



REGULAR MEETING LEGISLATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE

North Bay Conference Room (Room 145)
Sunnyvale City Hall
456 W. Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

**MAY 14, 2026
5:30 PM**

Meeting Information:

- *Legislative Action Committee meetings are open to the public at the location shown above.*
- *Members of the public may use the information below to join the webinar:*
 - **Webinar ID: 823 1430 2917**
 - **Passcode: 254352**
- *Meeting also livestreamed on YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/@citiesassoc>*
- *More information on public comment and accessibility is given at the end of the agenda.*

Hon. George Casey will attend via teleconference from 200 E. Santa Clara Street, Floor 18, Conference Room 1853, San Jose, CA 95113. This teleconference location is open to the public and any member of the public may address the Legislative Action Committee members from the teleconference location.

Vice Mayor Larry Lang will attend via teleconference from Neutra House Conference Center, Los Altos Civic Center, 181 Hillview Avenue, Los Altos, CA 94022. This teleconference location is open to the public and any member of the public may address the Legislative Action Committee members from the teleconference location.

WELCOME & CALL TO ORDER – (MOORE)

ROLL CALL (SIRKAY)

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NONAGENDIZED ITEMS

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons wishing to address the Legislative Action Committee on any matter not on the agenda but within the Committee's jurisdiction. State law prohibits the Legislative Action Committee from discussing and/or acting on nonagendized items.

AGENDA

1. Consent Agenda (Action)

Recommendation: Review and approve minutes of the Legislative Action Committee Meeting held on April 9, 2026.

Attachment:

- a. Minutes from April 9, 2026 Legislative Action Committee meeting

2. Chair Update (Information)

Recommendation: Receive update from Chair Rob Moore.

3. Early Bill Review (Discussion and Potential Action)

Recommendation: Share early bills and discuss any potential action to recommend to the Board of Directors.

Attachments: Included are bill summaries, letters of support and other supporting documentation as available for the following bills:

- a. AB 1821 (Pacheco): California Public Records Act: agency response time
- b. AB 2296 (Papan): Planning and zoning: housing element: regional housing needs allocation
- c. SB 1167 (Blakespear): Vehicles: electric bicycles
- d. SB 949 (Becker): Environmental protection: Natural Resources Agency: resource of statewide significance: Santa Cruz Mountains.
- e. AB 1708 (Solache): Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention program: smaller jurisdictions
- f. SB 922 (Laird): Vehicles: local agency charges: use of streets or highways.
- g. AB 2385 (Petrie-Norris): Local reconstruction agencies.

4. Propose Bills to Consider for Discussion at Next Legislative Action Committee Meeting (Action)

ADJOURN (MOORE)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION OPTIONS

Online Participation:

Members of the public may also attend online. However, the Cities Association of Santa Clara County cannot guarantee uninterrupted access to online technology. Technical difficulties may occur from time to time. The meeting will continue even if technical difficulties prevent online participation.

Members of the public wishing to comment on an item on the agenda may do so in the following ways:

1. Email comments to shali@citiesassociation.org
 - IMPORTANT: identify the Agenda Item number in the subject line of your email.
 - Emails must be received at least 72 hours before meeting start day/time to be entered into the record for the meeting.
2. Provide oral public comments in-person during the meeting
3. Provide oral public comments virtually during the meeting
 - When the Chair announces the item on which you wish to speak, click the “raise hand” feature in Zoom. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.
 - When called to speak, please limit your comments to the time allotted (up to 3 minutes, at the discretion of the Chair).
 - Phone participants:
 - *6 - Toggle mute/unmute
 - *9 - Raise hand

ACCESSIBILITY

We strive for our meetings and materials to be accessible to all members of the public, and welcome feedback and requests for accommodations. Please submit requests for accommodations to shali@citiesassociation.org at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to allow us to best meet your request.



REGULAR MEETING LEGISLATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE

North Bay Conference Room (Room 145)
Sunnyvale City Hall
456 W. Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

**APRIL 9, 2026
5:30 PM**

AGENDA IN BLACK/**MINUTES IN RED**

Meeting Information:

- *Legislative Action Committee meetings are open to the public at the location shown above.*
- *Members of the public may use the information below to join the webinar:*
 - **Webinar ID: 823 1430 2917**
 - **Passcode: 254352**
- *Meeting also livestreamed on YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/@citiesassoc>*
- *More information on public comment and accessibility is given at the end of the agenda.*

Hon. George Casey will attend via teleconference from 200 E. Santa Clara Street, Floor 18, Conference Room 1853, San Jose, CA 95113. This teleconference location is open to the public and any member of the public may address the Legislative Action Committee members from the teleconference location.

