



**ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS**  
 Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area

**LEGISLATION**  
**2009 State Legislative Session**  
**Legislation & Governmental Organization Committee**  
**May 7, 2009**

Bill Author	Subject	Status	Staff Recommendation	L&GO Position	Legislation Summary
<b>*NEW BILLS</b>					<b>Bold Face/Shading in Legislation Summary indicates change/ amendments.</b>
<i>Bills to be reviewed are listed in numeric order with Assembly bills listed first, followed by Senate bills</i>					
<b>ASSEMBLY BILLS</b>					
<b>AB 18 Knight</b>	<b>Local Government: City Councils</b>	<b>ASM: Elections and Redistricting Committee</b> <b>Hearing 5/5</b>	Watch  After amended, LCC support	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Amended 3/17 and 4/27: Would require the city council to, within 60 days of a vacancy in an elective office, fill that vacancy by appointment or call a special election to fill the vacancy, as specified.</b> Originally: Would authorize a city council to leave a seat on the city council vacant for up to one year or the next general election, whichever comes first: if the remaining city council members cannot agree up an appropriate appointee and the remaining city council members can still form a quorum. <i>Existing law requires a city council to, within 30 days of a vacancy in an elective office to fill that vacancy by appointment or call a special election to fill the vacancy.</i>
<b>AB 46 Blakeslee</b>	<b>Energy: Energy Conservation Assistance</b>	<b>ASM: APPROPRIATIONS</b>  <b>Referred to Suspense File</b>	Support concept	<b>Watch</b>	<b>Amended 3/31: This bill extends the sunset dates, from January 1, 2011 to January 1, 2020, for the Energy Conservation Assistance Account (ECAA) and the Local Jurisdiction Energy Assistance Account (LJEA), each administered by the California Energy Commission (CEC): continues local assistance energy programs nine more years.</b> Originally: Would extend the operation of the State Energy Conservation Assistance Account to January 1, 2015: a continuously appropriated account in the General Fund that provides grants and loans to local governments and public institutions to maximize energy use savings. In existing law will end January 1, 2011.

Bill Author	Subject	Status	Staff Recommendation	L&GO Position	Legislation Summary <span style="float: right;">Page 2</span>
AB 55 Jeffries	Water Supply Planning	ASM: Parks and Wildlife Committee	Watch	Watch	<p><i>Is now being considered a Two-Year bill</i></p> <p>Existing law requires a city or county that determines a project is subject to CEQA to identify any public water system that may supply water for the project and request those public water systems to prepare a water supply assessment. This bill would revise the definition of "Project" to include within the scope of the definition and water supply requirements related to projects the following: specified business, commercial, hotel or motel, industrial, manufacturing, and mixed use developments with an equivalent water demand similar to a 500 dwelling unit project.</p>
AB 68 Brownley	Solid Waste: Single-use Carryout Bags	ASM: Appropriations  Hearing 5/6/09	Watch	Watch, but encourage bag giveaway programs	<p><b>Amended 3/31 and 4/23: Amended definition of "Reusable bag" to mean a bag that is specifically designed and manufactured for multiple reuse, meaning 50 or more uses.</b></p> <p><b>This bill would, on and after July 1, 2010, prohibit a store, as defined, from providing a single-use carryout bag to a customer unless the store charges a fee of not less than \$0.25 per bag at the point of sale. The bill would exempt certain customers from paying the fee. The bill would establish the Bag Pollution Fund in the State Treasury and would require a store to remit the single-use carryout bag fees, less a specified amount, to the State Board of Equalization for deposit in that fund. The bill would prohibit a store from distributing a single-use carryout bag that is not a plastic or compostable carryout bag that meets specific requirements. The bill would require the board to administer and enforce the single-use carryout bag provisions and would require the State Board of Equalization to administer the collection of the fees imposed on those bags. The moneys in the fund would be required to be expended, upon appropriation by the Legislature, in a specified order of priority, by the board for grants to cities and counties for programs related to single-use carryout bags and reusable bag giveaway programs, by the State Board of Equalization to reimburse its costs associated with collecting the fees, by the board for purposes of implementing the above provisions, and by the board, in consultation with specified state agencies, to develop and implement specified programs related to single-use carryout bags. The bill would expressly prohibit the expenditure of revenues from the fund for activities unrelated to the prevention or reduction of single-use bag pollution. The bill would require the board, on or before January 1, 2013, to submit to the Legislature a report regarding the effectiveness of the above provisions and recommendations to further encourage the use of reusable bags.</b></p> <p>Originally: Would on and after July 1, 2011, prohibit a store from</p>

