



MEETING AGENDA

Monday August 17, 2015

Mt. San Jacinto College Campus, Room 805

Presiding: Alex Braicovich, Chair

2015 Strategic Initiatives

Budget & Tax Reform / Job Creation and Retention / Healthcare / Infrastructure & The Environment

Call to Order, Roll Call & Introductions: 12:00 p.m.

Chair Report

Agenda Items

- 1. Approval of July 2015 Meeting Minutes Action**

- 2. Legislative Report #8 Action**
 - 1. [SB 789 \(Wieckowski\) ~~Driver's license suspension: restricted privilege.~~ Sale of water by local public entities: excise tax.](#)
 - 2. [SB 540 \(Hertzberg\) Franchise Tax Board: Taxpayers' Rights Advocate.](#)
 - 3. [AB 154 \(Ting\) Taxation: federal conformity.](#)
 - 4. [AB 1354 \(Dodd\) Discrimination: equal pay: state contracting.](#)
 - 5. [AB 662 \(Bonilla\) Public accommodation: disabled adults: changing facilities.](#)
 - 6. [SB 602 \(Monning\) Seismic safety: California Earthquake Authority.](#)

- 3. Guest speaker: Greater Riverside C of C President /Chief Executive Officer Cindy Roth**

- 4. Legislator, Staff and Stakeholder Updates Information**

Federal: Senators Feinstein & Boxer. Representatives Calvert & Hunter
State: Governor Brown, Senators Stone, Roth & Morrell, Assembly Members Melendez, Waldron, Jones & Medina
Local: County, Cities, Utilities, EDC, Healthcare, League of Cities

- 5. Chamber & Council Member Announcements Information**

Adjourn – Next meeting September 28, 2015.



For updates that affect your business everyday - LIKE us on:

The Southwest California Legislative Council Thanks Our Partners:

[Southwest Riverside Country Association of Realtors](#)
[Southern California Edison Metropolitan Water District of Southern California](#)
[Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District](#)
[The Gas Company](#)
[Abbott Vascular](#)

[Commerce Bank of Temecula Valley](#)
[Loma Linda University Medical Center](#)
[Southwest Healthcare Systems](#)
[Wal-Mart](#)
[EDC of Southwest California](#)
[CR&R Waste Services](#)
[The Murrieta Temecula Group](#)

[Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Murrieta Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Wildomar Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Meniffee Valley Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce](#)



Southwest California Legislative Council

Menifee Valley Chamber of Commerce

Murrieta Chamber of Commerce

Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce

Lake Elsinore Chamber of Commerce

Wildomar Chamber of Commerce

Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce

Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 27, 2015

2015 Chair: Alex Braicovich, Chair

Legislative Consultant: Gene Wunderlich

Directors Attendance:

- ✓ Alex Braicovich, CR&R, Inc.
- Ali Mazarei, Perris Chamber of Commerce
- Andy Morris, EVMWD
- ✓ Brad Neet, Southwest Healthcare Systems
- Dennis Frank, D.R. Frank & Associates
- ✓ Don Murray, Commerce Bank of Temecula Valley
- Gary Thornhill, City of Hemet
- Glen Daigle, Oakgrove Equities
- Greg Morrison, EVMWD
- ✓ Jason Hope, JD Promotions
- ✓ Joan Sparkman, SWHS
- ✓ Judy Guglielmana, Town & Country Real Estate
- Matt Buck, California Apartment Association
- ✓ Pietro Canestrelli, Reid & Hellyer, APC
- Shaura Olsen, WalMart
- Steve Amante, Amante & Associates
- Vicki Carpenter, Coldwell Banker
- ✓ Gene Wunderlich, Liaison

Guests:

Brenda Dennstedt, Rep Ken Calvert & WMWD
Brian Ambrose, City of Murrieta
Danielle Coats, Eastern Municipal Water District
Darlene Wetton, Temecula Valley Hospital
Debbie Kosum, Realty One Group
Doug McAllister, McAllister Storage
Gregory Foster, Diane Harkey BOE
Maryann Edwards, Senator Jeff Stone
Meggan Valencia, Rancho California Water District
Michael Garrison, Assem. Melissa Melendez
Randi Johl-Olsen, City of Temecula
Rebecca Shear'Ree, Shear'Ree Realty Group
Roger Ziemer, Rancho California Water District

Tom Stinson, Assembly member Marie Waldron
Walter Wilson, Walter Wilson Realty
Kim Kelliher, Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
David Madsen, SCAQMD
Adam Eventov, Menifee Chamber
Andy Abeles, Rancon Real Estate
Jeremy Goldman, SoCal Edison
Linda Hofstatter, HomeSmart Real Estate
Altie Holcomb, Sen. Richard Roth
Michelle Juma, EMWD
Midori Ramsey, Essential Ink
Claire Burger, Reputation Biz
David Matza, Sen. Mike Morrell

Chris Osborn, MSJC
Megan Locke, Sen. Jeff Stone
Kylie Thomas, Sen. Jeff Stone
Mason Herror, Assm. Brian Jones
Marie Waldron, Assemblymember
Melissa Melendez, Assemblymember
Sam Spencer, Assm. Melissa Melendez

Ray Nolta, IESBDC
Anthony Rodebush, SWHS
Debbie Herrera, Sen. Jeff Stone
April Vidal, Murrieta Chamber Ambassador
Yolanda Osborn, MSJC
Jeff Greene, Supervisor Kevin Jeffries
Ben Benoit, City of Wildomar

Staff:

Alice Sullivan – Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
Patrick Ellis, Murrieta Chamber of Commerce
Cindy Espinoza, Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce
Kimberly Niebla, Murrieta Chamber of Commerce
Laura Turnbow, Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
Kim Cousins, Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce
Janet Cook, Menifee Valley Chamber of Commerce

Meeting called to order at: 12:09 by Chair Alex Braicovich

1. Approval of Minutes **Action**

Motion was made to approve the minutes. Motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.

2. Special Presentation. Assemblymember Melissa Melendez made a special presentation to Yolanda Osborne for her prompt and professional response to render CPR lifesaving efforts to an infant suffering a choking/seizure event. Thanks to Ms. Osborne the infant survived.