Councilmember Ellen Kamei will attend via teleconference from Lobby, Courtyard by Marriott Paso Robles 120 S Vine St, Paso Robles, CA 93446, United States. This teleconference location is open to the public and any member of the public may address the Board of Directors members from the teleconference location.

Vice Mayor Larry Lang will attend via teleconference from Neutra House Conference Center, Los Altos Civic Center, 181 Hillview Avenue, Los Altos, CA 94022. This teleconference location is open to the public and any member of the public may address the Legislative Action Committee members from the teleconference location.

WELCOME & CALL TO ORDER – (CHAIR)

Meeting called to order at 5:33 PM

ROLL CALL (SIRKAY)

Board Members Present (14):

Campbell	Anne Bybee
Cupertino	Liang Chao* (arrived 6:09 PM)
Gilroy	Kelly Ramirez
Los Altos	Larry Lang
Los Altos Hills	Rajiv Bhateja
Los Gatos	Rob Moore (arrived 5:40 PM)
Monte Sereno	Ken Toren
Morgan Hill	Mark Turner
Mountain View	Ellen Kamei
Palo Alto	Vicki Veenker (arrived 5:48 PM)
San Jose	George Casey
Santa Clara	Kelly Cox (arrived 5:38 PM)
Saratoga	Tina Walia
Sunnyvale	Charlsie Chang

*Alternate

Board Members Absent: (1)

Milpitas	Carmen Montano
----------	----------------

Also Present (1):

Shali Sirkay	Executive Director
--------------	--------------------

Members of the Public Present (1):

Bena Chang	Silicon Valley Clean Energy
------------	-----------------------------

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NONAGENDIZED ITEMS

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons wishing to address the Legislative Action Committee on any matter not on the agenda but within the Committee's jurisdiction. State law prohibits the Legislative Action Committee from discussing and/or acting on nonagendized items.

None

AGENDA

1. Consent Agenda (Action)

Recommendation: Review and approve minutes of the Legislative Action Committee Meeting held on February 12, 2026

Attachment:

- a. Minutes from February 12, 2026 Legislative Action Committee meeting

Motion to approve the minutes of the February 12, 2026 Legislative Action Committee meeting as presented

By Bhateja

Second by Turner

AYES: 10

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

ABSENT: 5 (Chao, Cox, Montano, Moore, Veenker)

2. Chair Update (Information)

Recommendation: Receive update from Chair

3. Early Bill Review (Discussion and Potential Action)

Recommendation: Share early bills and discuss any potential action to recommend to the Board of Directors.

Attachments: Included are bill summaries, letters of support and other supporting documentation as available for the following bills:

- a. SB 1013 (Cervantes): Automated license plate recognition systems

Motion to recommend that the Cities Association take an oppose unless amended position on SB 1013 (Cervantes) so that the number of days for ALPR information to not match the hot list is raised from 14 days to 30 days

By Turner

Second by Ramirez

AYES: 6 (Bhateja, Moore, Ramirez, Toren, Turner, Walia)

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 7 (Bybee, Casey, Chang, Cox, Kamei, Lang, Veenker)

ABSENT: 2 (Chao, Montano)

Motion fails 6-0-7-2

- b. SB 1159 (Cabaldon): Artificial intelligence: transparency and governance

Motion to recommend that the Cities Association take a support position on SB 1159 (Cabaldon)

By Turner

Second by Veenker

AYES: 11 (Bhateja, Casey, Change, Cox, Kamei, Moore, Ramirez, Toren, Turner, Veenker, Walia)

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 2 (Bybee, Lang)

ABSENT: 2 (Chao, Montano)

Motion passes 11-0-2-2

c. AB 1761 (Rogers): Electricity: calculation methodology: data disclosure

Motion to *recommend that the Cities Association take a support position on AB 1761 (Rogers)*

By Walia

Second by Turner

AYES: 12

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 2 (Chang, Cox)

ABSENT: 1 (Montano)

Motion passes 12-0-2-1

d. AB 2517 (Calderon): Fire safety: fire hazard severity zones

Motion to *recommend that the Cities Association take a support position on AB 2517 (Calderon)*

By Toren

Second by Moore

AYES: 12

NAYS: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 2 (Chao, Cox)

ABSENT: 1 (Montano)

Motion passes 12-0-2-1

e. SB 894 (Allen): Wildfire resiliency: financial assistance

No motion was made on SB 894 (Allen)

f. SB 899 (Grove): Fire prevention: Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force: wildfire smoke

No motion was made on SB 899 (Grove)

g. SB 949 (Becker): Environmental protection: Natural Resources Agency: resource of statewide

No motion was made on SB 949 (Becker)

4. Propose Bills to Consider for Discussion at Next Legislative Action Committee Meeting (Action)

The following bills were proposed by LAC members for consideration at the May 14, 2026 LAC meeting: SB 922, AB 1821, SB 1167, AB 1942, AB 1708, AB 1751, AB 2146, SB 457, AB 2162, SB 1215, SB 922, and AB 1674.