Bill Author	Subject	Status	Staff Recommendation	L&GO Position	Legislation Summary <span style="float: right;">Page 3</span>
					<p>providing a single-use carryout bag to a customer unless the store charges a fee of not less than 25 cents per bag at the point of sale. Would establish a Bag Pollution Fund where stores would remit the carryout bag fees, depositing in the fund through the State Board of Equalization. Moneys in the fund would be required to be expended, upon appropriation by the Legislature in priority to cities and counties for programs related to single-use carryout bags and reusable bag giveaway programs.</p>
<p><b>AB 87 Davis</b></p>	<p><b>Single-use Carryout Bags: Environmental Effects— Mitigation</b></p>	<p><b>ASM: Appropriations</b></p> <p>Hearing 5/6</p>	<p>Watch</p>	<p><b>Watch, but encourage bag giveaway programs</b></p>	<p><b>Amended 3/18 and 4/27: This bill restricts grocery and convenience stores from providing single-use carry out bags to their customers. Specifically: 1) As of July 1, 2010, prohibits grocery and convenience stores and pharmacies, as defined, from providing single-use carryout bags, to customers without charging a sales tax-free fee of 25 cents per bag (the Bag Pollution Cleanup Fee). 2) Exempts from the fee customers participating in certain low-income assistance programs. 3) Allows stores charging the fee to retain a portion of the amount generated by the fee to pay for implementation of the requirements of the bill, including educational programs and donation of reusable bags to community groups, nonprofits, and similar entities. 4) Creates the Bag Pollution Fund, available for annual legislative appropriation to the Integrated Waste Management Board for state programs for litter cleanup and source reduction and for grants to cities and counties for those same purposes.</b></p> <p>Originally: Would on and after July 1, 2010, prohibit a store from providing a single-use carryout bag, including a green carryout bag, to a customer unless the store charges a fee of not less than 25 cents per bag at the point of sale. Would establish a Bag Pollution Fund and by January 31, 2011, would require stores that collect the single-use carryout bag fees to remit the fees to the State Board of Equalization for deposit in the fund, and do so on a quarterly basis. Would require the manufacturer of single-use carryout bags to develop educational materials to encourage the reduction, reuse and recycling of single-use bags for those store required to comply with program. Would require a biennial report to legislature in coordination with other state agencies and stakeholders on the effectiveness of the program and recommendations to further encourage the use of reusable bags.</p>
<p><b>AB 155 Mendoza</b></p>	<p><b>Local Government: Bankruptcy Proceedings</b></p>	<p><b>ASM Appropriations Com</b></p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>CSAC Oppose</p> <p>LCC Oppose</p>		<p><b>Prohibits a local public entity (defined as a county, city, district, public authority, public agency) from exercising it rights under applicable federal bankruptcy law unless granted approval by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC), under CDIAC's terms and conditions.</b></p>