3. Legislative Items **Action**

1. **AB 718 (Chu) Local government: powers.** This bill prohibits local governments from penalizing, by impoundment or other method, the act of sleeping in a lawfully parked motor vehicle. Assembly members Melendez and Waldron both commented on the bill as they had voted opposite sides of the issue. M. Melendez indicated she had initially voted out of compassion but will change her vote when the bill returns to the Assembly after input from her constituents.
Motion to OPPOSE AB 718. Seconded and carried.
2. **AB 1520 (Committee on Judiciary) Public Records.** This bill, under the California Public Records Act, would clarify the exemption from public disclosure for specified personal information of residential utility customers.
Motion to OPPOSE AB1520. Seconded and carried.
3. **AB 12 (Cooley) State government: administrative regulations: review.** This bill requires each state agency, on or before January 1, 2018, to review, adopt, amend or repeal any applicable regulations that are duplicative, overlapping, inconsistent, or out of date and revise those identified regulations, as specified.
Motion to SUPPORT AB12. Seconded and carried.
4. **AB 172 (Rodriguez) Emergency departments: assaults and batteries.** The purpose of this legislation it to increase the penalties for assault and battery committed against a physician, nurse, or other health care worker engaged in performing services within the emergency department.
Motion to SUPPORT AB172. Seconded and carried.
5. **AB 807 (M Stone) Real estate transfer fees: recorded documents.** This bill makes declaratory and clarifying changes to existing law pertaining to the disclosure of real estate transfer fees, including, among other things, providing that transfer fees due at times other than upon the transfer or sale of a property are subject to disclosure under existing law.
Motion to SUPPORT AB807. Seconded and carried.
6. **AB 349 (Gonzalez) Common interest developments: property use and maintenance.** This bill would render void and unenforceable any provision of the governing documents or architectural or landscaping guidelines or policies of an HOA that prohibits, or includes conditions that have the effect of prohibiting, the use of artificial turf or any other synthetic surface that resembles grass.
Motion to SUPPORT AB349. Seconded and carried.

3. Guest Speakers: Assembly members Melissa Melendez and Marie Waldron

Assemblymember Melendez spoke of concerns in Sacramento including the need to watch closely for 'gut and amend' bills that are often dropped on legislators at the last minute with no opportunity to read prior to a vote. She said there are many bad bills making their way through the legislature but a few good ones too. Notable among the bad - SB3 (minimum wage), SB4 (healthcare coverage for undocumented immigrants) and SB 350 (gas tax).

Good bills include her own bill AB585 to provide a tax rebate of 25% for low-water landscape retrofits and AB 1455, a bill to provide a revenue bond mechanism for the Ontario Airport. She also updated on ongoing (though not successful) efforts to differentiate between IE water requirements and Coastal and NorCal requirements.

Assemblymember Waldron echoed many of the comments and concerns of colleague Melendez and added her appreciation for the SWCLC. She values our input and position letters as a local organization that knows what's good and bad for local area businesses.

4. Legislator, Staff and Stakeholder Updates

Information

Representative Ken Calvert

Reported by Brenda Dennstedt: Report on Congressman's upcoming events.

Senator Jeff Stone

Reported by Maryann Edwards: Report on irregularities, inconsistencies and insanity of the Senators first session in Sacramento.

Senator Mike Morrell

Reported by David Matza: Senator is working on a bill to increase transparency, considered a landmark bill.

Senator Richard Roth

Report by Altie Holcomb

Supervisor Kevin Jeffries

Report by Jeff Greene

City of Wildomar

Report by mayor Ben Benoit

City of Murrieta

Reported by Brian Ambrose: Report on legislative focus. AB 287 died in committee.

City of Temecula

Report by Randi Johl-Olson on legislative focus; testified before committee on AB 287.

Other Reports

Danielle Coats - EMWD

Roger Ziemer - RCWD

Ken Dickson - MVUSD

Morris Myers - EDC

David Madsen - SCAQMD

Greg Foster - BOE

5. Chamber and Council Member Announcements

Information

Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce

Report by Laura Turnbow on upcoming events.

Murrieta Valley Chamber of Commerce

Report by Patrick Ellis on upcoming events

Menifee Valley Chamber of Commerce

Report and welcome by new Chamber CEO.

Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce

Report by Kim Cousins on upcoming events.

6. Today's Lunch Sponsor

Adjournment – Next Meeting August 17, 2015

Motion to adjourn at 1:45 p.m.

Legislative Item #1	Action
----------------------------	---------------

[SB 789 \(Wieckowski\) Sale of water by local public entities: excise tax.](#)

Recommended action: OPPOSE

Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Perfect example of a gut-and-amend bill.

SB 789, as amended, Wieckowski. ~~Driver's license suspension: restricted privilege.~~ *Sale of water by local public entities: excise tax.*

The California Constitution prohibits the Legislature from imposing taxes for local purposes, but allows the Legislature to authorize local governments to impose them.

This bill would authorize a local public entity that supplies water at retail or wholesale for the benefit of persons within the service area or area of jurisdiction of that public entity to impose, by ordinance, an excise tax on an excessive user of water, at a rate not to exceed 300% of the purchase price of the water, if the ordinance proposing the tax is approved by ²/₃ of the electors voting on the measure and the revenue from the tax is equally distributed between the public entity and the State Water Resources Control Board for water conservation efforts within the jurisdiction of the public entity.

Description:

Water Excise Tax. Drives up costs and creates uncertainty for businesses by authorizing a local public agency to impose an excise tax of up to 300% on an excessive user of water, of which the term is undefined.

This bill:

This bill authorizes a local public entity that supplies water at retail or wholesale to impose an excise tax on an excessive user of water with two-thirds voter approval. Under this bill, the revenue generated from the excise tax would be equally distributed between the public entity and the State Water Resources Control Board for local water conservation efforts within the jurisdiction of that public entity. This bill prohibits the rate for an excise tax from exceeding 300% of the purchase price of the water.

Background:

According to the author, "The bill seeks to create an additional tool for local water agencies to use to address overuse by water users in their service territory. California is in a historical drought with no end in sight. Reservoir and river levels are low and groundwater pumping is at an all-time high. The State Water Resources Control Board has taken extraordinary steps to curtail water use, calling for a 25% across-the-state reduction.

