable Joe Soria, Mayor Pro Tem, City of  
Lindsay  
The Honorable Jose Sigala, Councilmember, City  
of Tulare  
South Coast Water District  
South Orange County Economic Coalition  
Southern California Water Coalition  
Three Valleys Municipal Water District  
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District  
Western Municipal Water District

#### Opposition

N/A



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	05/7/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
<b>Contact Name</b>	Kellie McManamon
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:kmcmamon@sfgwater.org">kmcmamon@sfgwater.org</a> , 628-249-0574
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Kellie McManamon
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO    X N/A

### SB 1125

### Senator Caroline Menjivar, District 20, Democrat-Van Nuys.

### Water Rate Assistance Program.

#### Recommended Position

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

cost burdens while supporting equitable access to safe drinking water.

The SFPUC recommends a Support position for SB 1125.

#### Summary

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

#### Background/Analysis

SB 1125 emerges out of a long-standing gap between recognizing water as a human right and funding affordability programs in California. The state formally established the human right to water through AB 685 (2012), which declared that all Californians are entitled to safe, clean, and affordable water. However, for more than a decade, the state has struggled to fund water rate assistance.

A key turning point came with SB 401 (2015), which directed the State Water Resources Control Board to develop a plan for a statewide low-income water rate assistance program. The plan estimated that a comprehensive program would require roughly \$140 million annually to implement. Despite this planning work, the program was never fully realized, largely due to funding challenges and legal constraints such as Proposition 218, which limits how local agencies can structure ratepayer-funded assistance programs.

Water costs have continued to rise due to aging infrastructure, climate adaptation needs,

regulatory requirements, and overall cost of living prices. With this increase also comes further affordability pressures on low-income households. This dynamic requires a focus on identifying needs and designing programs to establish durable, statewide funding.

---

### **Challenge**

The high and rising costs of basic needs, including water, in California is a huge problem particularly impacting vulnerable groups and residents. Public water utilities are often limited in their ability to offer low-income rate assistance programs to the degree they are necessary because of funding limitations. These limitations can result in a lack of access to clean and safe water for some low-income residents.

Existing water affordability efforts like the California Water and Wastewater Arrearage Payment Program focus more on debt relief than the cost upfront. A program like the one SB 1125 establishes tackles the cost of water rates from the start.

---

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

The SFPUC recommends a support position for SB 1125.

---

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

The bill does not directly impact other San Francisco departments. The SFPUC already operates its own low-income assistance program, but SFPUC ratepayers would receive additional state support. The bill would also pave the way for smaller water agencies to create their own assistance programs, helping countless ratepayers across California.

---

### **Fiscal Impact**

There are no negative fiscal impacts for SFPUC.

---

### **Support / Opposition**

---

#### Co-sponsor

Clean Water Action  
Community Water Center  
Leadership Counsel for Justice & Accountability

#### Support

Supervisor Eddie Valero, Tulare County District 4  
Mayor Krista Bernasconi, City of Roseville  
Mayor Pro Tem Joe Soria, City of Lindsay

Councilmember Bryan Osorio, City of Delano  
Councilmember Caitly Maple, City of Sacramento District 5  
Councilmember Gregorio Gomez, City of Farmersville  
Councilmember Jose Sigala, City of Tulare  
Allensworth Progressive Association  
Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment Action  
Asian Pacific Environmental Network Action  
California Coastkeeper Alliance  
California Environmental Justice Alliance  
California Environmental Voters  
Center for Environmental Health  
Center on Race, Poverty, & the Environment  
Central California Environmental Justice Network  
CleanEarth4kids.org  
Courage California  
Environmental Defense Fund  
Erin Brockovich, Inc.  
Friends Committee on Legislation of California  
Integrated Resource Management  
Irvine Ranch Water District  
Lamont Public Utility District  
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy  
Los Angeles Waterkeeper  
Lutheran Office of Public Policy - California  
Medical Advocates for Healthy Air  
Mono Lake Committee  
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles  
Planning and Conservation League  
Rancho California Water District  
Regional Water Authority  
SAFER Advisory Group  
Sierra Club California  
State Center Community College District  
Sultana Community Services District Board  
UNIDOS Network  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
Wholly H2O

#### Opposition

N/A



## State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	5/7/2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
<b>Contact Name</b>	Scott Ammon
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:sammon@sfgwater.org">sammon@sfgwater.org</a> ; 415-407-5208
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Scott Ammon
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

### SB 1098

**Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, District #25, Democrat**

**Public utilities: forecast-based ratemaking.**

#### Recommended Position

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

#### Summary

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.