Bill Author	Subject	Status	Staff Recommendation	L&GO Position	Legislation Summary <span style="float: right;">Page 4</span>
<b>AB 280</b> <b>Blakeslee and Ma</b>	<b>California Earthquake Authority: Retrofit Programs—Grants</b>	<b>ASM Appropriations Suspense File</b>	Support Concept	<b>Support in concept</b>	Would authorize the 3-member governing Board (Governor, Treasurer, Commissioner) to create a program, administered by the Earthquake Authority, to access and dispense federal stimulus dollars for purposes of retrofitting multiunit, soft-story buildings. Includes parameters of a city or county having adopted by ordinance a retrofit program, and other stipulations.
<b>AB 338</b> <b>Ma</b>	<b>Transit Village Developments: Infrastructure Financing</b>	<b>ASM Third Reading</b>  <b>Passed Appropriations</b>	Watch	<b>Watch</b>	Would recast the area included in a transit village plan to include all land within not more than ½ mile of the main entrance of a transit station. Would eliminate the requirement for voter approval for the formation of an infrastructure financing district, adoption of an infrastructure financing plan, and an issuance of bonds for developing and financing a transit facility. Includes other stipulations about public benefit and affordable housing.
<b>AB 349</b> <b>Silva</b>	<b>State Mandates</b>	<b>ASM Appropriations</b>	Support Concept  CSAC Support		<b>Requires the Director of Finance to provide to the Legislature all proposed statutory changes necessary to repeal reimbursable state mandates that have been suspended for three consecutive years in the Governor’s Budget.</b>
<b>AB 782</b> <b>Jeffries</b>	<b>Regional Transportation Plans: Sustainable Communities Strategies</b>	<b>ASM Natural Resources Committee</b>	Watch	<b>Watch</b>	The bill outlines a number stipulations regarding what happens after Sustainable Communities Strategy or alternative planning strategy (resulting from SB 375 requirements) is accepted: stipulations on project approval, adding commercial builders/business community to a business advisor committee to be created by MPOs, extending CEQA exemptions, and states Legislative intent to enact legislation to resolve conflicts with scheduling of new housing element updates and adoption of regional transportation plans.
<b>AB 814</b> <b>Krekorian</b>	<b>Firearm Surrender Process and Procedure</b>	<b>ASM Appropriations Com.</b>  <b>Suspense File</b>	Support concept	<b>No Position—need clarification</b>	<b>Amended 4/13: This bill would establish a procedure for a defendant who owns, has possession, custody, or control of a firearm, to sell the firearm to a firearms dealer or relinquish the firearm to a law enforcement agency in order to comply with existing prohibitions. The procedure would in part require the defendant to disclose whether the defendant owns or has possession, custody, or control of any firearms and to list those firearms. The bill would provide procedures for persons in or out of custody to relinquish their firearms, including designating a law enforcement agency or a person as the defendant’s designee, and would require the defendant or the defendant’s designee to file a form showing, among other things, the date the firearm was relinquished. Failure to timely file the form would be an infraction punishable by a fine not</b>

Bill Author	Subject	Status	Staff Recommendation	L&GO Position	Legislation Summary <span style="float: right;">Page 5</span>
					<p><b>exceeding \$500.</b>  Originally: Would establish a procedure for defendants to sell firearm to a firearms dealer or relinquish the firearm to a law enforcement agency. Require the defendant to disclose, under penalty of perjury, whether the defendant owns or has possession or custody or control of any firearms and to list those firearms. Would provide procedures for them to relinquish their firearms.</p>
<b>AB 1084</b> <b>Adams</b>	<b>Local Planning: Development Projects--Fees</b>	<b>ASM Appropriations Committee</b>	Watch	<b>Support</b>	<p><b>Amended 4/13/, 4/27/ and 4/28:</b>  <b>This bill provides a time frame for notice relating to an increase or change in fee levied under the Mitigation Fee Act and establishes procedures for requesting an audit of those fees.</b>  <i>(Existing Law: Authorizes a local agency to charge a variety of fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions in connection with the approval of a development project, as defined. Provides, under the Mitigation Fee Act, that in any action establishing, increasing, or imposing a fee as a condition of approval of a development project by a local agency, the local agency is required to determine how there is reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development project on which the fee is imposed fees.)</i> <b>Specifically, the bill would:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1) Require a local agency that is a city, county, or city and county to mail notice of the time and place of the meeting that will be held regarding adoption of a new fee or increasing an existing fee under the mitigation fee act.</b></li> <li><b>2) Require that the mailing, which must be sent 14 days prior to the hearing, include a general explanation of the matter to be considered and a statement of the proposed costs.</b></li> <li><b>3) Provide that any written request for mailed notice is valid for one year and the legislative body of the city, county, or city and county may establish a reasonable annual charge for sending these notices.</b></li> <li><b>4) State that at least 10 days prior to the meeting, a local agency that is a city, county, or city and county shall make available to the public the data indicating the amount of cost or estimated cost, required to provide the public facilities and the revenue sources anticipated to fund those public facilities.</b></li> <li><b>5) Prohibit any new or increased fee adopted by a local agency that is a city, county, or city and county from going in to effect until 60 days after the final adoption, unless otherwise provided in law.</b></li> <li><b>6) State that any person can request an audit in order to determine whether any fee or charge levied by a local agency</b></li> </ol>