ADJOURN (CHAIR)

Meeting adjourned at 6:47 PM

Respectfully submitted on May 14, 2026,

Vaishali Sirkay

Vaishali Sirkay

Executive Director

Cities Association of Santa Clara County

DRAFT

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION OPTIONS

Online Participation:

Members of the public may also attend online. However, the Cities Association of Santa Clara County cannot guarantee uninterrupted access to online technology. Technical difficulties may occur from time to time. The meeting will continue even if technical difficulties prevent online participation.

Members of the public wishing to comment on an item on the agenda may do so in the following ways:

1. Email comments to shali@citiesassociation.org
 - IMPORTANT: identify the Agenda Item number in the subject line of your email.
 - Emails must be received at least 72 hours before meeting start day/time to be entered into the record for the meeting.
2. Provide oral public comments in-person during the meeting
3. Provide oral public comments virtually during the meeting
 - When the Chair announces the item on which you wish to speak, click the “raise hand” feature in Zoom. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.
 - When called to speak, please limit your comments to the time allotted (up to 3 minutes, at the discretion of the Chair).
 - Phone participants:
 - *6 - Toggle mute/unmute
 - *9 - Raise hand

ACCESSIBILITY

We strive for our meetings and materials to be accessible to all members of the public, and welcome feedback and requests for accommodations. Please submit requests for accommodations to shali@citiesassociation.org at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to allow us to best meet your request.

AB 1821 (Pacheco): California Public Records Act: agency response time (Cal Cities co-sponsored bill)

Summary:

This bill converts the California Public Records Act's (CPRA) 10-day and 14-day response deadlines from calendar days to business days.

Legislative Digest:

The California Public Records Act requires each state or local agency, upon a request for a copy of records that reasonably describes an identifiable record or records, to make the records promptly available to any person upon payment of fees covering direct costs of duplication, or a statutory fee if applicable, except with respect to public records exempt from disclosure by express provisions of law.

Existing law requires each agency, within 10 days of a request for a copy of records, to determine whether the request seeks copies of disclosable public records in possession of the agency and to promptly notify the person of the determination and the reasons therefor. Existing law authorizes that time limit to be extended by no more than 14 days under unusual circumstances, as defined.

This bill would instead require each agency to determine whether the request seeks copies of disclosable public records in possession of the agency and to promptly notify the person as described above within 10 business days of a request for a copy of records.

Supporters:

This bill is supported by several cities and organizations that represent public agencies (including Cal Cities), who argue that the change from calendar to business days will help agencies comply with CPRA more effectively and consistently, especially as the number and scope of requests continue to grow.

Opposition:

The opposition to this bill includes the First Amendment Coalition, ACLU California Action, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, government accountability groups, and others. They argue that the existing timeline does not present an undue burden, and that extending initial-response deadlines undermines the intent of the CPRA, and compounds downstream delays.



April 21, 2026

The Honorable Buffy Wicks
Chair, California State Assembly Committee on Appropriations
1021 O St, Room 8220
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: AB 1821 (Pacheco) California Public Records Act: agency response time.
As Amended April 6, 2026 – SUPPORT**

The California State Association of Counties (CSAC), League of California Cities (Cal Cities), California Municipal Clerks Association (CMCA), Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC), and Urban Counties of California (UCC) are pleased to support Assembly Bill (AB) 1821 by Assemblymember Blanca Pacheco.

The California Public Records Act (CPRA) is a vital tool that enables the public to hold government accountable. Local agencies take these responsibilities seriously and devote substantial resources to responding thoroughly and promptly to public records requests. Our members are committed to transparency and accountability.

AB 1821 provides an important and practical clarification to CPRA response timelines. The bill's shift from "calendar days" to "business days" for initial determinations and extensions is a common-sense update that reflects the operational realities of local agencies. Public agencies generally do not have staff available on weekends or holidays, yet current law continues to toll CPRA deadlines during these periods. A business-day standard ensures agencies have the full, intended number of working days to conduct thorough and accurate searches for disclosable records.

Under existing law, agencies must determine within 10 days whether a request seeks disclosable records, with a possible 14-day extension in unusual circumstances. Neither timeframe accounts for weekends or holidays when staff are unavailable. AB 1821 corrects this discrepancy by converting these periods to business days, helping agencies comply with the law more effectively and consistently.