"Still, many water users continue to waste water or use it excessively for purposes that do not take the severe nature of the drought into account. A Rancho Santa Fe resident recently exclaimed that 'we're not all equal when it comes to water.' Brett Barbre, a board member with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, a huge water wholesaler serving 17 million customers, demonstrated his unwillingness to reduce landscape water, declaring that water authorities would have to pry the watering hose from his, 'cold, dead hands.'

"According to the State Water Resources Control Board the Santa Fe Irrigation District and about twenty-one other districts representing over 5% of the State's 396 public water agencies have actually increased water use compared to 2013 levels which was also a bad year for water. Numerous other agencies were far from reaching their mandated water reduction goals despite the best efforts of the water managers in those districts faced with a severe statewide drought emergency.

"Local water agencies are prohibited from using pricing mechanisms or 'tiered rates' to provide incentives to water users to modify behavior. Many public water agencies have imposed severe water use and watering restrictions and have imposed severe penalties. Despite those extraordinary measures, excessive use and abuse of water in a severe public emergency continues.

Policy Considerations.

What Is Excessive? Opposition argues that there is no definition of an "excessive user of water" in the bill and note that "several classes of water users exist such as residential, agricultural, commercial, industrial, and institutional. Each uses water in varying ways and at varying prices depending on their water purveyors and necessary water treatment. Many businesses such as restaurants, food processors, grocery stores, medical clinics, etc. use water for health and safety purposes which may not be altered without another agency's approval. Also, in some instances only a master water meter exists for several units without the ability to measure individual unit's usage."

The Committee may wish to ask the author, absent any clarification in the bill, what types of water use the bill is aiming to curb. Without further specification in the bill, local agencies may establish one definition for an "excessive user" which would have different impacts based on the type of water user. For example, what is considered "excessive use" for a single family home may be very different than for a farmer who owns hundreds of acres.

Who Will Use This Authority? The Committee may wish to note that there are no local agencies in support of the bill, nor have any local agencies requested this authority.

Distribution of Revenue to State Water Board. The Committee may wish to ask the author for the policy reasoning behind the allocation requirement in this bill, which requires half of the locally-generated revenues to go to the State Water Board. The Committee may wish to consider if there are any constitutional issues associated with the state requiring the allocation of this locally-imposed revenue.

Low-Income Households. The drought has raised new affordability challenges for both providers and customers. Many public water providers have increased fixed rates and fees on monthly bills, which disproportionately impact lower-income households. While this bill may allow local agencies to focus on excessive users, there are no protections for low-income water users. The Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association argues, "While clearly meant to target water wasters, [this bill] could easily apply to low-income families living at the poverty line who now must contend with a new regressive tax."

Local Agencies Taxing Other Local Agencies? Some local public agencies wholesale water, but do not sell water to retail customers. It is not uncommon for one local agency to provide wholesale water to another local agency. Given this common relationship, the Committee may wish to consider if this bill authorizes local public agencies to tax one another.

New Taxing Authority? This bill requires that the ordinance proposing the excise tax is approved by two-thirds of the electors voting on the measure, pursuant to Article XIII C of the California Constitution. Article XIII C of the California Constitution defines a "special tax" to mean any tax imposed for specific purposes, including a tax imposed for specific purposes, which is placed into a general fund, and requires local agencies to impose a special tax with a two-thirds voter approval. One of the most commonly referenced excise taxes are parcel taxes, which are levied per parcel at a flat rate or according to size. The authority granted to local agencies by this bill is levied on a user, not a parcel, at a specified rate based on "excessive" use. The Committee may wish to consider if constitutional challenges may be raised, regardless of the two-thirds voter requirement contained in this bill.

Too Many Questions, Not Enough Answers. Given the number of outstanding questions and vague authority granted by this bill, the Committee may wish to encourage the author to take more time to flesh out the policy goals. Local agencies experience many financial barriers due to Proposition 218 and other legal challenges associated with tiered water rates to obtain the necessary funding to provide much needed services while encouraging conservation. Therefore, the Committee may wish to encourage the author to work with local agencies to craft legislation to provide local agencies with badly needed financial tools that they can and will use.

Arguments in Support.

Supporters, in concept, argue that as the drought continues, local agencies need increased tools to curtail excessive users of water. This bill will allow local agencies to ask voters for increased taxing authority for those who refuse to cut back on unnecessary water use.

Arguments in Opposition.

Opposition argues that this bill is unconstitutional and unworkable. Additionally, there is no definition of excessive user of water, therefore, no practical way to determine who or what constitutes an excessive user of water.

Support

California League of Conservation Voters (in concept)
Clean Water Action (in concept)
Sierra Club California (in concept)

Opposition

California Apartment Association
California Business Properties Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Farm Bureau Federation
California Manufacturers and Technology Association
California Taxpayers Association
Family Business Association
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Status: Active - in Assembly Committee process

Senate floor votes: Bill amended in Assembly - Senate votes inconsequential

Legislative Item #2	Action
----------------------------	---------------

SB 540 (Hertzberg) Franchise Tax Board: Taxpayers' Rights Advocate.

Recommended action: **SUPPORT**
Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Description:

Abatement of Penalties. Seeks to reduce taxpayers' exposure to financial penalties, fees and interest due to errors made by the Franchise Tax Board.

Background:

This bill proposes to eliminate the sunset date, thus making the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate (TRA) program at the California Franchise Tax Board (FTB) permanent and remove the \$7,500 cap on the amount of relief that may be granted by the Advocate. In addition, this bill requires the Advocate to coordinate with the Chief Counsel, beginning on January 1, 2016, in abating penalties, fees, additions to tax, or interest imposed, but would retain the existing requirement for the FTB Executive Officer to approve the amount of relief in excess of \$500. This bill also eliminates the requirement for a taxpayer to file with the Advocate an application for relief and requires that the records of relief granted to taxpayers be placed on file in the office of the FTB Executive Officer for at least one year.

Existing law limits the total amount of relief that may be granted by the Advocate to \$7,500, as adjusted for inflation. Existing law also authorizes, but does not require, the Advocate to grant relief to taxpayers under the Program. SB 540 proposes to remove the \$7,500 ceiling and to require the Advocate to provide relief to taxpayer in coordination with the FTB Chief Counsel.

Arguments in Support:

Author's Statement. The author has provided the following statement in support of this bill: "Filing taxes can be challenging; it's even more frustrating for individuals who fall victim to administrative errors and delays from the tax collection agency. SB 540 improves the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate (TRA) program at the California Franchise Tax Board (FTB). The TRA works on behalf of Californians to correct problems that can cost individual taxpayers thousands of dollars."

