Date: November 21, 2017

To: State Legislative Committee Members

From: Patrick H. West, City Manager

Subject: Long Beach State Legislative Bill Positions and Final Outcomes in 2017

The City of Long Beach (City) took a position on 26 pieces of legislation in the 2017 State Legislative Session. Of those 26 bills, Long Beach supported 23 bills, and of those 23 bills that received the City’s support, 15 were enacted; of the 3 bills that the City opposed, 2 failed passage and one was vetoed. A description of each bill and its final outcome in 2017 is below. Attached for information, are all letters of support and opposition that were sent on behalf of the City on these proposals.

**Affordable Housing and Homelessness Prevention**

**Support for SB 2 (Atkins) – Building Jobs and Homes Act.** Along with a coalition of Big 11 Mayors, Mayor Garcia signed a letter of support for SB 2. This bill imposes a fee of $75 to be paid at the time of the recording of every real estate instrument, paper, or notice required or permitted by law to be recorded, per each single transaction, per single parcel of real property, not to exceed $225. In the most recent fiscal analysis published by the Senate Appropriations Committee, the estimated revenue range for SB 2 is between $200 to $300 million per year. Half of the collected recordation fees will go directly to local governments for uses that have already been specified in the bill. SB 2 was signed into law as Chapter 364, Statutes 2017.

**Support for SB 3 (Beall) – Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018.** Along with a coalition of Big 11 Mayors, Mayor Garcia signed a letter of support for SB 3. This bill proposes the Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018, which, if approved by a majority of voters in November 2018, would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of $4 billion. The proceeds from the sale of these bonds would be used to finance existing housing programs, as well as infill infrastructure financing programs and affordable housing matching grant programs. SB 3 was signed into law as Chapter 365, Statutes of 2017.

**Support for AB 1406 (Gloria and Chiu) – Homeless Youth Advocacy.** This bill would establish the Homeless Youth Housing Program to fund up to 10 Continuums of Care that demonstrate the ability to contract with service providers capable of providing housing assistance and supportive services to homeless youth. The goal is to transition youth experiencing homelessness towards self-sufficiency. The Senate Transportation and Housing Committee hearing for this bill was cancelled at the request of the author, and it is now a two-year bill.

**Animal Care Services**

**Support for AB 485 (O'Donnell) – Dogs and Cats: Adoptions and Retail Sales.** This bill prohibits a pet store operator from selling a live dog, cat, or rabbit in a pet store unless the dog, cat, or rabbit was obtained from a public animal control agency or shelter, society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, human society shelter, or non-profit rescue or adoption.
organization that is in cooperative agreement with at least one private or public shelter. This bill is consistent with the Long Beach Municipal Code as it relates to pet stores and animal adoptions. AB 485 was signed into law as Chapter 740, Statutes of 2017. The potential fiscal impact of this new law is unknown.

**Economic Development**

**Support for AB 755 (Garcia) – Local Agencies: Capital Investment: Incentive Program.** This bill extends to January 1, 2019, a city's authorization to establish a Capital Investment Incentive Program (CIIP). AB 755 was signed into law as Chapter 709, Statutes of 2017. The CIIP was instrumental in incentivizing Weber Metal’s move into Long Beach in 2015. The program may be used again in the future to attract additional businesses. The potential fiscal impact of this bill is positive.

**Support for AB 1111 (Garcia) – Removing Barriers to Employment Act: Breaking Barriers to Employment Initiative.** This bill establishes the Breaking Barriers to Employment Initiative, which will be administered by the California Workforce Development Board. The purpose of the initiative is to create a grant program to provide individuals with barriers to employment the services they need to enter, participate in, and complete broader workforce preparation, training, and education programs aligned with regional labor market needs. AB 1111 was signed into law as Chapter 824, Statutes of 2017. The potential fiscal impact of this bill is positive for Long Beach; however, a specific dollar amount has not been determined.

**Education**

**Support for AB 1533 (O’Donnell) – Pupil Instruction: College Promise Partnership Act.** This bill extends the operation of the College Promise Partnership Act indefinitely. This bill is also supported by the Long Beach Unified School District, California School Boards Association and Long Beach Community College District. AB 1533 was signed into law as Chapter 762, Statutes of 2017. The potential fiscal impact of this new law is unknown.

**Support for AB 422 (Arambula) – California State University: Doctor of Nursing Program.** This bill extends an existing authorization for the California State University to offer Doctor of Nursing Practice degrees. AB 422 was signed into law as Chapter 702, Statutes of 2017.

**Human Resources**

**Support for SB 396 (Lara) – Transgender Work Opportunity Act.** This bill would require employers with 50 or more employees to include as a component of training and education regarding sexual harassment to all supervisory employees, training of harassment based on gender identity, gender expression and sexual orientation. SB 396 was signed into law as Chapter 858, Statutes of 2017.

**Immigration and Public Safety**

**Support for AB 699 (O'Donnell) – Immigration Status Discrimination Protection in Schools.** This bill requires that "immigration status" be included as a protected characteristic in education equity policies. This bill would prohibit school officials and employees of a school district or county office of education or charter school from collecting information or documents about the immigration status of a pupil or their family members. This bill also prohibits Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents from entering a school without prior
permission and a judicial warrant. AB 699 was signed into law as Chapter 493, Statutes of 2017. There is no fiscal impact to the City of Long Beach resulting from this law.