Local agencies across California have seen a sharp rise in both the volume and complexity of CPRA requests, reporting a 73% increase over five years and noting that

more than 90% of agencies have had to divert staff time away from core services to meet these demands. Modern government operations now generate far more disclosable records, including emails, texts, and internal messages, which require extensive searching, review, and redaction of sensitive information such as attorney-client communications, personal identifiers, and medical or criminal data. At the same time, agencies have lost key revenue sources that once offset these costs: Proposition 42 eliminated state reimbursement for CPRA compliance, and a 2020 California Supreme Court ruling restricted agencies from recovering staff time or technical costs associated with producing records. As a result, local governments must absorb the full cost of increasingly time-intensive requests.

We appreciate the author's efforts and remain committed to continued conversations about broader CPRA reform. The business-day clarification in the bill is a narrow but meaningful improvement that will help agencies comply with the law more effectively and consistently.

For these reasons, CSAC, Cal Cities, CMCA, RCRC, and UCC are pleased to support AB 1821 and respectfully request your AYE vote. If you have any questions regarding our position, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



Eric Lawyer
Senior Legislative Advocate
California State Association of
Counties
elawyer@counties.org



Johnnie Pina
Legislative Advocate
League of California Cities
Jpina@calcities.org



Ethan Nagler
Legislative Representative
California Municipal Clerks Association
enagler@publicpolicygroup.com



Sarah Dukett
Senior Policy Advocate
Rural County Representatives of
California
sdukett@rcrcnet.org



Jean Hurst
Legislative Representative

AB 2296 (Papan): Planning and zoning: housing element: regional housing needs allocation (Cal Cities sponsored bill)

Summary:

This bill would alter the housing element review process by giving cities six more months to complete their housing elements. It would also require the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to provide clearer direction in its review letters to local governments.

Legislative Digest:

This bill extends several RHNA and housing element planning deadlines by approximately six months, giving local governments and Councils of Government more lead time in the planning cycle, though COGs with 2027 revision deadlines are exempt from two of these changes.

When HCD finds that a draft housing element does not comply with state law, the bill requires HCD to go beyond simply identifying deficiencies and to also provide the specific text or analysis needed to fix them. Local legislative bodies must consider this guidance before adopting their element, and must either incorporate HCD's suggested language or adopt written findings explaining why they believe their draft already complies without it. This same requirement applies when HCD finds an adopted element out of compliance.

The bill also cuts HCD's review window for revised drafts from 60 days to 30 days, speeding up the back-and-forth between local governments and the state.

Finally, the bill expresses the Legislature's intent to assign housing element deadlines based on jurisdiction size and smaller regional groupings, consistent with a recommendation from a January 2026 State Auditor report.

Supporters:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County and the League of California Cities.

Opponents:

California YIMBY, Greenbelt Alliance, South Pasadena Residents for Responsible Growth, and SPUR.



April 3, 2026

The Honorable Diane Papan
Member, California State Assembly
1021 O Street, Suite 4220
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 2296 (Papan) Planning and zoning: housing element: regional housing needs allocation.
Notice of SUPPORT (As of 3/19/26)

Dear Assemblymember Papan,

The League of California Cities (Cal Cities) **is proud to sponsor** your measure **AB 2296 (Papan)**, which would allow local governments to begin the housing element update process six months early, provide greater certainty and reduce ambiguity in the housing element review process, and implement several of the recommendations provided by the California State Auditor's Office to improve the housing element review process.

Since 1969, California's local governments have planned and selected sites for housing at all income levels through the housing element portion of a local government's general plan. Every five to eight years, local governments are required to adopt a blueprint outlining where developers can or cannot build residential developments within their respective communities and obtain certification from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Local governments plan for their fair share of housing development as determined through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process. As part of this complex process, local governments submit in their housing elements a variety of essential data, actions, and programs to promote fair, equitable, and affordable housing in their community. Currently, local jurisdictions are planning and zoning for nearly 2.5 million additional homes statewide.

During the 6th RHNA cycle, local governments experienced various challenges in obtaining certification from HCD. Some of the challenges include multiple housing element drafts before certification within a short timeline for completing these complex documents, a nearly 126% increase in the duration to complete the housing element compared to the 5th RHNA Cycle¹, a lack of clarity regarding what the state expects from local governments when reviewing additional housing element drafts, and an ever-changing legal environment mid-cycle that local jurisdictions must account for and incorporate into their housing elements.