The proponents of this bill state that the "when taxpayers fall victim to FTB errors and delays, prompt action is necessary to relieve erroneously assessed penalties, fees and interest." They note that since the "abatement program was enacted in 2009, relief has been provided to taxpayers for FTB's erroneous processing of tax returns, unreasonable delay in issuing a tax bill (due to a technology upgrade), and erroneous instruction of a specified tax form." The proponents argue that when

dealing with the government, "taxpayers should have an advocate looking out for them" to ensure that any errors and oversights are addressed in a timely manner," and that SB 540 recognizes that "the state should be held accountable for causing errors and delays." They further argue that eliminating the cap on the potential refund would not increase "the potential for claims or costs to the state," given the "strict standards under which a refund can be granted under this program."

Support

Franchise Tax Board (Sponsor)
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
California Taxpayers Association
California Chamber of Commerce

Opposition:

None on file

Status: Active - in Assembly Committee process.

Senate floor votes: YES: Morrell, Stone NVR: Anderson

Legislative Item #3	Action
----------------------------	---------------

AB 154 (Ting) Taxation: federal conformity.

Recommended action: **SUPPORT**

Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Description:

Eases taxpayer compliance and reduces the chance of penalties generated by error or mistake by creating conformity between state and federal law on several tax-related issues.

Summary:

AB 154 is a critical first step toward reinstating comprehensive conformity, and is important for taxpayers and the state for the following reasons:

Reduces potential for errors and costly related penalties. When the state does not conform to federal tax laws, it forces taxpayers to make numerous adjustments (and sometimes use different methodologies) when filing their state and federal tax returns, thus increasing the potential for reporting errors. According to the independent FTB Taxpayers' Right Advocate's 2014 report to the Legislature, non-conformity is a leading cause for taxpayer error and non-compliance: "Taxpayers that are not aware that California does not conform to a particular federal provision are likely to calculate their income tax incorrectly, potentially subjecting themselves to penalties and interest." Since errors may not be discovered until tax returns are audited several years later – and penalties and interest accrue from the year of the return – some taxpayers face punitive assessments that are greater than their original tax liability. Conformity would reduce the number of different adjustments and methodologies required when filing a state return, protecting working Californians from the potential for errors, and penalty and interest assessments.

Eases tax filing and administration. Lack of conformity complicates filing and administration for taxpayers and the FTB. Non-conformity requires many businesses to keep multiple sets of records to comply with federal reporting requirements and to accommodate the differences in state tax laws, and unnecessarily increases the complexity and costs of tax compliance. For the FTB, non-conformity requires separate calculation and verification of tax returns instead of relying on federally audited returns. Conformity would facilitate tax reporting, audit and enforcement for taxpayers and the FTB.

Saves the state and taxpayers money. Complicated reporting requirements tend to cost taxpayers more money, not only because of the exposure to errors and related penalties, but also because taxpayers may require professional accounting services. Businesses spend more money to keep multiple sets of records and employ accountants and attorneys to ensure correct compliance. The state also utilizes more staff to answer taxpayer questions, conduct separate audits, and initiate collections on errors. Conformity would reduce the need for many of these activities, saving the state and taxpayers time and money.

Background:

Purpose of the bill. According to the author, “AB 154 is a vital measure conforming state tax law to federal tax, easing tax preparation for taxpayers and tax preparers alike. This measure is intended to narrow differences between state and federal law and provide relief to members of the United States Armed Forces, businesses, and individual taxpayers.”

AB 154 is the state’s first omnibus tax conformity measure in five years, and would move ahead the state’s conformity date by six years, picking up changes that will more closely align state and federal personal income and corporation tax statutes, easing compliance headaches for taxpayers as well as administrative difficulties for FTB. However, the measure also contains changes to the state’s Large Corporate Understatement Penalty, which only applies to large corporate taxpayers that significantly understate tax on their original returns, and doesn’t have a federal counterpart. While the measure’s changes to the penalty simply account for changes where federal law affords taxpayers time to choose between two transaction structures, or have their tax due changed by decisions made by either IRS or FTB, putting the two together is an odd match. The Committee may wish to consider whether AB 154’s changes to the understatement penalty should be in a separate bill.

Supporting:

California Asian Chamber of Commerce,
California Bankers Association,
California Chamber of Commerce,
California Manufacturers and Technology Association,
California Society of Enrolled Agents,

California Taxpayers Association,
Computing Technology Industry Association,
Hewlett Packard Company,
National Federation of Independent Business,
Spidell Publishing, Inc.

Opposition:

None on record

Status: Active - In Senate Committee Process

Assembly Votes: Yes: Jones, Linder, Medina, Melendez, Waldron

Legislative Item #4	Action
----------------------------	---------------

[AB 1354 \(Dodd\) Discrimination: equal pay: state contracting.](#)

Recommended action: OPPOSE

Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Description:

State Contractor Equal Pay Reporting. Increases the reporting requirements of state contractors with 100 or more employees by requiring such contractors to submit a workforce analysis and equal pay report that includes data of wages paid to employees by ethnicity, gender and race.

Summary:

This bill enacts the *Equal Pay for Equal Work Act of 2015* and requires an employer with 100 or more employees, prior to becoming a contractor or subcontractor with the state, to submit a nondiscrimination program to the Department of Fair

Employment and Housing (DFEH) and to submit periodic reports, no more than annually, of its compliance with that program.

Background:

Existing law already requires state contractors to submit a “nondiscrimination program” to the DFEH that must contain specific procedures to insure equal employment opportunity for all protected classifications under the Fair Employment and Housing Act, including gender and race. Specifically, the report must include the contractor’s anti-discrimination policies, employment selection procedures, any existing practices that have resulted in disparate treatment to those protected classifications, a workforce analysis that lists each job title identified in an applicable collective bargaining agreement that ranks the employees from lowest to highest paid, as well as the total number of male and female employees in those job titles, and finally an analysis that identifies the wage rate or salary range of minorities in each job title. (California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Section 11103)

A contractor’s failure to comply with its nondiscrimination policies subjects the sanctions “including but not limited to cancellation, termination, or suspension of the contract in whole or in part, by the contract awarding agency or decertification from future opportunities to contract with the State of California by the DFEH.” (California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Section 11107)

Accordingly, existing law already precludes a contractor from engaging in any discrimination based upon gender or race, including inequitable compensation for performing the same or similar job. To the extent AB 1354 is simply duplicating the information already required in a nondiscrimination program, it is unnecessary and will add an additional layer to a contractor’s bid with the state. To the extent AB 1354 is seeking more information from contractors, it is unclear as to what the scope of that information is or how it will indicate income inequality based upon summary data of compensation.