**Support for SB 6 (Hueso) – State Funded Program for Legal Counsel to Immigrants in Removal Proceedings.** Consistent with the City Council direction on February 7, 2017 to support immigrants who positively contribute to our local communities and California’s economy, Long Beach supported SB 6 when verbiage proposed to require the State Department of Social Services to either contract with qualified non-profit legal services organizations, or contract with a non-profit agency to administer funding to non-profit legal services organization subcontractors, to provide legal services to individuals in removal proceedings who are not otherwise entitled to legal representation under an existing local, state, or federal program. This bill was amended to address issues around tribal gaming on September 5, 2017, and the City of Long Beach removed our position on this bill accordingly. The bill was signed into law as Chapter 455, Statutes of 2017. This new law does not have a fiscal impact on the City of Long Beach.

**Support for SB 31 (Lara) – California Religious Freedom Act.** This bill prohibits a State or local agency from collecting information about an individual’s religious beliefs for database and immigration enforcement purposes. This bill was signed into law as Chapter 826, Statutes of 2017. The potential fiscal impact of this new law is unknown.

**Support for SB 54 (deLeon) – Support for Religious Freedom Act.** This bill limits the ability of local law enforcement including school police and security departments to use money and personnel to investigate, interrogate, detail, detect or arrest individuals solely for immigration enforcement purposes. Consistent with the City Council direction on February 7, 2017 to support immigrants who positively contribute to our local communities and California’s economy, Long Beach requested amendments to ensure that local law enforcement agencies would also have clear discretion to partner with federal law enforcement agencies to combat serious and violent crimes. Long Beach negotiated amendments that would ensure local law enforcement agencies’ ability to participate in multi-agency federal task-force operations with the intent to combat international and domestic terrorism and fighting organized crime such as human trafficking and drug trafficking. SB 54 was signed into law as Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017. The potential fiscal impact of this new law is unknown.

**Local Control**

**Opposition to AB 252 (S. Ridley-Thomas) – Prohibition on Local Government Sales or User Tax for Video Streaming Services and Utility.** This bill, until January 1, 2023, would have prohibited the imposition by a city of a utility users tax (UUT) on video streaming services. The bill failed to pass out of the Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee; it is a two-year bill, and as a result, will not impact local revenues.

**Opposition for AB 1146 (Flora) – Cities and Counties Legal Services: Contingency Fee Contracts.** This bill sought to prohibit a city from entering a contingency fee contract for legal representation without first conducting a public hearing and demonstrating that the contingency fee contract is in the public interest. Long Beach depends on contingency fee contracts in major lawsuits, such as the one against Mosanto for stormwater runoff pollution. AB 1146 would have made it difficult, as well as more expensive for the City to partner with other cities to retain outside
counsel. The author of this bill canceled the hearing in the Assembly Local Government Committee and therefore this bill did not move forward; it is a two-year bill.

**Opposition to SB 649 (Hueso) – Wireless Telecommunication Facilities.** This bill proposed to remove a local government’s authority to regulate the telecommunication industry’s deployment of “small cells”. Currently, cities administer the deployment through a discretionary permitting process which allows local governments to clearly prescribe specific aesthetic standards to ensure that small cell telecommunication equipment are deployed in a manner that is consistent with the aesthetic of the neighborhood. Long Beach opposed this bill due to concerns about local discretionary control related to aesthetics, permitting processes, fees, use of city-owned facilities, and infrastructure in the public right-of-way. The Governor vetoed SB 649. The potential fiscal impact of this proposed law was significantly negative.

**Public Health**

**Support for AB 210 (Santiago) – Multi-Disciplinary Personnel Team Info Cross-sharing.** This bill authorizes counties to establish multidisciplinary personnel teams for the purposes of sharing of confidential information with the goal of expediting services for homeless individuals and families. The bill was sponsored by Los Angeles County. While Long Beach has its own Continuum of Care for coordinating homeless prevention and services, AB 210 will benefit Long Beach by enabling greater connectivity between City and County services. AB 210 was signed into law as Chapter 544, Statutes of 2017. The potential fiscal impact of this new law is positive for Long Beach.

**Support for AB 391 (Chiu) – Medi-Cal Asthma Preventive Services.** This bill would have established the Asthma Preventive Services Program Act of 2017 and required the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to seek an amendment to its Medicaid State plan to authorize asthma preventive services providers, who are not licensed practitioners, to provide services so long as the services have been initially recommended by a licensed practitioner. The goal was to increase access for Medi-Cal beneficiaries to asthma education and home environmental trigger assessments services. The Governor vetoed AB 391, asserting that “The Department of Health Care Services... has considerable administrative authority to make changes to benefits based upon new medical evidence and clinical guidelines. Therefore, these statutory changes are unnecessary.”

**Support for SB 687 (Skinner) – Emergency Rooms.** This bill would require a non-profit hospital to obtain approval from the State Attorney General before closing an emergency department. It would also require the hospital to hold at least one public hearing about the planned closure. The bill directs the Attorney General to consider impacts that a closure would have on the availability or accessibility of health care services in a community. On April 18, 2017, the Long Beach City Council voted to support this legislation. The Governor vetoed SB 687, asserting that “A hospital's decision to reduce or eliminate emergency services poses real challenges for a community. This is why current law requires public notice prior to a hospital taking such an action. Removing a hospital’s authority to determine emergency service needs, however, will not solve the underlying financial issues that typically force these decisions. An Attorney General decision to prohibit a reduction or elimination of these services may hasten the reduction of other services or closure of the entire hospital.”
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**Stormwater**

**Support for AB 1180 (Holden) – California Tire Fee: Stormwater Compliance Fund.** This bill authorizes the Los Angeles County Flood Control District to levy a tax to pay for the costs and expenses of carrying out projects and programs to increase stormwater capture and reduce stormwater and urban runoff pollution in the district. AB 1180 was signed into law as Chapter 617, Statutes of 2017. Depending on voter approval, and developments within the tax Expenditure Plan, AB 1180 may provide the City with additional revenues for stormwater management and water quality improvements.