¹ 2024-109 California Department of Housing and Community Development
<https://www.auditor.ca.gov/reports/2024-109/#summary>



AB 2296 would address these issues by allowing local governments to begin updating their housing elements six months early and by staggering housing element statutory deadlines to help manage HCD's workload capacity. Additionally, the measure would require HCD to identify specific sections in housing element drafts that are not compliant with state law, to clarify in written findings whether the findings are suggestions from the department or based on state law, and to offer to schedule a technical assistance call with planning staff to discuss the department's findings. Finally, the measure would provide time for local agencies to receive guidance and resources from HCD around new housing element laws prior to their effective date.

AB 2296 would provide greater clarity and certainty to the housing element process and help ensure that all jurisdictions adopt a certified housing element on time. For these reasons, Cal Cities is **pleased to sponsor AB 2296 (Papan)**. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at bguertin@calcities.org or 916-658-8255.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Brady Guertin" is enclosed in a yellow rectangular box.

Brady Guertin
Legislative Advocate

SB 1167 (Blakespear): Vehicles: electric bicycles.

Summary:

This bill aims to address misrepresentation in the e-bike marketplace and strengthen consumer protections around how electric bicycles are marketed and sold.

Legislative Digest:

This bill updates California vehicle law to address the growing popularity of electric off-road vehicles by clarifying definitions and closing regulatory gaps. It tightens the definition of e-bikes to exclude higher-powered or faster vehicles, and specifies that motorcycles, mopeds, off-highway electric motorcycles, and similar devices do not qualify as e-bikes. Selling or advertising these vehicles as e-bikes would constitute a misleading statement under the Business and Professions Code.

The bill also updates definitions for motor-driven cycles and mopeds to exclude overlap with other vehicle categories, and requires electric motor-driven cycles and mopeds manufactured after January 1, 2027 to be equipped with turn signals.

The bill prohibits operating any electric motorcycle, motor-driven cycle, or moped on forest, brush, or grass-covered land unless the vehicle has been certified by an accredited independent laboratory, with the certification permanently marked on the vehicle or its drive system. This aims to address fire risk concerns similar to existing spark arrester requirements for gas-powered off-highway vehicles.

The bill also establishes labeling and advertising requirements for electric vehicles across these categories, and makes conforming changes throughout the Vehicle Code to reflect the updated definitions.

Supporters:

350 Sacramento, Active San Gabriel Valley, Bicycling Monterey, Bike East Bay, Bike LA, Bike Temecula Valley, California Bicycle Coalition (CalBike), California District Attorneys Association, California Emergency Nurses Association, California Orthopedic Association, Chico Velo Bicycle Advocates, Circulate San Diego, City of Carlsbad, City of Oceanside, City of Vista, Claremont Streets for People, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, Move LA, Move San Mateo, Move Santa Barbara County, Napa County Bicycle Coalition (Napa Bike), Oceanside Unified School District, Rails to Trails Conservancy, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, San Diego County Sheriff's Office, San Dieguito Union High School District, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, Sandiego350, Santa Monica Safe Streets Alliance, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition, Sunnyvale Safe Streets, Transbay Coalition, Walk Bike Berkeley, Walk Bike Cupertino, and West Hollywood Bicycle Coalition

Opponents:

None.

SB 949 (Becker): Environmental protection: Natural Resources Agency: resource of statewide significance: Santa Cruz Mountains.

Summary:

This bill designates the Santa Cruz Mountains as a resource of statewide significance and directs the California Natural Resources Agency to encourage collaborative stewardship of the region's ecosystems, wildlife habitat, forests, watersheds, trails, working lands, and tribal cultural resources. The designation does not impose new regulatory requirements on landowners.

Legislative Digest:

Existing law establishes the Natural Resources Agency, composed of departments, boards, conservancies, and commissions responsible for the restoration, protection, and management of the state's natural and cultural resources.

This bill would designate the Santa Cruz Mountains, as defined, as a resource of statewide significance that requires special protection, as defined. The bill would require the Natural Resources Agency and its boards, departments, and conservancies, to the extent that resources are available, and when appropriate, to encourage collaborative stewardship approaches that support the protection, restoration, and preservation of the Santa Cruz Mountains, among other things.

This bill would make legislative findings and declarations as to the necessity of a special statute for the Santa Cruz Mountains covering portions of the Counties of San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz.

NOTE:

During the Legislative Action Committee meeting, concerns were raised that the bill could be used to control land use. Assemblymember Berman, a Principal Co-author of the bill, expressed similar concerns, so Senator Becker explicitly added language to the bill about this:

"71470(e) This section shall not be construed as authorizing the Natural Resources Agency to impose additional regulatory requirements on land use or working lands, including timber and agricultural lands, within the Santa Cruz Mountains."

Supporters:

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, Sempervirens Fund (Co-source), Amah Mutsun Land Trust, County of Santa Clara, Green Foothills, Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency, and the Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority

Opponents:

None.