					<p><b>that is a city, county, or city and county exceeds the amount reasonably necessary to cover the cost of any product, public facility, or service provided.</b></p> <p><b>7) Specify that any costs incurred by a city, county, or city and county by having an independent audit conducted may be recovered from the person who requests the audit.</b></p> <p><b>8) Specify that the oversight of local agency fees is of statewide concern, and therefore, this measure shall apply to charter cities.</b></p> <p>Originally: Would revise the definition of “fee” that a local agency can charge in connection to the approval of a development project to mean a “charge or other exactions, including a dedication, reservation, set-aside, or contribution of real or personal property or services, including a monetary exaction other than a tax or special assessment that is charged by a local agency, including a local agency that does not itself approve the development project, to the applicant in connection with the development project or as a condition of approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project.” <i>“Public facilities” would be defined to include public improvements, public services, community amenities, and measures intended to mitigate or alleviate the effects of the development project, whether or not owned or controlled by a public agency. Also stipulates that regarding the fees/amount, it would need to be justified prior to imposing the fee how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee and the cost of the public facility/or portion. Includes also a series of stipulations on the process, timing, and scope.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

<b>AB 962 DE LEON</b>	<b>Ammunition</b>	<b>ASM Appropriations  Hearing 5/6</b>	Support in Concept	<b>Support with amendments</b>	<b>Would require the Department of Justice to maintain additional info relating to ammunition transfers and licensed handgun ammunition vendors; require starting 7/1/10 not person shall sell or transfer more than 50 rounds of handgun ammunition in any month unless a handgun ammunition vendor; request background clearance of employees, store handgun ammunition safely and securely away from purchasers, maintain records, and require handgun ammunition be sold in face to face transactions so that the vendor can confirm identity of purchaser and record that information, obtain a thumbprint and other info from purchaser. Prohibits sale to person associated with criminal street gang or others that reasonably should not possess ammunition.</b>
---------------------------	-------------------	--	--------------------	--------------------------------	---

<b>AB 2235</b> DeSaulnier	<b>Firearms: Owner-Authorized Handguns</b>	<b>2008 position: SEN Appropriations Committee Held under submission</b>	Support in Concept	Support in Concept	This bill could be re-introduced into the 2009 legislative cycle. <i>The 2008 bill provisions would require all newly manufactured or imported handguns in the state be owner-authorized, which means having a permanent programmable biometric feature that makes only a lawful owner or authorized user able to fire the gun. Other stipulations how to monitor technology and implementation are included.</i>
<b>AB 1342</b> Evans	<b>Local Taxation: Income Taxes— Vehicle License Fees</b>	<b>ASM Revenue &amp; Taxation Com</b>	Support  CSAC Support		<p><b>Authorizes counties, under specified circumstances, to adopt a local personal income tax (PIT), a local vehicle license fee (VLF), or both:</b></p> <p><b>1)Contains legislative findings noting that:</b></p> <p>a) <b>Proposition 13 has reduced local property taxes by approximately 50%;</b></p> <p>b) <b>In response to the enactment of Proposition 13, the state has provided local governmental agencies with increased amounts of state funds to maintain police, school, and other local services;</b></p> <p>c) <b>Proposition 13 has resulted in increased state control and decreased local control with respect to the provision of local governmental services;</b></p> <p>d) <b>The state is experiencing great difficulty in providing state funds to maintain local governmental services at historical levels; and,</b></p> <p>e) <b>It is appropriate and necessary to shift some authority, control, and responsibility back to local governmental agencies to allow those agencies to determine the level of services appropriate for their citizens.</b></p> <p><b>--Provides that, notwithstanding existing law, the board of supervisors of any county may, by ordinance, place on the ballot either or both of the following for consideration by the voters in accordance with all constitutional and statutory requirements: A local PIT; and/or, a local license fee on any vehicle, registered within the county in which the local license fee is imposed, that is subject to registration under the Vehicle Code and on which a VLF is imposed under existing law.</b></p> <p><b>--Provides that a local VLF shall be subject to the following conditions:</b> a) <b>The aggregate license fee rate imposed by both the state and county on any vehicle shall not exceed 2% of the vehicle's market value;</b></p> <p>b) <b>The local VLF shall be assessed and collected in the same manner as the fee imposed by state law;</b></p> <p>c) <b>The local VLF shall be administered by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV); and the DMV shall transmit all revenues, less its costs of administration and any refunds, to</b></p>