**Support for SB 231 (Hertzberg) --Local Government: Fees and Charges.** This bill defines “sewer”, which includes stormwater, to the list of Proposition 218 exemptions and would enable local governments to fund stormwater management similar to the way in which trash services are funded. SB 231 was signed into law as Chapter 536, Statutes of 2017. The potential fiscal impact of this new law is positive for Long Beach.

**Sustainability**

**Support for AB 655 (O’Donnell) – California Renewables Portfolio Standard Program.** The City of Long Beach, in partnership with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) sponsored AB 655 in an effort to classify existing waste-to-energy facilities as renewable energy facilities. The City of Long Beach was a co-sponsor to this bill as it would have applied to the City’s Southeast Resource Recovery Facility (SERRF). The SERRF facility is an asset to the City. The change in classification would have provided a measure of parity between waste-to-energy facilities and landfills. Landfills currently fall under the renewable energy classification and have an advantage over negotiating energy pricing in contracts. AB 655 failed passage in the Assembly Natural Resources Committee and did not move forward.

**Support for SB 705 (Allen) – Solid Waste: Expanded Polystyrene Food Service Containers.** The bill sought to prohibit all food vendors from dispensing prepared food to a customer in an expanded polystyrene food service container beginning January 1, 2022. The bill would have authorized a city or county to grant a food vendor an exemption from these prohibitions if the food vendor demonstrated to the satisfaction of the city that compliance with the prohibition would impose an undue economic hardship. This bill would have also allowed local government to adopt an ordinance of their own. SB 705 is currently in the Senate inactive file and is a two-year bill.

**Sponsor SB 174 (Lara) –Southern California Edison Settlement Funds to Long Beach.** Long Beach sponsored legislation to transfer $4 million in penalties paid by Southern California Edison to the California Public Utilities Commission for unexpected power outages in Long Beach to the City of Long Beach instead. Funding could have been used to advance public infrastructure projects that would have promoted energy efficiency projects in areas affected by the power outages. This bill was not referred to an Assembly policy committee, and therefore did not advance beyond the State Senate. This proposed bill had a potential positive fiscal impact on Long Beach of $4 million dollars, but it is highly unlikely the bill will advance in 2018, once they are deposited into the State’s General Fund upon approval by the California Public Utilities Commission.
Transportation
Support for SB 1 (Beall) / AB 1 (Frazier) – Transportation Funding. This bill establishes the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program and generates revenues from the taxes and fees to fund State and local road and highway repairs and maintenance. Long Beach expects to receive $11 million in new transportation revenues from SB 1 once all funding mechanisms are implemented in 2020. SB 1 was signed into law as Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017 on April 28, 2017. Long Beach is expecting to receive $2.8 million in SB 1 funding in FY 18. The City expects the amount to rise to $8.3 million in FY 19.

Support for SB 268 (Mendoza) – Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. This bill would have required by December 1, 2018 a plan for reorganizing the membership of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority to include 22 members, and for that membership to provide equitable and proportional voting representation for each region of the County, including increased representation for cities other than the City of Los Angeles. This bill did not pass the Committee on Local Government; and is a two-year bill. The potential fiscal impact of this proposed bill was unknown.

If you have questions or comments, please contact Diana Tang, Manager of Government Affairs, at (562) 570-6506.

cc: Mayor and Members of the City Council
Charles Parkin, City Attorney
Laura Doud, City Auditor
Monique De la Garza, City Clerk
Tom Modica, Assistant City Manager
Kevin Jackson, Deputy City Manager
All Department Directors
Rebecca Jimenez, Assistant to the City Manager
Diana Tang, Manager of Government Affairs
Di Mare, Brown, Hicks, & Kessler, LLC
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September 25, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor, State of California
California State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for SB 2 (Atkins) – Building Homes and Jobs Act

Dear Governor Brown:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in support of Senate Bill 2 (Atkins). This bill would establish a permanent funding source for affordable rental or ownership housing, supportive housing, emergency shelters, transitional housing and other housing needs. Long Beach shares your interest in supporting affordable housing and recognizes that it is critical to have substantial investment from the State to leverage limited local resources.

Long Beach is a large urban city that is strongly committed to the development and preservation of affordable housing units. Earlier this year, the Long Beach City Council voted and approved 29 strategies to promote and increase affordable housing within the City. These strategies were created after a long process of community input and study reports. Your proposal will generate millions of dollars annually with 50 percent of collected recordation fees going to local governments in its first year and 70 percent all other years, helping to maximize local investments and prioritize local needs.

We are proud to share that the City has not had a single affordable housing project denied in the past two decades. This achievement is a success for all those living in Long Beach. Increased and ongoing funding for affordable housing will help stabilize the State’s housing development and construction marketplace.

Given these reasons, I respectfully request your signature on SB 2 (Atkins).

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
September 25, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor, State of California
California State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for SB 3 (Beall) – Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018

Dear Governor Brown:

As Mayor of the City of Long Beach, I write in support of Senate Bill 3 (Beall). This bill authorizes a $4 billion State general obligation bond to fund affordable housing programs and infill infrastructure projects if approved by a majority of voters in the November 2018 election.