AB 1708 (Solache): Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention program: round 8: smaller jurisdictions
(Cal Cities Sponsored bill)

Summary: This bill would require regions to plan for funding homelessness programs and services in smaller cities and establish a clear, consistent process for cities to access funds.

Legislative Digest:

This bill makes changes to Round 8 of the Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention (HHAP) program to better incorporate smaller cities, defined as those with populations under 300,000, into regional homelessness planning and funding. It requires that regionally coordinated homelessness action plans include a description of programs offered by smaller jurisdictions, along with an analysis of how regional, state, and federal funding can support those programs, how regional dollars can help smaller cities expand or sustain existing efforts, and an evaluation of whether a target percentage of funds should be directed to smaller jurisdictions.

To access funding, smaller jurisdictions must meet several eligibility requirements, including having a compliant housing element, adopting a local encampment policy consistent with state guidance, demonstrating how their past actions have aligned with regional homelessness goals, and adopting a resolution committing to participate in the regional plan. Regions receiving Round 8 funding are permitted to allocate a portion of those funds to qualifying smaller jurisdictions through a transparent, publicly available application process with clear timelines and evaluation criteria.

Supporters:

This bill is sponsored by the League of California Cities and supported by the cities of Alameda, Albany, Arcata, Artesia, Bellflower, Beverly Hills, Big Bear Lake, Brawley, Buellton, Buena Park, Carlsbad, Carpinteria, Chula Vista, Coachella, Delano, Diamond Bar, Elk Grove, Encinitas, Eureka, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Grand Terrace, Huntington Park, Lake Forest, Lemon Grove, Modesto, Mountain View, Needles, Oceanside, Oroville, Pacifica, Palmdale, Palo Alto, Paramount, Paso Robles, Petaluma, Pico Rivera, Placentia, Redondo Beach, Rocklin, Salinas, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, Santa Monica, Simi Valley, South Gate, Stanton, Temecula, Thousand Oaks, Torrance, Union City, Vacaville, Ventura, Victorville, Walnut Creek, West Hollywood, and Westminster.

Additional supporters include DignityMoves, the Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities, the San Bernardino Council of Governments, and the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority.

Opponents:

City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority



April 20, 2026

The Honorable Alex Lee
Chair, Assembly Human Services Committee
1020 N Street, Room 122
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 1708 (Solache) HHAP Pathways for Cities Act
Notice of SPONSORSHIP *(As Amended 04/6/2026)*

Dear Assembly Member Lee,

The League of California Cities is proud to **sponsor** AB 1708 (Solache), which would increase regional collaboration and require financial planning to support cities with populations under 300,000 in addressing homelessness in their communities.

Since 2019, the state's flagship homelessness grant program, the Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention (HHAP) Program, has provided direct funding to cities with populations over 300,000, all 58 counties, and the 44 Continuums of Care across California. This structure has left the other 469 cities in California without direct state support.

To access funding, HHAP recipients must submit regionally coordinated action plans to the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) that identify each jurisdiction's roles and responsibilities in addressing homelessness. While cities with populations under 300,000 may participate in these plans, counties are encouraged, but not required, to allocate HHAP funding to those cities. As a result, many cities lack access to state homelessness funding, even as they invest significant general fund resources to prevent and reduce homelessness in their communities.

AB 1708 would require outreach and planning to support smaller cities through this regional process. Specifically, this measure would require regions to work directly with cities to identify programs and interventions serving unhoused residents in their communities. The regions would then be required to conduct a fiscal analysis to determine how to sustain and address the financial needs of those programs through a mix of state, local, and federal funding available to the region, including HHAP funds. AB 1708 would also require the region to establish a clear process for smaller cities to apply for and access funding, and to consider dedicating a portion of HHAP funding specifically to support smaller jurisdictions.

To ensure accountability and alignment with statewide goals, smaller cities would need to meet several requirements to be eligible for funding. This would include maintaining a compliant housing element, adopting encampment policies consistent with state guidance, demonstrating how their efforts have advanced regional homelessness strategies, and formally committing to participating in the regionally coordinated action plan.



According to a [2026 Cal Cities survey](#), 85% of cities have been **unable** to access HHAP funding, and 7 in 10 cities are concerned about their ability to provide existing homelessness services over the long term. A majority of cities report they would use state funding to sustain and expand existing projects and programs.

Cal Cities recognizes the impact of the HHAP program, which has placed more than 90,000 people into permanent housing since 2023. Cities of all sizes have consistently supported funding for HHAP, even though most will never receive program funds, because they recognize its value in reducing homelessness statewide. AB 1708 strikes a thoughtful balance, ensuring smaller cities are engaged in the regional process while maintaining local flexibility to allocate funding in ways that support these communities without disrupting existing programs.