Arguments in Support:

Proponents note that “the existing nondiscrimination and compliance employment program established in Government Code Section 12990, is a set of specific and result-oriented procedures to which a contractor or subcontractor commits itself to ensure employment opportunity for all employees or applicants for employment. This bill would build upon the existing nondiscrimination reporting program to require state contractors to provide summary data on employee compensation. This bill aims to achieve the same goal as the 2014 Presidential Memorandum – to help employers take proactive measures to ensure fair pay for their employees. Simply compiling the data will prompt some businesses to make necessary changes.”

Arguments in Opposition:

Opponents argue that “current law already requires state contractors to submit a nondiscrimination program to the DFEH for all protected classifications under the Fair Employment and Housing Act. These required reports include the contractor’s policies on antidiscrimination and an analysis of employment selection procedures based on gender and race. In addition, under existing law they must provide DFEH with a ‘workforce analysis’ that lists each job title, ranks the employees from lowest to highest paid, as well as the total number of male and female employees in those job titles, and the wage rate of minorities in each job title.” Additionally, opponents note, “Existing law also precludes contractors who are subject to a collective bargaining agreement from engaging in any discrimination based upon gender or race, including inequitable compensation for performing the same job

Support:

American Association of University Women California
Employment Lawyers Association California Labor
Federation California Nurses Association
Consumer Attorneys of California
Equal Rights Advocates. National Women’s Law Center
9to5, National Association of Working Women
North Bay Labor Council, AFL-CIO Women in Non
Traditional Employment Roles

Opposition:

Air Conditioning Sheet Metal Association
Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Contractors Association
Associated Builders and Contractors of California
Associated General Contractors
California Business Properties Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Legislative Conference of the Plumbing, Heating and Piping Industry

California Manufacturers and Technology Association
Finishing Contractors Association of Southern California
National Electrical Contractors Association (California chapters)
National Federation of Independent Business
United Contractors
Wall and Ceiling Alliance

Status: Active - To Senate Committee on Appropriations

Assembly Vote: NO: Jones, Melendez, Waldron YES: Linder, Medina

Legislative Item #5	Action
----------------------------	---------------

AB 662 (Bonilla) Public accommodation: disabled adults: changing facilities.

Recommended action: OPPOSE
Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Description:

Imposes Unnecessary New Costs on Businesses. Imposes new financial burdens on businesses and complicates building code compliance issues by requiring that certain facilities install adult changing stations in every restroom stall.

Summary:

This bill requires the State Architect, California Building Standards Commission (CBSC), or other appropriate state regulatory entity to adopt regulations requiring a commercial place of amusement to install and maintain at least one adult changing station for persons with a physical disability.

Requires the State Architect, CBSC, or other appropriate state regulatory entity to adopt regulations, by January 1, 2020, requiring a commercial place of amusement to install and maintain at least one adult changing station for persons with a physical disability that is accessible to both men and women.

Specifies that the regulations must contain the following requirements:

- a) That the entrance to the station must have conspicuous signage indicating its location.
- b) That any central directory indicates the location of the station.
- c) For any new construction after January 1, 2020.
- d) For a renovation of a restroom after January 1, 2029, if it requires a permit or if the estimated cost is \$10,000 or more.

Defines a “commercial place of public amusement” as any of the following:

- a) Auditorium
- b) Convention center
- c) Cultural complex
- d) Exhibition hall
- e) Permanent amusement park structure
- f) Sports arena
- g) Theater or movie house with a minimum occupancy of 1,000 people
- h) Not any public higher education facility

Defines “adult changing station” as an adult changing table placed within an enclosed restroom facility that is for use by persons with physical disabilities who need help with diapering.

Background:

This bill aims to improve access for adults with physical disabilities that need an adequate facility to assist with the changing of diapers. As the number of persons with disabilities continues to grow, the need for access to adult changing stations will be more apparent. According to the author, “By expanding public restroom accommodations in large occupancy buildings such as auditoriums, convention centers, exhibition halls, sports arenas, and theaters, we are ensuring that individuals with physical disabilities and their families are given the dignity and basic human right to maintain their health.”

The idea for this bill originated from Alisa Rosillo, a Concord resident and mother of two teenage wheelchair-bound boys. Because her young adult children require diaper changing, she is forced to limit her excursions to less than four hours or be forced to change them on the floor. The ADA does not require this type of facility, but it is estimated that over 53,000 disabled persons could benefit from adult diaper changing facilities. Persons with disabilities are engaging in more activities as they integrate into social activities like attending sporting events and concerts. In order for them to attend these functions, proper restroom accommodations are necessary for their health and safety.

Currently, special education departments in California school districts provide for restroom accommodations including a changing table and a lift so students with disabilities can comfortably and safely attend to their needs. When examining the private sector, Disneyland and the Disney California Adventure Park offer adult diaper changing facilities that are reportedly used dozens of times daily without incident. It is unclear how many facilities would be impacted by this bill; however, the delay in implementation is designed to provide ample time for compliance with this requirement.

Arguments in Opposition:

To be clear, we do not oppose the concept of providing increased access to the disabled community; however, AB 662 attempts to provide such access in a way that is flawed from both a practical and policy perspective. AB 662 should be amended to direct the Division of the State Architect (DSA) to investigate the need for such a change in California’s Disabled Accessibility Building Standards.

Given the limits of the existing process, it is unclear how this bill, as written, could be implemented. According to the administration, neither the State Architect nor any other state regulatory entity adopts regulations such as those proposed in this bill that require commercial buildings to install and maintain changing facilities.

According to the opposition, this bill undermines and circumvents the longstanding building code process. The opposition suggests that it is uncommon and unusual to place building code in statute. It should be noted that, while it may be imperfect policy practice to put building codes in statute because codes should be able to adapt to changing times and technologies, it is far from uncommon or unusual for the Legislature to propose to do so.