Long Beach is a large urban city that is strongly committed to the development and preservation of affordable housing units. Earlier this year, the Long Beach City Council voted and approved 29 strategies to promote and increase affordable housing within the City. These strategies were created after a long process of community input and study reports. Funding for programs that support the Local Housing Trust Fund Matching Grant program, multifamily housing, and others is essential to the development of affordable housing statewide.

Our City is proud to support quality affordable housing developments, especially those that benefit our veterans. Additional resources that may be made available by SB 3 will help leverage existing funds and programs for veterans and low-income residents. Long Beach looks forward to hearing the will of the voters on this crucial funding mechanism for affordable housing statewide.

Given these reasons, I respectfully request your signature on SB 3 (Beall).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O'Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
April 20, 2017

The Honorable David Chiu, Chair
California State Assembly, Committee on Housing and Community Development
1020 N Street, Room 162
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: AB 1406 (Gloria) – Support Relating to Homeless Youth Advocacy

Dear Chairman Chiu:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in support of Assembly Bill 1406 (Gloria). This bill seeks to address California’s homelessness crisis as it relates to California’s youth by establishing the Homeless Youth Advocacy and Housing Program. AB 1406 will reduce youth homelessness by supporting ten local Continuums of Care (CoC) across California with grant funding for youth services. Long Beach is the largest CoC administered by a city, and the only federally recognized Unified Funding Agency (UFA) in the County of Los Angeles. The Long Beach CoC has a strong history of successfully supporting individuals in the transition from homelessness to housing. It is uniquely positioned to assist youth who may be at risk for homelessness achieve self-sufficiency.

In December 2016, the United States Conference of Mayors published a report evaluating 31 cities nationally. The report shows that Long Beach is outperforming all other large urban cities in reducing homelessness. Because of the City’s demonstrated achievements, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development recognizes Long Beach as a UFA, which enables the City to have greater flexibility in funding for homeless services. The addition of state funding through AB 1406, specifically for youth experiencing homelessness, will help Long Beach leverage existing funding for this purpose.

The Long Beach CoC actively partners with 11 local organizations to provide rapid rehousing, transitional housing, permanent housing, and supportive services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness. Through the City’s partnership with the Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), Long Beach is able to provide a variety of supportive programs including the Family Preservation Program for children and youth who are at risk of out of home placement. In 2016, the Center for Families and Youth worked with 398 families, 95 percent of which remained together at case closure. The City believes AB 1406 will help provide additional resources to assist youth in achieving self-sufficiency through housing and supportive services.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach strongly supports AB 1406 (Gloria).

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Todd Gloria, State Assembly, 78th District
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 31st District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 76th District
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September 25, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor, State of California
California State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for AB 485 (O’Donnell) – Dogs and Cats: Adoption and Retail Sales

Dear Governor Brown:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write to support Assembly Bill 485 (O’Donnell). This legislation extends a successful local ordinance statewide and would further promote the adoption of animals from shelters and rescue groups statewide.

By proposing to prohibit pet store owners from selling a live dog, cat, or rabbit in a pet store unless the animal is obtained from a public animal control agency, non-profit shelter, or rescue group, statewide AB 485 prioritizes and encourages animal adoption.

Long Beach proudly invests significant effort into placing animals in loving, humane environments, and promoting responsible pet ownership to reduce animal overpopulation. Since the adoption of our local ordinance, Long Beach has begun working with many local pet stores and local rescue groups to adopt out animals in need. It is with great pride that Long Beach celebrates the human-animal bond.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach requests your signature on AB 485 (O’Donnell).

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
September 25, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor, State of California
California State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for AB 755 (E. Garcia) – Local agencies: Capital Investment Incentive Program

Dear Governor Brown:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write to support Assembly Bill 755 (E. Garcia). This legislation seeks to extend a successful statewide program related to economic development, and from which Long Beach has benefited. The California Capital Investment Incentive Program (CIIP) authorizes cities and counties to establish a CIIP and requires those that choose to do so to pay a capital investment incentive amount to the proponent of a qualified manufacturing facility for up to 15 consecutive years.

The State’s CIIP is crucial to assisting businesses wishing to locate or expand in Long Beach, and our experience with the program has been positive. In 2015, the City was able to support Weber Metals with implementing a major expansion to its Long Beach manufacturing facility, including the installation of a 60,000-ton hydraulic forging press for the manufacture of aircraft parts. The investments in real and business personal property necessary for the full and normal operation of the facility is an estimated $295 million and will generate new tax revenues to the City. The agreement also includes a Community Services Agreement whereby, through a Job Creation Plan, Weber Metals has projected that the average number of employees for this project will grow from 11 in 2015 to 86 by 2020.

Following on the success of Weber Metals, the City of Long Beach is exploring partnerships with two additional businesses through the CIIP. We look forward to working with the California Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) on these opportunities to bring businesses into Long Beach, where there is a strong manufacturing and engineering workforce.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach requests your signature on AB 755 (E. Garcia).

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
    The Honorable Patrick O'Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
    The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 36th District
    The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
    The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
    The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
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September 25, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor, State of California
California State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for AB 1111 (E. Garcia) – Removing Barriers to Employment Act: Breaking Barriers to Employment Initiative

Dear Governor Brown:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write to support Assembly Bill 1111 (E. Garcia). This bill establishes the Breaking Barriers to Employment Initiative, which includes a grant program to support remedial education and work readiness skills development for individuals facing multiple employment barriers. As a member of the Pacific Gateway Workforce Investment Network (Pacific Gateway), Long Beach has a demonstrated history of workforce development. This legislation will help extend the reach of the existing programs that are available to our community.