The SFPUC recommends a Support position for SB 1098.

#### Background/Analysis

The increased use of memorandum and balancing accounts has inhibited the ability of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to ensure that IOU rates are just and reasonable. Every 4 years, the CPUC approves the revenue requirements

each IOU can collect from their ratepayers. These amounts include forecasted operating expenses, capital expenditures, and a rate of return on the utility’s capital investments. Under Public Utilities Code Section 451, it is the CPUC’s responsibility to ensure that IOU rates are just and reasonable.

However, in addition to the amounts approved for ratepayer recovery through the GRC process, IOUs also request and receive CPUC approval for ratepayer recovery of costs recorded in memorandum and balancing accounts. For example, the CPUC may authorize IOUs to use balancing accounts to record costs for a defined scope of work which is difficult to accurately estimate. Alternatively, IOUs can record costs for unforeseen costs in memorandum accounts. The IOU may seek retroactive authorization to receive ratepayer recovery for costs recorded in such accounts.

#### Challenge

In practice, the use of memorandum and balancing accounts has expanded and this has enabled IOUs to circumvent the GRC process to pursue ratepayer recovery for costs in excess of their authorized revenue requirement. Approval of such costs is retroactive and separate from the more complete and transparent review of proposed spending in the GRC process. As a result, ratepayers are subject to additional

unpredictable rate increases which occur outside of the GRC process.

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

---

The SFPUC recommends a Support position for SB 1098.

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

---

CCA customers, including those served by CleanPowerSF, are exposed to cost increases stemming from IOU balancing and memorandum accounts. The bill would limit IOUs' overreliance on such accounts and improve the ability of the CPUC to conduct a holistic, thorough, and transparent review of proposed IOU spending. This would help ensure that IOU costs borne by CCA ratepayers, including CleanPowerSF customers, are just and reasonable.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

---

This bill would provide a check on the overuse of balancing and memorandum accounts by IOUs. As a result, this bill would help prevent future unexpected rate increases borne by CCA ratepayers, including CleanPowerSF customers.

#### **Support / Opposition**

---

##### Support

The Utility Reform Network (Sponsor)  
California Environmental Voters  
Climate Action Campaign  
Public Advocates Office

##### Opposition

California Chamber of Commerce  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
San Diego Gas and Electric Company  
Southern California Edison  
Southern California Gas Company



# State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	May 8, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Department of Public Health
<b>Contact Name</b>	Max Gara; 628-271-7517
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org">Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org</a> Sneha Patil; <a href="mailto:Sneha.patil@sfdph.org">Sneha.patil@sfdph.org</a>
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Max Gara
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

## AB 2571

### Asm Flora, District #9, Democrat Reimbursement for pharmacist services

Recommended Position

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

medication- related problems, including adverse drug events

Summary

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.

Any Medi-Cal patient who is identified by a pharmacist to have complex medication therapies, chronic diseases, high prescriptions costs or risk factors that can result in challenges to adherence or positive clinical outcomes is eligible for MTM services under Medi-Cal.

Challenge

Under current law, MTM services must be provided within or affiliated with a pharmacy. Individual pharmacists, like those employed in settings such as hospitals, clinics, physician practices, etc. are not permitted to bill for these services as current law requires the billing to be done through a pharmacy. Health system and community pharmacists can play a vital role optimizing medication use, reducing adverse drug interactions and ensuring adherence not only in brick-and-mortar pharmacy settings, but also in hospitals, mobile clinics, primary care clinics, physician offices and other locations that are especially important in low-income, rural and medically underserved communities. Currently, the reimbursement structure for pharmacists may limit or restrict services being offered in pharmacy

Background/Analysis

Under current law, pharmacists can perform a variety of patient care services including medication therapy management (MTM) services. MTM services are provided to individual patients to help patients get the most benefit from their medications and detect and prevent costly medication problems. Examples services include:

- Formulating a medication treatment plan;
- monitoring and evaluating the patient's response to therapy, including safety and effectiveness;
- Performing a comprehensive medication review to identify, resolve, and prevent

deserts within San Francisco, such as in the Bay View neighborhood.