As the Governor and the Legislature consider future investments in the HHAP program, it is important not only to sustain funding but also to ensure the program is structured to maximize its reach and impact. Providing all cities with a clear pathway to participate in HHAP would strengthen regional collaboration and accountability and ensure that state resources are deployed where they can most effectively serve unhoused Californians.

AB 1708 would help ensure that communities of all sizes have a meaningful role in the state's homelessness response efforts. For these reasons, Cal Cities is proud to **sponsor** AB 1708 (Solache). If you have any questions, please contact me at cgrinder@calcities.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Caroline Grinder".

Caroline Grinder
Legislative Advocate

SB 922 (Laird): Vehicles: local agency charges: use of streets or highways. (Cal Cities Sponsored bill)

Summary: This bill would help cities maintain and repair local streets. Heavy service vehicles like garbage and recycling trucks can cause significant road damage, and cities have historically recovered those costs through service-related fees.

Legislative Digest:

This bill responds to a 2025 court ruling that prevented the City of Redlands from including road repair costs in its waste hauling fees. In *Rogers v. Redlands*, a California Court of Appeals held that factoring road damage from heavy garbage trucks into franchise fees violated a 1990 prohibition on local charges for the privilege of using public streets.

To address this, the bill clarifies that fees and charges imposed by local agencies to recover the costs of street maintenance, repair, and other public services do not constitute a charge for the privilege of using local streets, and are therefore not subject to that prohibition. It also explicitly allows local agencies to impose taxes, permit fees, or other charges for street use, provided those charges are not based on vehicle weight.

Supporters:

This bill is supported by Mayor Todd Gloria of the City of San Diego, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO), the California Police Chiefs Association, the California Special Districts Association, the California State Association of Counties, the California State Council of Service Employees International Union, Californians Against Waste, the City and County of San Francisco, and the cities of Beverly Hills, Capitola, Fullerton, Glendale, Goleta, Gonzales, Grover Beach, Hollister, Lakewood, Marina, Moreno Valley, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Rancho Cucamonga, Redondo Beach, Salinas, San Bernardino, Santa Paula, Scotts Valley, Stanton, Tulare, and Upland.

Additional supporters include the City of Oxnard Public Works, the counties of Madera and Monterey, the League of California Cities, Recology, RecycleSmart, Republic Services, the Rural County Representatives of California, the Town of Apple Valley, the Town of Truckee, and the West Valley Solid Waste Management Authority.

Opponents:

California Building Industry Association and the California Taxpayers Association



February 13, 2026

The Honorable Maria Durazo
State Capitol, Room 407
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 922 (Laird) Vehicles: local agency charges: use of streets or highways.
CO-SPONSOR AND SUPPORT *(As Introduced on January 28, 2026)*

Dear Chair Durazo,

The League of California Cities (Cal Cities), the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), and the Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC) are pleased to **sponsor** and **support** SB 922, which would clarify and reaffirm long-standing local authority related to the recovery of street maintenance and repair costs associated with providing essential public services.

Local governments are responsible for maintaining most local streets and roads in California. Essential public services, including garbage, recycling, and green waste collection, rely on the regular use of local streets by heavy service vehicles. These vehicles are critical to protecting public health and environmental quality, and for decades their use of local streets has been accounted for through existing service-related rates, fees, or franchise arrangements.

Cities and counties have long worked collaboratively with service providers, including waste haulers, to incorporate the cost of maintaining streets used to deliver essential services into these established arrangements. These practices are familiar, predictable, and transparent for both local governments and service providers, and help ensure that streets remain safe and functional for the delivery of services communities rely on every day.

Recently, a court decision created uncertainty around these long-standing practices. As a result, cities and counties are facing litigation challenging existing service-related cost recovery mechanisms, placing critical street maintenance funding at risk and creating uncertainty for local governments and service providers alike.

SB 922 would address this uncertainty by clarifying that restrictions on local road charges apply only to weight-based charges imposed for the privilege of using streets or highways. The bill further makes clear that fees for the provision of

1400 K Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814 • 916.658.8200 • calcities.org



public services may recover the cost of street maintenance and repair associated with providing such services. By reaffirming existing authority, SB 922 would restore clarity, reduce unnecessary litigation, and provide certainty for all parties involved.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact us at btriffo@calcities.org, ejungwirth@counties.org, or jkennedy@rcrcnet.org.