Pacific Gateway already provides quality workforce development services in Long Beach, Signal Hill, and Los Angeles Harbor communities by offering local job search, skills development, and training to adults and youth through the Career Center and the Youth Opportunity Center. Those who utilize the Career Center receive individualized services to meet specific needs and career goals.

Through resources that would be authorized by AB 1111, the City anticipates new opportunities to partner with the State to further assist individuals who face barriers to employment. This bill will also help the City support partnerships between community-based organizations and workforce development boards.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach requests your signature on AB 1111 (E. Garcia).

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
September 6, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor, State of California
State Capitol, Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for AB 1533 (O’Donnell)

Dear Governor Brown:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I am pleased to write this letter of support for AB 1533 (O’Donnell). Among other things, this bill eliminates the June 30, 2017, sunset date for the Long Beach College Promise Partnership Act. This critical piece of legislation was adopted in 2011 and provides concurrent enrollment and priority registration guarantees to local Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) high school students and transfers, respectively.

In order to continue to provide an extensive array of programs and services through the Long Beach College Promise, and as a mechanism for promoting student success, LBUSD and Long Beach Community College District (LBCCD) request long-term support for affording incoming LBCCD students with priority registration.

The Long Beach College Promise has achieved multiple goals and benchmarks across the educational institutions in Long Beach. The following are examples of success under the Long Beach College Promise partnership:

- The successful completion of college-level English increased for participating students at a greater rate.
- The successful completion of college-level Math in the first year among participating students was greater than for their peers.
- Among participating students, there has been a two- to four-fold increase in the successful completion of 25 transferable units in their first year.

I am confident that AB 1533 will further advance these goals through the Long Beach College Promise, and I hope you sign the bill into law. If you have any questions about my support, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach
July 13, 2017

The Honorable Joaquin Arambula
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 5155
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: Support for AB 422 (Arambula) – California State University: Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree

Dear Assemblymember Arambula:

As Mayor of the City of Long Beach, I write to convey my support for AB 422 (Arambula). This bill would extend an existing authorization enabling the California State University (CSU) system to award Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNPs) degrees.

In 2010, AB 867 (Nava/Arambula) was passed into law, giving the CSU authority to offer DNP degree programs on a pilot basis until July 1, 2018. This program has been incredibly successful, graduating highly qualified healthcare professionals into the local workforce, and supporting key industry partnerships between our educational institutions, medical facilities and the City of Long Beach. California State University, Long Beach’s DNP graduates are key members of our nursing workforce and provide quality and innovative nursing care to families across Long Beach.

I fully support the overall CSU DNP program at the California State University, Long Beach, and appreciate their efforts to promote excellence in nursing education.

Given these reasons, I am pleased to support AB 422.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
    The Honorable Joaquin Arambula, 31st District
    The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
    The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
    The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
    The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
    The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
June 29, 2017

The Honorable Tony Thurmond, Chair
Assembly Labor Committee
State Capitol, P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, California 94249

RE: Support for SB 396 – Transgender Work Opportunity Act

Dear Chair Thurmond:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I am pleased to write in support of SB 396 (Lara). This bill would require employers with 50 or more employees to provide training and education regarding harassment based on gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation to all supervisory employees every two years. Additionally, the bill would require employers to post a department poster with information on transgender civil rights in their workplaces.

The City of Long Beach is proud to recognize gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation rights in our municipal laws and policies. Long Beach has passed a Contractor Non-Discrimination Ordinance, offers Trans-Inclusive Health Benefits to City employees and their beneficiaries, supports a LGBT Liaison in the Police Department, and advocates in support of legislation and policy proposals that promote equality.

Consistent with the values held by the City of Long Beach, SB 396 would establish California as a national leader in transgender civil rights protections by expanding existing sexual harassment training laws to specifically include topics on gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation-based discrimination and harassment.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach strongly supports SB 396.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
California State Assembly, Committee on Higher Education
June 23, 2017

The Honorable Benjamin Allen, Chairman
California State Senate Education Committee
State Capitol, Room 2083
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: AB 699 (O’Donnell) – Support Relating to Protection of Pupils Based on Immigration Status

Dear Chairman Allen:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in support of Assembly Bill 699 (O’Donnell). On February 7, 2017, the Long Beach City Council voted to support State legislation that would ensure local resources are not used to facilitate deportations or collect information about an individual’s religious beliefs. Support for AB 699 is consistent with the City Council’s position on federal immigration enforcement in California.

AB 699 proposes protection of students and their families based on immigration status by requiring schools to include “immigration status” as a protected characteristic in educational equity policies. AB 699 also prohibits schools from collecting information based on immigration status and requires officers of the United States Immigration Customs and Enforcement (ICE) to obtain permission from a school principal and a judicial warrant before entering a school. Further, this legislation addresses bullying by requiring the California Department of Education to monitor local educational agencies’ compliance with anti-bullying procedures and policies based on immigration status.