Bill Author	Subject	Status	Staff Recommendation	L&GO Position	Legislation Summary <span style="float: right;">Page 8</span>
AB 1520 Evans	State Watershed Program	ASM Natural Resources Com	Support concept  CSAC Support		<b>the county in which the fee is imposed.</b>  Establishes a Statewide Watershed Program as a voluntary program in the Department of Conservation to provide assistance and funding to local community-based efforts in the conservation, protection, and restoration of the state's watersheds.
ACA 9 Huffman	Local Government bonds: Special Taxes—voter approval	ASM Local Government Committee	Support  CSAC Support  LCC Support		Proposes a constitutional amendment to change the 2/3 voter-approval requirement for special taxes to, instead, authorize a city, county, or special district impose a special with the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the tax. Would lower to 55% the voter approval threshold for a city, county, city and county to incur bonded indebtedness.
	SENATE BILLS				
SB 7 Wiggins	Renewable Energy Sources: Feed-in Tariff—Net Metering	SEN Second Reading	Support concept		<b>Amended May 5:</b> This bill would require the electricity distribution utility or cooperative <i>to allow the eligible customer-generator to apply net surplus electricity, as defined, as a credit for kilowatthours consumed during one, or both, of the two following 12-month periods.</i>  <u>This bill</u> requires utilities to compensate customers that use net metering for any generation in excess of their load or, for customers on time of use rates any net dollar value, on an annual basis, or to roll that excess generation over, on a kilowatt hour basis, to the next 12-month cycle. The compensation rate would be set by the CPUC at a rate no less than the MPR.
SB 12 Simitian	Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, Clean Drinking Water, Water Supply Security, and Environmental Improvement 2009	SEN: Amended; Re-referred to Com. on APPR.  Hearing 5/18	Watch	Watch	<b>Amended 5/5/09:</b> section on Delta Protection Commission review of Delta local government plans: The bill would require <i>each Delta county, as defined, and each city within a Delta county, to submit to the commission for review proposed amendments to make its general plan consistent with the commission's revised resource management plan.</i> By imposing requirements on those counties and cities with regard to the preparation of their general plans, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. <i>The bill would establish a permit process for projects, as defined, requiring the commission to review and determine whether any project proposed to be carried out or approved by a local government within the primary zone is consistent with both the commission's revised resource management plan and the plan, and requiring the commission, until a Delta county or a city within a Delta county in which a project is located has adopted general plan amendments to make the general plan consistent with the commission's revised resource management plan, to review and determine whether any</i>

Bill Author	Subject	Status	Staff Recommendation	L&GO Position	Legislation Summary <span style="float: right;">Page 9</span>
					<p><i>project proposed to be carried out or approved by a local government within the secondary zone is consistent with both the commission's revised resource management plan and the plan. The bill would make any person who undertakes a development project within the commission's jurisdiction without securing a permit from the commission guilty of a misdemeanor, thereby imposing a state-mandated local program by creating a new crime. The council would be authorized to review development projects in the primary and secondary zones for consistency with the plan adopted by the council.</i></p> <p>Originally: Would authorize for funding the Act issuance of bonds in amount of \$6 million for voter approval. Would establish in state government the Delta Water and Land Use Authority, prescribe composition of its Board of Directors, and grant to the Authority a broad range of powers relating to preservation of the Delta ecosystem and the delivery of a reliable state water supply. Would authorize the Authority to contract to design, construct and own one or more facilities to move water from the Sacramento River to federal and state pumping facilities. The Authority would succeed to the powers and duties of the California Bay-Delta Authority. Would establish within the California Coastal Commission, the Delta Watershed Conservancy. Would subject any approval by a city or county in specified zones of the Delta, and certain lands adjacent to the Delta to review by the Delta Protection Commission, and require the Authority to adopt or reject these land use decisions of the Commission. Other fee provisions included.</p>
<b>SB 27 Hancock</b>	<b>Local Agencies: Sales and Use Tax--Reallocation</b>	<b>ASM-Local Government</b>  <b>Hearing 5/13</b>	Support Concept  CSAC Support LCC Support	<b>Support</b>	<p>The bill would prohibit a city, county, or city and county, on or after the bill's effective date, from entering into any form of agreement or taking any action that would result, directly or indirectly, in the payment, transfer, diversion or rebate of any amount of Bradley-Burns local tax proceeds to any person for any purpose when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--The agreement results in a substantial reduction in the amount of Bradley-Burns tax proceeds received by another local agency from a retailer within that other local agency;</li> <li>--and the retailer continues to maintain a physical presence and location within that other local agency. This bill has a urgency clause that means it would be immediately enacted after passed, signed and chaptered.</li> </ul>
<b>SB 31 Pavley</b>	<b>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: Revenue</b>	<b>SEN Second Reading</b>	Watch	<b>Watch</b>	Would require that revenues collected due to compliance mechanisms adopted by the State Air Resources Board also be