Sincerely,

Ben Triffo
League of
California Cities
Legislative
Advocate

John Kennedy
RCRC
Senior Policy
Advocate

Emma Jungwirth
California State
Association of
Counties
Senior Legislative
Advocate

cc. The Honorable John Laird
Members, Senate Local Government
Jonathan Peterson, Principal Consultant, Senate Local Government
Ryan Eisberg, Policy Consultant, Republican Caucus

AB 2385 (Petrie-Norris): Local reconstruction agencies. (Cal Cities Sponsored bill)

Summary:

The bill clarifies that cities can reconstitute redevelopment agencies for disasters, called local reconstruction agencies, to support disaster recovery efforts.

Legislative Digest:

This bill updates California's Disaster Recovery Reconstruction Act of 1986 to modernize the tools available to local governments for coordinating disaster recovery. It expands the scope of disaster recovery plans to include intermediate recovery phases, integration with state and federal frameworks, and strategies for coordinating with nonprofits, private partners, and other agencies. It also requires the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation, in consultation with Cal OES, to develop model ordinance language and guidance to help local jurisdictions prepare recovery plans.

The centerpiece of the bill is a new framework allowing cities, counties, and other local agencies to establish a Local Reconstruction Agency (LRA) by ordinance to coordinate recovery in disaster-impacted areas. An LRA may be granted broad powers including acquiring and disposing of property, issuing bonds, incurring debt, accepting public and private funding, and preparing and carrying out plans for rehabilitation and redevelopment.

The LRA is governed by a board that must include members of the relevant legislative body as well as public members, at least one of whom must be a resident or business owner within the local reconstruction area. Board members are subject to ethics training, open meeting laws, and public records requirements. To ensure accountability, local agencies must specify a sunset date for the LRA of no more than 45 years from the date a bond is issued or a loan is approved.

Supporters:

Blue Ribbon Commission on Climate Action and Fire Safe Recovery and the League of California Cities.

Opponents:

None.



March 23, 2026

The Honorable Juan Carrillo
Chair, Assembly Local Government Committee
1020 N Street, Room 157
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 2385 (Petrie-Norris) Local Reconstruction Agencies.
Notice of SUPPORT *(As Introduced on February 20, 2026)*

Dear Chair Carrillo,

The League of California Cities (Cal Cities) is pleased to **support AB 2385 (Petrie-Norris)**, which would strengthen local disaster recovery planning and provide local governments with proactive tools to coordinate rebuilding efforts following a disaster.

Under existing law, the Disaster Recovery Reconstruction Act of 1986 allows cities and counties to prepare plans and ordinances prior to a disaster to facilitate recovery and reconstruction. These plans may include the creation of a local reconstruction authority with powers similar to those previously granted to community redevelopment agencies. However, redevelopment agencies were dissolved in 2012, and many jurisdictions could benefit from proactive tools to structure recovery and rebuilding efforts after a disaster.

AB 2385 would modernize these provisions by renaming these planning efforts as "disaster recovery plans" and requiring that a city or county's general plan be consistent with and reference any adopted disaster recovery plan. The bill would also direct the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation, in consultation with the Office of Emergency Services and regional councils of governments, to assess statewide recovery and rebuilding needs and develop guidance for local governments, including model ordinance language to assist jurisdictions in preparing disaster recovery plans.

In addition, AB 2385 would authorize cities, counties, and other local jurisdictions to adopt ordinances prior to a disaster establishing a local reconstruction agency that could be activated following a disaster to coordinate rebuilding efforts. The bill would allow these reconstruction agencies to exercise several important powers necessary to support recovery, including entering into contracts, issuing bonds, accepting public or private financial assistance, and coordinating redevelopment and rebuilding projects in impacted areas. Importantly, the measure would also allow reconstruction agencies to receive dedicated incremental revenues from local sales and use taxes or transactions and use taxes, if a local jurisdiction chooses to dedicate those revenues. This flexibility could help communities finance rebuilding activities, assist residents and businesses, and coordinate long-term recovery efforts following major disasters.

As California continues to face increasingly severe wildfires, floods, earthquakes, and other climate-driven disasters, local governments need effective tools to respond



quickly and rebuild communities safely and efficiently. AB 2385 would help ensure that cities and counties can plan ahead and coordinate recovery efforts in a structured and transparent manner when disasters occur.

For these reasons, Cal Cities **supports AB 2385 (Petrie-Norris)** and respectfully requests an "AYE" vote when the bill is heard in committee. If you have any questions, please contact Legislative Advocate Melissa Sparks-Kranz at msparkskranz@calcities.org or 916-658-8232.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Melissa L. Sparks-Kranz".

Melissa Sparks-Kranz
Legislative Advocate
League of California Cities

cc: The Honorable Cottie Petrie-Norris
Members, Assembly Local Government Committee
Jimmy MacDonald, Principal Consultant, Assembly Local Government
Committee
Tobias Wolken, Policy Consultant, Republican Caucus