In an apparent attempt to reduce costs and risk to public entities, AB 662 has recently been amended to exempt public higher education facilities that would otherwise meet the definitions of this bill. Public facilities have traditionally led the way in terms of providing public access, and we question the precedent of the state exempting itself from what are proposed disabled access provisions of state law.

Specifically, under the current language of this bill, a facility at a UC or CSU would not be required to provide AB 662’s proposed disability access, while virtually the exact same facility at a private college would be required to provide access. There is no policy justification for such a disparate treatment, as both facilities serve the same function.

Further, as originally envisioned, AB 662 sought to require full service bathrooms for severely disabled individuals that are typically only found in medical facilities or buildings that are specifically equipped to provide such services. As concerns about cost and feasibility were brought to light, the bill was narrowed to simply require the installation of one component of such a facility—the “adult changing station”—into existing facilities.

Although we appreciate the attempt to address cost concerns, this has only made the bill unworkable, as it is now a mandate to install just one portion of an otherwise integrated system -- one that requires special design, multiple handrails and other safety measures, load bearing hoists, and trained personnel nearby.

Support:

AARP
Alameda County Developmental Disabilities Council
California Association of Public Authorities for IHSS
California Disability Services Association
Californians for Disability Rights
Contra Costa Developmental Disabilities Council
Disability Rights California
East Bay Developmental Disabilities Legislative Coalition

Futures Explored
Meals on Wheels and Senior Outreach Services
National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter
North Los Angeles County Regional Center
Regional Center of the East Bay
Rehabilitation Services of Northern California
The Arc and United Cerebral Palsy California Collaboration

Opposition:

Building Owners and Managers Association of California
California Attractions and Parks Association
California Building Industry Association
California Business Properties Association
California Chamber of Commerce

California Restaurant Association
California Travel Association
International Council of Shopping Centers
National Association of Industrial and Office Properties
National Federation of Independent Business

Status: Active Bill - to Senate Appropriations

Assembly votes: Yes: Medina NO: Melendez, Waldron NVR: Jones, Linder

Legislative Item #6	Action
---------------------	--------

SB 602 (Monning) Seismic safety: California Earthquake Authority.

Recommended action: **OPPOSE**
Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Description:

SB602 allows the California Earthquake Authority, to use PACE-type loan programs to fund seismic upgrades.

Adds the California Earthquake Authority (CEA) to the list of public entities authorized to utilize property assessment districts, impose liens and issue bonds for the purpose of creating a statewide earthquake mitigation assessment district to fund voluntary residential seismic strengthening improvements.

Background:

Under existing law, local governments can authorize loan programs, often initially funded by local bonds, for homeowners to upgrade their homes for energy efficiency. The loans are collected in the property tax bill. This bill allows the California Earthquake Authority to use a similar program statewide. These new loans have super priority over any other existing loan on the property. Sellers who still owe on the loans are forced to either pay it off during closing, even if it means writing a check for the balance. Or they can negotiate to pass the obligation along to the buyer. However, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), which oversees Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, has determined that any property with one of these super priority loans attached is not eligible to be financed, or refinanced, with a conforming loan.

SB 602 seeks to create a loan program very similar to the PACE energy conservation loans, this time for seismic retrofits. Again the loans obtained through this program jump ahead of mortgages to 1st priority and therefore FHFA has stated that conforming loans cannot be used to finance a property with these loans attached.

The Property Assessed Clean Energy program has used this same mechanism to facilitate energy efficiency upgrades or renewable energy installations. Under that program, however, counties and cities must establish local programs and set up their own financing mechanisms.

Many local governments utilize the authorization granted by AB 811 to do PACE (Property Assessed Clean Energy), a financing tool that residential or commercial property owners can use to pay for renewable energy upgrades, energy or water efficiency retrofits, or electric vehicle charging stations for their homes or buildings. Local agencies create PACE assessment districts in their jurisdictions via a resolution of their legislative body, allowing the local agency to issue bonds to finance the up-front costs of improvements. In turn, property owners enter into a voluntary contractual assessment agreement with the local agency to re-pay the bonds via an assessment, secured by a priority lien, on their property tax bill. The intent of the program is that the assessment remains with the property even if it is sold or transferred, and the improvements must be permanently fixed to the property.

In California, instead of local governments administering their own PACE programs, the majority of local governments partner with a third-party to carry out their PACE programs. The cost of third-party administration is not borne by the local agency, but is built into PACE loan financing. Some of these programs focus on residential projects, others target commercial projects, and some handle both residential and commercial portfolios. Joint powers authorities (JPAs) also administer PACE programs and/or are involved in issuing bonds for third-party administrators.

Purpose of bill:

To allow the CEA to create a new voluntary financing tool for homeowners to mitigate and retrofit their homes. The Property Secured Mitigation Program (PSMP) would allow the CEA to provide 100% financing for residential mitigation projects that meet approved engineering guidelines. The loan would become a lien on the property and allow homeowners to pay for the costs in installments in the form of debt service payments collected through existing property tax collection mechanisms. The lien would “run with the land,” staying with the property upon sale.

Currently, fewer than 11% of California homeowners purchase earthquake insurance, despite predictions that the state will experience a major earthquake sometime in the next 30 years. The low frequency of earthquake disasters, compared to other natural catastrophes, tends to shape the perception that earthquake risk is much lower than it actually is, even in places where there have been very deadly and damaging events like California. In addition, earthquake insurance policies can be expensive and carry large deductibles, making them unattractive to homeowners who are not mandated to carry such coverage by their lenders.

The recent earthquake in Napa provided important data on the importance of retrofitting. Although just a moderate M 6.0 quake, homes in Napa were thrown from their foundations, and unreinforced masonry collapsed. Buildings that had not been retrofitted or built to modern standards are now closed and are unlikely to reopen without extensive repairs. Few had earthquake insurance to cover the damages. Buildings that were retrofitted performed well, however, and were able to reopen almost immediately.

Homeowners can greatly reduce their exposure to earthquake damage by taking relatively simple, low cost steps to strengthen their structures to better withstand earthquakes. An additional benefit to homeowners of seismic retrofitting is the availability of discounts on earthquake insurance premiums as a result of the lower risk of damage to their home.