	<b>Allocations</b>	<b>Passed Appropriations Committee</b>			deposited in the Air Pollution Control Fund. Specified uses of the revenues collected would fund renewable energy and energy efficiency programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (particularly programs focusing on low-income consumers); for investments in emission reduction technologies; and for green jobs development and training that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
<b>SB 279 Hancock</b>	<b>Local Government: Community Facilities Districts</b>	<b>ASM: Read First time; held at desk</b>	Support	<b>Support</b>	<b>Amended 4/13 and 4/21: Would authorize a community facilities district to finance and refinance the acquisition, installation, and improvement of energy efficiency and renewable energy improvements to or on real property and in buildings. Includes some provisions for establishing a community facility district and procedure for incurring bonded indebtedness.</b>
<b>SB 406 DeSaulnier</b>	<b>Land Use: Environmental Quality</b>	<b>SEN Appropriations</b>	Support		This bill authorizes regions to impose a surcharge on vehicle registrations to pay for regional land use planning activities. This bill also makes changes to the membership and duties of the Office of Planning and Research's Planning Advisory and Assistance Council. Allows an MPO, a COG, or a county transportation commission and a subregional COG jointly preparing an SCS to impose a surcharge of up to \$2 on vehicles registered in its jurisdiction to fund the development and implementation of an SCS or a regional blueprint plan to identify land use strategies to reduce the use of motor vehicles and thereby reduce emissions into the environment. Specifies that the regional entity shall adopt a resolution imposing the surcharge, except that: i) In the San Francisco Bay Area, both MTC and ABAG shall have to adopt a resolution and agree how to divide the revenue received; and ii) In the jurisdiction of the Southern California Association of Governments, both a county transportation commission and a subregional COG shall have to adopt a resolution and agree how to divide the revenue received.
<b>SB 457 Wolk</b>	<b>Creation of Delta Stewardship Council for Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta</b>	<b>SEN Appropriations Com</b>  <b>Hearing 5/18</b>	Watch	<b>Watch</b>	<b>Amended 4/13 and 5/5: Creates a 9-member Delta Stewardship Council and deletes section on establishing the Delta Conservancy. The bill would require the Delta Protection commission to revise all of its plans and policies to be consistent with the Delta Stewardship Plan, to review and certify all city and county general plans for consistency with the resource management plan and the Delta Stewardship Plan, to exercise appeal authority over actions taken by a local government or other local agency in the primary zone, to review, hold public hearings and receive testimony, and provide recommendations</b>

Bill Author	Subject	Status	Staff Recommendation	L&GO Position	Legislation Summary <span style="float: right;">Page 11</span>
					<p><b>to the council on all proposed projects subject to approval by the council, and develop a regional economic development plan. The bill would require the council to determine appeals from the commission on water conveyance and storage project decisions.</b></p> <p>Originally: This bill would create a 7-member Delta Stewardship Council in the Natural Resources Agency with specified powers and responsibilities relating to the Delta, including approving the Delta Stewardship Plan to guide and shape management of the Delta. The bill would require the commission to present the council with a draft plan on or before October 1, 2010. The bill would require the council to adopt the plan on or before January 1, 2011. The bill would require the council to review, and if necessary, amend the plan at least every 5 years.</p> <p>--- would establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy to undertake various activities related to the Delta and would prescribe the management, powers, and duties of the conservancy.</p> <p>--The bill would require the council by March 1, 2010, to appoint a Delta Science and Engineering Board and create a Delta Science and Engineering Program. The bill would state the intent of the Legislature that the Delta Science and Engineering Program be a replacement for, and a successor to, the CALFED Science Program, with specified responsibilities, and that the Delta Science and Engineering Board be a replacement for the CALFED Independent Science Board.</p> <p>--The bill would require the commission to require all general plans of cities and counties within the Delta, and the resource management plan, to be consistent with the Delta Stewardship Plan, thereby imposing a state-mandated local program on cities and counties. The bill would require the commission to revise all of its plans and policies to be consistent with the Delta Stewardship Plan, to review and certify all city and county general plans for consistency with the resource management plan and the Delta Stewardship Plan, to exercise direct consistency determination authority over development proposals in the primary zone, to review, hold public hearings and receive testimony, and provide recommendations to the council on all proposed projects subject to approval by the council, and develop a regional economic development plan.</p>
<b>SB 458</b> <b>Wolk</b>	<b>Establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy</b>	<b>SEN Appropriations</b>  <b>Hearing 5/11</b>	Watch	<b>Watch</b>	<b>Amended 4/2: deletes language about Conservancy activities that said “including monitoring projects within the watershed of the delta, providing stewardship, and coordinating with other delta governance entities” to now read the purpose of the Conservancy is to “support efforts that advance both environmental protection and the economic well-being of Delta</b>