Within the City of Long Beach, one in four community members self-identify as foreign-born. Long Beach is invested in protecting our youth by ensuring that they remain safe in our local schools and can focus on education.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach supports AB 699.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 39th District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
California State Senate Education Committee

562.570.6801 | mayor@longbeach.gov | @LongBeachMayor
333 West Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, California 90802
March 9, 2017

The Honorable Benjamin Hueso
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 4035
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: SB 6 (Hueso) – Support Relating to Accessibility to Legal Counsel in Removal Proceedings

Dear Senator Hueso:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in support of Senate Bill 6. This bill seeks to ensure that Californians receive affordable and competent access to legal representation during immigration removal proceedings. Long Beach takes pride in being a leader in progressive values that protect families in our communities. As an example of our commitment, on February 7, 2017, the Long Beach City Council adopted a motion to support State legislation that would ensure local resources are not used to facilitate deportations or collect information about an individual’s religious beliefs. The City’s support of SB 6 is consistent with that motion.

SB 6 would institute a State-funded program that would provide access to qualified legal counsel to adult immigrants in deportation or removal proceedings at low to no cost. The likelihood of success in challenging a removal during proceedings increases five times when there is legal representation, but approximately 68% of persons facing deportation proceedings in California do not have the means to afford legal representation. Removal of these family members often leaves their children, many who are U.S. born citizens, in the foster-care system.

The City of Long Beach values the economic benefits that families with immigrant household members bring to California. According to the American Immigration Council, immigrant families are responsible for $5.2 billion contributions in state income taxes and $4.2 billion in sales taxes each year. The City considers our diversity to be part of our economic strength. Since 2012, businesses in downtown Long Beach have doubled and as of March 2016, the unemployment rate in Long Beach reached a nine-year low. The
City would like for our economic growth to remain steady and to see families stay together.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach supports SB 6.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc:
The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
July 13, 2017

The Honorable Ricardo Lara
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 5050
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for SB 31 (Lara) – The California Religious Freedom Act

Dear Senator Lara:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in strong support of SB 31 (Lara), the California Religious Freedom Act. On February 7, 2017, the Long Beach City Council voted to approve a motion in support of this legislation. SB 31 would prohibit the State and local law enforcement agencies from ever providing, disclosing, or supporting financially, with personnel or equipment, the collection of personally identifiable information pertaining to the religious beliefs, practices or affiliations of any individual for the purpose of compiling a registry or database.

As a vibrant, multi-cultural city, Long Beach thrives on the ingenuity, entrepreneurship, and diversity of our immigrant communities and American-born residents. This diversity also includes diversity of religion. While the City does not have official statistics on the types of religious institutions in Long Beach, it is evident that numerous places of worship exist peacefully throughout the City to serve a number of different religions; this is part of what makes Long Beach great.

California must uphold the protection of religious freedom for all of its people, and the State has a moral obligation to protect its citizens from religious persecution. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution, guaranteeing the free exercise and enjoyment of religion without discrimination, is a crucial part of who we are as Americans. Long Beach values, tremendously, the respect we have for one another’s religion.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach is proud to join over 195 organizations from throughout California, in support of SB 31 (Lara). Thank you for introducing this legislation.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
July 13, 2017

The Honorable Kevin de León
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 205
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for SB 54 (de León) – The California Values Act

Dear Senate Pro Tempore de León:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write to express the City’s support of SB 54 (de León). Long Beach supports State legislation that protects immigrants who positively contribute to our communities and to California’s economy. The City also appreciates amendments to this bill that ensure law enforcement agencies have clear discretion to partner with federal law enforcement agencies to combat serious and violent crimes, as well as participate on multi-agency federal task force operations to combat international and domestic terrorism and organized crimes.

As a vibrant, multi-cultural city, Long Beach thrives on the ingenuity, entrepreneurship, and diversity of our immigrant communities and American-born residents. Over 40 percent of the Long Beach population identifies as Latino, and 12 percent identify as Asian; it is also believed that Long Beach has the largest Cambodian population outside of Southeast Asia. Since 2012, business in downtown Long Beach has doubled. In June of this year, the unemployment rate in Long Beach hit 4.4 percent—the lowest it has been since the State started collecting data in 1990. Additionally, in 2016, revenue per available Long Beach hotel room increased 8.8 percent over 2015 levels, reflecting an increase in tourism. Clearly, Long Beach is a safe city, and our economy is growing.

Immigration is a federal policy issue between the United States government and other countries. It is reasonable that SB 54 limits State and local law enforcement agencies from using local resources to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect or arrest individuals solely for immigration enforcement purposes. Long Beach, along with other major cities and the State of California, believe enforcing immigration at the local level undermines the trust and cooperation with immigrant communities, which are essential elements of community-oriented policing.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach writes in support of SB 54 (de León).

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
March 20, 2017

The Honorable Sebastian Ridley-Thomas
California State Assembly
State Capitol, room 2176
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: OPPOSITION to AB 252 (Ridley-Thomas) - Local Government: Taxation: Prohibition: Video Streaming Services

Dear Assemblymember Ridley-Thomas:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write to oppose Assembly Bill 252. This legislation undermines local control of a city’s finances by prohibiting cities from levying any tax on video streaming services, the sale or use of video streaming services or any utility user tax on video streaming services.

Over the last two decades, voters in over 107 cities and 3 counties have adopted measures to modernize Local Utility User Tax (UUT) policies to enable local governments to maintain stable revenues as advances in technology have expanded video service delivery options for end users. By modernizing UUT policy to include “over the top” (OTT) streaming services as a part of a technology neutral UUT tax, cities have been able to continue providing local government services as changes in technology occur.