Arguments in Support:

Supporters argue that this bill is imperative to ensure that California infrastructure is prepared for the next big earthquake that will inevitably occur within the state. This bill will provide funding to allow retrofitting of California infrastructure to defend against an earthquake. The R Street Institute argues, "Concerns about the impact of PACE-like programs have been expressed by federal lending authorities in the past. Their concerns, centered on the seniority of PACE liens, have proven to be illusory... To date, 31 states have enabled PACE programs and California's approach has been a terrific success. Applying a similar principle to seismic retrofitting would be both a national first and a step toward addressing California's urgent vulnerability to earthquakes."

Arguments in Opposition:

Opposition argues that while this bill relates to seismic strengthening improvements and not clean energy, the methodology for funding the seismic strengthening improvements is identical and contained within the same body of law. Specifically, opposition points to the following concerns: 1) PACE lending dries up liquidity for making loans; 2) PACE

lending hurts consumers; 3) PACE lending methods increase the risk of loss to taxpayers; and, 4) a lack of underwriting standards. Therefore, because of the concerns and issues surrounding the FHFA and treatment of PACE liens, opposition argues that an expansion of tax lien-based funding mechanisms are anti-consumer for unwary homeowners and potentially have a negative impact on California's real estate economy.

SB 602 expands a bad mechanism and makes it worse. Using a super-priority lien to fund all sorts of home improvements is a bad idea because it **endangers the availability of mortgage financing, and may be breach of the loan contract.** Expanding the use to seismic improvements makes it worse.

- **Seismic retrofits don't pay for themselves.** Unlike energy improvements, which might actually save the homeowner money to be used to pay for the new debt, this proposal is for new debt for seismic strengthening of unknown value, and no cash flow.
- **The bill undermines local control.** Unlike existing PACE-type programs which require local governments to approve them, the bill creates a single statewide "district" approved only in Sacramento.
- **SB 602 may affect the availability of mortgages.** FHFA (the Federal Housing Finance agency) which oversees Fannie and Freddie has strongly opposed the bill, saying it will increase mortgage costs and disrupt availability of mortgages. They threaten to dis-allow mortgages or re-finances to these properties.
- **Homeowners don't know what they are getting into.** No truth in lending is required on these "assessment" contracts.
- **Homeowners may be surprised to find themselves "underwater."** PACE-type financing is already being used for solar, energy conservation, water conservation and now seismic strengthening. Where will it end?

Because these loans are not subject to normal underwriting, homeowners may find that they are instantly "underwater" and have no equity left in their home.

Federal Housing Finance Agency Concerns with Residential PACE. The authority granted by this bill is specific to seismic improvements, not energy efficiencies, however, absent any direction from Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) on their position to distinguish PACE from the authority granted by this bill, concerns expressed over residential PACE may extend to the voluntary contractual assessment program established by CEA.

In 2010, FHFA, which oversees the nation's largest mortgage finance companies, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, raised concerns that residential PACE financing could pose a risk for federal mortgage enterprises (Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac), because PACE loans are a first-priority lien in the case of foreclosure and lenders would have to pay outstanding PACE assessments before paying mortgage costs. In August of 2010, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac announced they would not purchase mortgages for homes with first lien priority PACE obligations. The FHFA's action triggered many local governments to suspend their residential PACE programs.

To address this concern, the Legislature enacted SB 96 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 356, Statutes of 2013. This budget trailer bill tasks the California Alternative Energy and Advanced Transportation Financing Authority (CAEATFA) with administering a PACE loss reserve program of **\$10 million to keep mortgage interests whole** during a foreclosure or a forced sale. CAEATFA recently filed its regulations for the program, and is now accepting applications from PACE administrators.

The PACE Loss Reserve Program will compensate first mortgage lenders for losses resulting from the existence of a PACE lien in a foreclosure or forced sale. The program will cover PACE payments made during foreclosure, if a mortgage lender forecloses on a home that has a PACE lien, and any losses to a first mortgage lender up to the amount of outstanding PACE payment, if a county conducts a forced sale on a home for unpaid taxes. The intent of the Program is to put the first mortgage lender in the same position it would be in without a PACE lien.

The FHFA issued clarity to their position following the creation of the PACE Loss Reserve Program, in a **letter to the Governor dated May 1, 2014, which reads, "I am writing to inform you that FHFA is not prepared to change its position on California's first-lien PACE program and will continue to prohibit the Enterprises from purchasing or refinancing mortgages that are encumbered with first-lien PACE loans..."**In making this determination, FHFA has carefully reviewed the Reserve Fund created by the State of California and, while I appreciate that it is intended to mitigate these increased losses, it fails to offer full loss protection to the Enterprises. **The Reserve Fund is not an adequate substitute for Enterprise mortgages maintaining a first lien position and FHFA also has concerns about the Reserve Fund's ongoing sustainability.**

Intent of Voluntary Contractual Assessments. The Committee may wish to consider if the authorization granted by this bill continues to push the statutes governing voluntary contractual assessments further away from their original intent. Very few local governments have taken advantage of the authorization to do seismic improvements and the majority of local governments do not administer their own PACE programs, but rather contract with a third-party. The Committee may wish to consider, given outstanding and unresolved issues with FHFA and the evolution of other voluntary contractual assessment programs, if this is an appropriate time to further expand the authority to administer voluntary contractual assessments to entities beyond local governments.

Priority Lien. The California Association of Realtors in opposition, argues, "In light of the ongoing harsh policy rhetoric from the FHFA in regard to PACE assessments, we are concerned that encouraging the same super-lien priority of seismic funding will endanger the availability of mortgage financing for the property. It would be a cruel irony for a homeowner to strengthen the home to protect his or her equity from earthquake, only to find that the very mechanism to protect it makes the home unmarketable." Further, opposition, in a joint letter, states "The consequences are substantial and may preclude a borrower from completing a necessary transaction. Ultimately, a borrower needing to refinance or sell their property will be forced to pay the entirety of the balance of the seismic strengthening improvements. Depending on the amount financed for the seismic strengthening improvement loan and the borrower's financial condition, they may not have the ability to achieve payoff."

Notification to Homeowners. One of the concerns previously expressed in an FHFA statement included a concern that PACE loans lack adequate consumer protections, including those provided under the federal Truth-in-Lending Act. The Press Enterprise reported in June that the Riverside County District Attorney's office is investigating the HERO program and the way consumers are being sold energy efficient products, which includes an examination of current disclosure practices.