---

**Solution/Recommended Proposal**

---

AB 2571 would strengthen pharmacists' role as healthcare providers through expanded reimbursement and integration into Medi-Cal and insurance frameworks. Specifically, this bill would:

- allow Medi-Cal and health care service plans to reimburse pharmacists enrolled as providers with the plan for MTM services – regardless of whether the pharmacist provides MTM services within a pharmacy or affiliated with a pharmacy.
- require the rate of reimbursement for pharmacist services to be the same as the fee schedule for physician services, including MTM pharmacist services (currently pharmacy services are reimbursed at 85% of the fee schedule for physician services).
- direct the state to seek federal approval of a state plan to recognize pharmacists as health care providers at federally qualified health centers for reimbursement purposes under the Medi-Cal program.

For many Medi-Cal beneficiaries, particularly in communities of color, pharmacists serve as the most accessible and trusted healthcare providers. This bill will strengthen the case for pharmacies to operate in underserved areas and improves equitable access to basic and preventive care in San Francisco and expand to other areas in the city.

Expanding reimbursement options also enables pharmacists to provide services more effectively, reducing hospitalizations, mitigating chronic conditions and improving overall health. Overall, AB 2571 provides a pathway for pharmacists to continue their work in areas where a brick-and-mortar pharmacy does not exist and promotes equity and continuity of care. For example, community-based pharmacists could be reimbursed for providing pre-exposure or post-exposure furnishing of medications outside of the physical pharmacy. Within SF DPH, this may also allow for new reimbursement mechanisms for services currently being provided by pharmacists at our DPH clinics.

---

**Departments Impacted & Why**

---

No other departments would be impacted.

---

**Fiscal Impact**

---

The bill would allow the Department of Public Health to additionally bill for services currently provided. Bill would likely have impact on State general fund, but financial impacts have not been analyzed.

---

**Support / Opposition**

---

California Society of Health-System Pharmacists  
(Sponsor)



# State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	May 8, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	Department of Public Health
<b>Contact Name</b>	Max Gara; 628-271-7517 <a href="mailto:Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org">Maxwell.gara@sfdph.org</a>  Sneha Patil; <a href="mailto:Sneha.patil@sfdph.org">Sneha.patil@sfdph.org</a>
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Max Gara
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

## **SB 1422**

**Sen Durazo, Sen District 26, Democrat**

**Medi-Cal: eligibility: immigration status.**

### **Recommended Position**

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

### **Summary**

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

### **Background/Analysis**

The Medi-Cal program, administered by the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), provides health care services to qualified low-income individuals. For individuals who do not have “satisfactory immigration status” under federal Medicaid rules, federal Medicaid funding is available only for pregnancy care services and emergency care services for this population. On January 1, 2024, California became the first state in the nation to provide Medi-Cal coverage to all income-eligible individuals, regardless of immigration status.

In response budget shortfalls, the 2025-2026 CA State budget made changes to Medi-Cal eligibility for full-scope coverage for individuals who do not

have satisfactory immigration status. Specifically, for individuals with unsatisfactory immigration status (UIS) the budget froze enrollment into full-scope Medi-Cal coverage of individuals 19 years of age or older starting January 1, 2026, implements \$30 monthly premiums for individuals 19 to 59 years of age starting July 1, 2027, and eliminates dental benefits from full-scope Medi-Cal coverage for individuals 19 years of age or older starting July 1, 2026. According to the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO), the Medi-Cal enrollment freeze will contribute to more than 1 million immigrant Californians losing their health coverage by 2030. In December 2025, there were 26,858 UIS Medi-Cal enrollees age 19 and older in San Francisco.

These reductions in coverage are being made on top of the changes implemented at the federal level through H.R. 1, which makes significant cuts in federal funding for Medicaid, creates new work requirements for Medicaid enrollees, and implements various changes to the Affordable Care Act’s marketplaces.

### **Challenge**

Inability to access the routine and preventative care that full-scope Medi-Cal provides leads to

worse health outcomes for patients and higher costs for counties, hospitals, and emergency rooms. Further, the current enrollment freeze has a disproportionate risk of harm to the members of our community that are already struggling most with healthcare outcomes. As of 2023, 35% of undocumented Californians were uninsured, compared to a 6% uninsurance rate among the general population. Lack of access to preventative care does not mean the need for care disappears – rather, delayed treatment for preventable conditions means greater reliance on costly emergency room visits, an overwhelming cost shift to local health systems that must provide these services.