					<p>Residents, and cooperating with other Delta governance.” This bill would establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy to undertake various activities related to the Delta, as defined. The bill would prescribe the management, powers, and duties of the conservancy. The bill would create the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy Fund in the State Treasury. Moneys in the fund would be available, upon appropriation, for the purposes of the conservancy.</p>
<p><b>SB 488</b> Pavley</p>	<p><b>New title: Energy Usage Information</b></p> <p><b>Energy: Energy Efficiency Financing</b></p>	<p><b>SEN Second Reading</b></p>	<p>Support in Concept</p>	<p><b>Support</b></p>	<p><b>Amended 4/14 and 5/5:</b> This bill would require the commission, on or before July 1, 2010, to require each electrical corporation and each gas corporation to <i>adopt a pilot program to disclose, not less frequently than quarterly, on the billing statement of a residential subscriber, information documenting the amount of energy used by the metered residence compared to similar residences in the subscriber’s geographical area. The bill would require the commission to require each electrical corporation and each gas corporation to identify those residences that used significantly more energy during the period than was used by similar residences with comparable household square footage in the subscriber’s geographical area and to ensure that information is provided to those subscribers on energy saving strategies and programs available to assist in financing energy efficiency improvements. The bill would require each electrical corporation and each gas corporation, on or before July 1, 2011, and each July 1 thereafter, to submit to the commission a report on the energy savings resulting from the pilot program adopted by the utility.</i></p> <p>Originally: Would require the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission to establish an ongoing procedure to develop an energy efficiency financing program to allow residential, commercial, industrial and municipal participants to finance energy efficiency improvements funded through cost avoidance of energy saves by the implemented measure. Includes a list of programs, measures and challenges to be addressed through energy efficiency.</p>
<p><b>SB 575</b> Steinberg</p>	<p><b>Local Planning: Housing Element</b></p>	<p><b>SEN Appropriations Committee</b></p>	<p>Watch</p>		<p><b>This bill is a clean-up bill for SB 375 an SB 732, cleaning-up three provisions: the exemption for transportation sales tax projects; the rezoning requirement under housing element law and housing element due dates generally.</b></p>
<p><b>SB 676</b> Wolk</p>	<p><b>Local Fees</b></p>	<p><b>SEN Local Government Committee</b></p>	<p>Support</p> <p>CSAC Support</p>		<p><b>This bill increases or eliminates the statutory limits on 14 fees still set by state law: such as federal lien certificates, environmental quality act filings, recorded documents, document indexing, court-appointed counsel, restitution, county probation department payments, change of plea/setting aside of a verdict, sealing of records, installment payments,</b></p>

Bill Author	Subject	Status	Staff Recommendation	L&GO Position	Legislation Summary <span style="float: right;">Page 13</span>
-------------	---------	--------	----------------------	---------------	--

<b>SB 808 Wolk</b>	<b>San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary: Strategic Work Plan</b>	<b>SEN Natural Resources and Water Com</b>  <b>Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</b>	Watch	<b>Watch</b>	<b>fingerprinting, support of a minor sealing of juvenile records.</b> This bill would require the State Water Resources Control Board to implement its resolution entitled the Strategic Workplan for Actions to Protect Beneficial Uses of the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary by commencing an investigation of the reasonableness of the methods of diversions from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta used by the State Water Project and the federal Central Valley Project, ensuring that the implementation is consistent with its duties to protect the public trust and prevent the waste, unreasonable use, unreasonable method of use, or unreasonable method of diversion of water, and taking other action. The state board would be required to prepare related quarterly reports, which the state board would be required to make available to the public and to post on the state board's Internet Web site.
------------------------	--	---	-------	--------------	---