Long Beach depends on our UUT to support core government service such as police, fire, parks and libraries. While our City values advances in technology, it is essential UUT revenues not be impacted as new and innovative entertainment delivery models emerge. By creating a carve out for video streaming services, AB 252 sets a dangerous precedent and potentially creates an environment where advances in technology result in the direct loss of local government services.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach strongly opposes AB 252.

Sincerely,

Patrick H. West
CITY MANAGER

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
March 24, 2017

The Honorable Heath Flora
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Suite 3149
Sacramento, CA 94249

RE: OPPOSITION to Assembly Bill 1146 (Flora) – Local Cities and Counties: Legal Services: Contingency Fee Contracts

Dear Assemblymember Flora:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write to oppose Assembly Bill 1146. This legislation undermines the City Attorney’s ability to contract outside representation in a timely manner for purposes of seeking relief in civil litigation where the City of Long Beach is the plaintiff.

This bill requires the City Council to substitute the legal judgement of the City Attorney, who is duly sworn to pursue the best interest of the City of Long Beach, by requiring the City Council to first determine whether a contingency fee contract is cost effective and in the public interest. The criteria for these determinations requires the City Council consider the novelty, complexity, difficulty of the questions involved, and the skill requisite to perform the attorney services properly. These determinations are best suited for the City Attorney. Further, in a case where time is of the essence, the City’s ability to bring forth a lawsuit will be delayed by making the contingency fee contract into a public competitive process as required by this bill.

AB 1146 (Flora) requires that the City of Long Beach expose confidential information, including intent to seek outside counsel, which is otherwise protected by the duty of confidentiality. This requirement alone would undermine outside counsel’s efforts to represent the City to the best of their ability. It is in Long Beach’s best interest to preserve the contracting rights of public entities, and AB 1146 undermines those rights.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach opposes AB 1146.

Sincerely,

Patrick H. West
CITY MANAGER
CITY OF LONG BEACH
OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER

333 WEST OCEAN BOULEVARD • LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802 • (562) 570-6711 • FAX (562) 570-6583

PATRICK H. WEST
CITY MANAGER

May 11, 2017

The Honorable Ricardo Lara, Chair
California State Committee on Appropriations
State Capitol, Room 2206
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Oppose SB 649 (Hueso) – Wireless telecommunications facilities

Dear Senator Lara:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in opposition to SB 649. This legislative position represents a shift in the City’s original “oppose unless amended” position. Long Beach has met periodically with Verizon in search of a solution that would enable the telecommunication industry to obtain permits for small cells more expeditiously, and Long Beach to maintain the unique identity of our City. Unfortunately, the proponents of SB 649 have not been able to meet the City’s concerns with regards to local discretionary control related to aesthetics, permitting processes, use of city-owned facilities, and infrastructure in the public right-of-way.

Long Beach takes pride in supporting a robust economy inclusive of modern technology, well-designed urban spaces, and a beautiful skyline. While the City values services provided by the wireless telecommunication industry, the City must also have the authority to fulfill our role as a local government. As a part of this responsibility, Long Beach manages space in the public right-of-way. The most recent small cell permit approved, provides for a $1,500 annual fee per pole in downtown Long Beach, plus a one-time application fee of $5,000. The term of the agreement is 10 years.

The City understands the need to modernize the telecommunication permitting process given changes in technology. Zoning updates related to “small cells” are underway in Long Beach, and will provide appropriate aesthetic and location standards for City residents and stakeholders, and increase clarity of regulations and efficiency of processing for the wireless industry. These updates can, and are, occurring without SB 649.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach respectfully opposes SB 649 (Hueso).

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Patrick H. West
CITY MANAGER

cc: The Honorable Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Ben Hueso, State Senate, 40th District
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
Senate Appropriations Committee Members
September 25, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor, State of California
California State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 210 (Santiago) – Support Relating to Homeless Multidisciplinary Personnel Teams

Dear Governor Brown:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in support of Assembly Bill 210 (Santiago). This bill seeks to address California’s homelessness crisis, in part, by establishing Homeless Multidisciplinary Personnel Teams. Challenges associated with homelessness are complex. While there is a need to protect patient confidentiality, there are also benefits that can be gained when public service entities align to share information within confined parameters. Long Beach has found that the most effective means by which local governments can assist individuals with a transition out of homelessness and into transitional and permanent housing is to develop a comprehensive plan that addresses the multiple factors that contribute to an individual’s state of homelessness.

AB 210 proposes to eliminate barriers to information sharing, as it relates to providing homelessness services. While cities and counties may currently establish multidisciplinary teams, the ability for information cross-sharing is limited because of existing healthcare privacy laws. This bill allows counties to formally establish protocols for sharing confidential information, which will enable homeless service providers to collaborate on treatment strategies that address the whole person, not simply individual factors associated with that person.

Long Beach provides a range of homeless supportive services at our Multi-Service Center with the goal of transitioning individuals experiencing homelessness into permanent housing. Currently, there is no statutory authority for county departments and homeless service providers to share data on homeless youth, families, or single adults. The ability to share information would help to facilitate the identification, assessment, and linkage of homeless youth, families and individuals to the most appropriate housing and supportive services. It also would enable county departments and agencies to know what services homeless persons are currently receiving or have received in the past.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach requests your signature on AB 210 (Santiago).