The changes to limit eligibility and add barriers to health coverage from state and federal changes are anticipated to result in 25,000 – 50,000 San Franciscans losing Medi-Cal coverage by the end of 2027. Of those losing coverage, an estimated 8,400 – 16,800 receive services from DPH. These cuts and losses in reimbursement will result in reduced funding for healthcare and public health service and impact the overall safety net - DPH is expected lose \$65 million in FY 2026-27 and \$195.8 million in FY 2027-28. These impacts to the Department and City are projected to increase to \$400M when HR 1 is fully implemented by 2038.

Medi-Cal disenrollments due are expected to increase demand on indigent care programs. Work has been under way by the Department to prepare the Healthy San Francisco program, one of San Francisco’s programs for indigent care, as an option for those undocumented residents ineligible for full scope Medi-Cal. Healthy San Francisco provides universal, comprehensive, affordable health care to uninsured adults irrespective of the person’s income level, employment status, immigration status or pre-existing medical conditions. Current enrollment is around 3,000 with projections that it may increase from 8,000 to 11,000 due to elimination of new UIS enrollment into State-funded full-scope Medi-Cal.

---

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

SB 1422 would sunset the Medi-Cal enrollment

freeze for undocumented Californians 19 years and older beginning January 1, 2027.

Ensuring access to affordable and comprehensive health insurance is an important strategy for promoting health. Uninsured people receive less medical care and less timely care, leading to worse health outcomes. Additionally, lack of insurance can lead to costly out-of-pocket medical expense that become a fiscal burden for individuals and their families. In restoring access to preventative care and other full-scope benefits, SB 1422 will prevent additional harm to undocumented Californians and the county health systems that serve them. For these reasons, the San Francisco recommends supporting SB 1422.

---

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

In addition to SFDPH, Human Services Agency, which administers the eligibility and enrollment of Medi-Cal for City residents, would be impacted due to increases in the number of residents eligible for enrollment. The bill would require the state to reimburse local agencies for costs associated eligibility and enrollment.

---

### **Fiscal Impact**

State Fiscal Impact: The bill is expected to have significant ongoing costs (high hundreds of millions General Fund) to eliminate the existing enrollment freeze for full-scope Medi-Cal coverage for individuals who do not have satisfactory immigration status.

City Fiscal Impact: This bill would have a positive impact on the City’s GF due to reduced expenditures on HSF and other forms of uncompensated care.

---

### **Support / Opposition**

**Sponsors:** Health4All Coalition, Latino Coalition for a Healthy California, California Immigrant Policy Center, Health Access California

**Support:** 70 plus health/social service organizations and multiple counties.

**Oppose:** No associations or organizations 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](mailto:Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org), and Nathaniel Edwards at [nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org](mailto:nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org).

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

**Public health: abortion services.**  
**Assembly Member Irwin (D-42)**  
**Public health: abortion services.**

### Recommended Position

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

### Summary

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.

Introduced February 20, 2026, and amended on March 16, 2026. The bill has been re-referred to the Health Committee.

### Background/Analysis

On December 22, 2025, the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) issued a memo that rescinded a Biden-era rule that granted veterans and eligible family members and caretakers to access abortion care. The memo ended access to abortion care and counseling even in instances of rape, incest, or health emergencies. The VA will now only provide abortion care in very narrow, life-saving circumstances.

### Challenge

Women are the fastest growing group of veterans, totaling 2.1 million in 2023, and many rely on the Veteran’s Administration for healthcare for themselves and their families. Cutting these women and their families off from abortion care poses a tremendous risk to their livelihoods. A myriad of chronic health issues, ranging from high blood pressure to diabetes, can make pregnancy risky. Veterans also experience chronic mental health issues that can be negatively impacted by a pregnancy at much higher rates than non-veterans. Lastly, one in three women veterans have reported experiencing sexual trauma in the military and denying victims of abuse counseling and abortion care exacerbates the harms inflicted on them.

---

**Solution/Recommended Proposal**

---

The proposed bill would allow Medi-Cal providers to expand reproductive care services to veterans under existing programs that serve low-income and underserved populations. The bill would also 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. We recommend supporting this measure.

---

**Departments Impacted & Why**

---

N/a

---

**Fiscal Impact**

---

No fiscal analysis has been completed yet, but local costs are not anticipated.