In light of these concerns relative to existing residential PACE programs and the potentially statewide nature of the CEA program authorized by this bill, the Committee may wish to ask the author to accept amendments that would require additional notification to homeowners prior to entering into voluntary contractual assessments for seismic improvements, which identify not only the terms and conditions, but also the impact of the assessments on existing mortgages and the property owner's ability to sell or refinance their home.

Support

American Red Cross
Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)
Automobile Club of Southern California

California Department of Insurance
R Street Institute

Opposition

California Association of Realtors
California Bankers Association
California Credit Union League
California Independent Bankers

California Land Title Association
California Mortgage Association
California Mortgage Bankers Association

Status: Active Bill - to Assembly Committee on Local Government

Assembly votes: Yes: Anderson, Morrell, Stone

OPPOSE SB 350 (de León; D-Los Angeles) JOB KILLER: Costly and Burdensome Regulations —

Potentially increases costs and burdens on all Californians by mandating an arbitrary and unrealistic reduction of petroleum use by 50%, increasing the current Renewable Portfolio Standard to 50% and increasing energy efficiency in buildings by 50% — all by 2030 without regard to the impact on individuals, jobs and the economy.



SB 350 (DE LEON) CLEAN ENERGY AND POLLUTION REDUCTION ACT OF 2015

OPPOSE - JOB KILLER

August 12, 2015

TO: Members, Assembly Appropriations Committee

FROM:

- California Chamber of Commerce
- Agricultural Council of California
- Associated Builders and Contractors of California
- Associated General Contractors
- Building Owners and Managers Association
- California Association of Nurseries and Garden Centers
- California Business Properties Association
- California Cotton Ginners Association
- California Cotton Growers Association
- California Dairies, Inc.
- California Farm Bureau Federation
- California Fresh Fruit Association
- California Independent Petroleum Association
- California Manufacturers & Technology Association
- California Metals Coalition
- California Retailers Association
- Chemical Industry Council of California
- Family Business Association
- Far West Equipment Dealers Association

Southwest California Legislative Council

Greater Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce
Greater Fresno Area Chamber of Commerce
Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce
Industrial Environmental Association
International Council of Shopping Centers
NAIOP - Commercial Real Estate Development Association
National Federation of Independent Business
National Tank Truck Carriers
North Orange County Chamber
Orange County Business Council
Rancho Cordova Chamber of Commerce
Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce
South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
Southwest California Legislative Council
Torrance Chamber of Commerce
Western Aerosol Information Bureau
Western Agricultural Processors Association
West Coast Lumber and Building Material Association
Western Growers Association
Western Plant Health Association

**SUBJECT: SB 350 (DE LEON) CLEAN ENERGY AND POLLUTION REDUCTION ACT OF 2015
OPPOSE - **JOB KILLER** - AS AMENDED JULY 16, 2015**

The California Chamber of Commerce and above listed organizations respectfully **OPPOSE SB 350 (de Leon)**, which has been labeled as a **JOB KILLER**. As amended July 16, 2015, **SB 350** is an arbitrary and unrealistic reduction of petroleum use by 50% by 2030, increasing the current Renewable Portfolio Standard to 50% by 2030 and increasing energy efficiency in buildings by 50% by 2030, without regard to the impact on individuals, jobs and the economy.

Petroleum Reduction

BLANK CHECK AUTHORITY TO CARB

SB 350 provides broad and undefined authority to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt regulations, standards and specifications “in furtherance of achieving a reduction of petroleum use in motor vehicles by 50% by January 1, 2030...” This bill does not specify whether or not CARB should adopt and implement policies that impact the demand for petroleum fuels, or whether they should adopt and implement policies that affect the supply of transportation fuels. **SB 350** fails to require CARB to give consideration to the costs or job loss associated with the mandatory reduction.

DRIVING IS INTEGRAL TO DAILY LIFE

Without legislative guidance or protections against increased costs or job loss what tools could CARB employ to meet the reduction mandate: Ration the use of petroleum?

Limit driving to certain days of the week?

Demand vehicle efficiency without available technology?

Implementation of any of those approaches will come at a high cost to the families and residents in California. Most of California’s businesses and families rely on petroleum for their day to day transportation needs and **SB 350** has the ability to compromise the availability of transportation fuels. The California Energy Commission reported in its 2014 Integrated Energy Policy Report that 92% of all transportation fuels in California are made up of petroleum. Businesses rely on petroleum to transport goods and people, imagine the upset reducing petroleum by 50% will have on day to day life, getting to and from work, taking children to school, grocery shopping, getting to the doctor, the list goes on and on.

SB 350 FAILS TO ACCOUNT FOR HIGHER COST VEHICLES

The goal of reducing petroleum consumption by 50% fails to recognize the needs of average Californians. Electric and hybrid vehicles, which consume less petroleum than traditional vehicles come with a higher price tag and is out of reach for average Californians. Their disposable income is spent on groceries, child care, rent and other basic needs.

PETROLEUM JOBS ARE GOOD JOBS

Will there be a 50% straight reduction in the production of petroleum in the state? What would that do to the good paying jobs in the petroleum industry?

The petroleum industry is a major economic engine in the state and has been helping California grow for over 100 years. In a 2014 report produced by the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation, it was reported that in 2012, the petroleum industry was responsible for 468,000 jobs in the state with 104,000 of those jobs located in Los Angeles County. The industry provided billions of tax dollars to the state and local government. If half of this is taken away, the job and economic losses to the state would be devastating.

IMPACTS ON ENERGY COSTS

In addition to the 50% reduction in petroleum, **SB 350** also seeks to increase the current Renewable Portfolio standard from 33% to 50% as well as increasing energy efficiency in buildings to 50%. Both of these policies will significantly increase costs to ratepayers. California's energy price per kilowatt hour is among the highest in the nation and our energy efficiency standards are among the strongest. Given the cost of upgrading current energy efficiency standards, while at the same time increasing the cost of energy, makes California's businesses less competitive.

For these reasons and others, we **OPPOSE SB 350 (de Leon)** as a **JOB KILLER**.

cc: The Honorable Kevin de Leon
Martha Guzman-Aceves, Office of the Governor
Jennifer Galehouse, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Eric Swanson, Assembly Republican Caucus
California Air Resources Board
District Offices, Members, Assembly Appropriations Committee

AM:ms