---

**Support / Opposition**

---

There is no declare support or opposition to this legislation yet.



**State Legislation Committee Proposal Form**

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

<b>Date Submitted</b>	May 7, 2026
<b>Submitting Department</b>	San Francisco Police Department
<b>Contact Name</b>	Steven Lopez
<b>Contact Email and Phone Number</b>	<a href="mailto:Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org">Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org</a>
<b>SLC Meeting Presenter</b>	Steven Lopez
<b>Reviewed and approved by Department Head?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Reviewed and approved by Commission?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

**[AB 1877]**

**[Assemblymember, Catherine Stefani, Assembly District #19, Democrat-San Francisco]  
[Domestic Violence: Protective Orders]**

**Recommended Position**

SPONSOR     SUPPORT     SUPPORT if amended     OPPOSE     OTHER & Describe

**Summary**

*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.*

**Background/Analysis**

*Protective/Restraining orders are often the most accessible remedy for victims of domestic violence. Multiple studies have shown that approximately 44-50% of incidents of intimate partner violence (IPV) go unreported to law enforcement and 62% of victims of IPV not reporting their abuse to medical professionals. This is why in law enforcement, we see increases in reporting of IPV as a positive and an indication that more survivors are confiding in law enforcement or the judiciary to provide them relief and/or seek justice.*

*Statistics like this put into context the importance of legal remedies of protective orders as they are sought out by survivors who chose to present their case before the judiciary. Because of this, we*

*should ensure that these orders are treated with the utmost seriousness and incur appropriate consequences when they are violated, especially when they are issued for heinous offenses.*

### **Challenge**

---

*The effectiveness of protection orders in cases involving IPV are varied with the average effective rate resting at approximately 40%. Most of the reasons for the variation are the complex nature of domestic violence cases with various case characteristics being associated with higher or lower levels of orders being violated. For example, studies suggest that survivors in long-term relationships with the restrained individual may experience different violation patterns than those in shorter-term relationships. Studies also suggest that while the race of an abuser was not found to have any statistically significant correlation to violating a restraining order, the race of the survivor was with black women being at three times higher risk of renewed abuse after legal intervention when compared with white women.*

### **Solution/Recommended Proposal**

---

*AB 1877 appropriately updates State law surrounding the violation of specific criminal protective orders that are commonly issued in cases concerning domestic violence. The bill would make the initial knowing and willful violation of these specific criminal protective orders punishable as either 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 protective order was based.*

*Second, the bill makes a second or subsequent conviction for violating these specified protective orders a felony.*

*Although the primary goal of this bill is to strengthen protections in domestic violence cases, the protective orders specified also apply to other critical matters when a criminal element occurs, including witness intimidation, elder or dependent adult abuse, and protective conditions imposed during probation.*

### **Departments Impacted & Why**

---

*This bill has the potential to impact agencies involved in the criminal justice system such as: SFPD, the District Attorney's Office, Sheriff's Department, Adult Probation and the Public Defenders Office.*

*The bill adds higher penalties for violating the specified orders and can result in an increase in the number of orders issued.*

### **Fiscal Impact**

---

*This bill may increase incarceration costs for individuals who repeatedly or seriously violate specified protective orders. Research on the effectiveness of protective orders shows that violation rates vary widely across jurisdictions, though most studies suggest violations occur in a minority of cases.*

### **Support / Opposition**

---

*This bill is currently supported by the following organizations: Mayor Daniel Lurie, Black Women Revolt Against Domestic Violence, San Francisco Safehouse, San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium, Safe and Sound, Open Door Legal, Community Forward, California District Attorneys Association, California Medical Association, California Police Chiefs Association, Peace Officers*

*Research Association of California, Arcadia Police Officers' Association, Brea Police Officers Association, Burbank Police Officers Association, California Association of School Police Chiefs, California Coalition of School Safety Professionals, California Reserve Peace Officers' Association, Claremont Police Officers Association, Corona Police Officers Association, La Casa De Las Madres, Los Angeles School Police Management Association, Los Angeles School Police Officers Association, Murrieta Police Officers Association, Newport Police Officers Association, Palos Verdes Police Officers Association, California Narcotic Officers Association, Place County Deputy Sheriffs' Association, Riverside Police Officers Association, Riverside Sheriffs' Association*

*This bill is currently opposed by the American Civil Liberties Union California Action*