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
    The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
    The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
    The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
    The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
    The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District

562.570.6801 | mayor@longbeach.gov | @LongBeachMayor
333 West Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, California 90802
June 22, 2017

The Honorable Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry, Chair
California State Assembly, Committee on Local Government
1020 N Street, Room 157
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Oppose SB 649 (Hueso) – Wireless telecommunications facilities

Dear Chair Aguiar-Curry:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in strong opposition to SB 649. This bill would neutralize the City’s ability to manage and regulate the way in which telecommunication small cell and cable equipment impact neighborhoods and business communities in Long Beach. Based on our experience managing these assets, Long Beach believes that SB 649 would result in a much more rapid deployment of telecommunication equipment in our cities, at a significant cost to the quality of life and local culture in our neighborhood and business communities. These changes will be visually apparent, and they will be financially significant.

In an effort to work with the telecommunications industry on this policy issue, Long Beach has met with Verizon officials on several occasions earlier in the legislative session. The City had hoped to identify a solution that would enable the telecommunication industry to obtain permits for small cells more expeditiously, while enabling cities to maintain local unique identities. Unfortunately, there remains a fundamental disagreement between many cities and counties, including the City of Long Beach, and the telecommunications industry. Long Beach believes local land use decisions, and the management of public infrastructure should remain within the purview of local jurisdictions, and not transferred to a private-for-profit industry.

The City of Long Beach takes pride in supporting a robust economy inclusive of modern technology, well-designed urban spaces, and a beautiful skyline. As a part of this responsibility, Long Beach manages space in the public right-of-way, including that which is used by the telecommunication and cable industries for siting of privately-owned equipment. The most recent small cell permit approved in Long Beach considered local aesthetic, as well as market rates. These permits were approved at a cost of $1,500 annual fee per pole in downtown Long Beach, plus a one-time application fee of $5,000. The term of the agreement between the City and the telecommunications provider is 10-years.

SB 649 proposes to limits the fees that a city or county may charge for the installation of a small cell telecommunications facility on publicly owned vertical infrastructure. The bill provides for a fee structure that ranges from $100 to $850 per small cell per year. The City is concerned with this language, as it significantly subsidizes the private sector with below market rates for the usage of public assets paid for by city residents.
Long Beach understands the need to modernize the telecommunication permitting process given changes in technology. Zoning updates related to “small cells” were adopted in our City earlier this year, and will provide appropriate aesthetic and location standards for City residents and stakeholders, as well as increase clarity of regulations and efficiency of processing for the wireless industry. These updates can, and are, occurring without SB 649. If SB 649 passes, the updates streaming “small cell” permits in Long Beach would become mute.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach strongly opposes SB 649 (Hueso).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patrick H. West
CITY MANAGER

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Ben Hueso, State Senate, 40th District
The Honorable Sieven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
California State Assembly, Committee on Local Government
September 21, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor of California
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Opposition to SB 649 (Hueso): Wireless telecommunications facilities

Dear Governor Brown:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write to request your veto on Senate Bill 649. Long Beach first opposed this legislation in April 2017, after meeting with telecommunication officials in an attempt to work with the industry on this issue. As adopted by the Legislature, SB 649 would nearly eliminate local government’s ability to manage and regulate the way in which small cell and cable equipment infrastructure is deployed in neighborhoods and business communities in Long Beach, and for this reason, the City is strongly opposed to this bill.

The City of Long Beach supports modern technology, well-designed urban spaces, and a beautiful skyline. Zoning updates related to “small cells” were adopted in our City earlier this year. These changes provide appropriate aesthetic and location standards for City residents and stakeholders, as well as increase clarity of regulations and efficiency of processing for the wireless industry. These updates can, and are, occurring without SB 649. Notably, if SB 649 becomes law, the changes adopted by the Long Beach City Council to enable a responsible deployment of “small cell” infrastructure in Long Beach would become mute.

As a part of the City’s responsibility to our communities, Long Beach also manages space in the public right-of-way, including that which is used by the telecommunication and cable industries for the siting of privately-owned equipment. The most recent package of small cell permits approved in Long Beach successfully considered local aesthetic concerns, as well as market rates for infrastructure leasing. These permits were approved after a one-time application fee of $5,000 and at a cost of $1,500 annual fee per pole in downtown Long Beach. The term of the agreement between the City and the telecommunications provider is 10-years. SB 649 proposes to place a cap
on these fees of $250 per year – representing a significant discount to the private sector, at the expense of our community.

Additionally, as amendments have been made to SB 649, the legislation progressively expanded to private property “macro” wireless sites, in addition to right-of-way small cells. The result is a near-complete deregulation of wireless telecom development and a loss of most local control over aesthetics. Given that the aesthetics of wireless telecom sites is the only main element left upon which local agencies may exercise any meaningful regulation, the adoption of SB 649 would essentially remove all oversight of wireless telecommunication development at the local level, leading to a one-size-fits-all, hands-off Statewide regulatory approach, which will likely result in an uncontrolled burst of wireless telecommunication buildouts with no regard to local communities.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach continues to strongly oppose SB 649 (Hueso), and requests your veto on this bill.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Ben Hueso, State Senate, 40th District
     The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
     The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
     The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
     The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
     The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
     The Honorable Patrick O'Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
March 9, 2017

The Honorable Miguel Santiago  
California State Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 6027  
Sacramento, California 95814  

RE: AB 210 (Santiago) – Support Relating to Homeless Multidisciplinary Personnel Teams

Dear Assemblymember Santiago:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in support of Assembly Bill 210. This bill seeks to address California’s homelessness crisis, in part, by establishing Homeless Multidisciplinary Personnel Teams. Long Beach recognizes that the challenges associated with homelessness are complex. While there is a need to protect patient confidentiality, there are benefits to be gained when public service entities align to share information within confined parameters. Long Beach has found that the most effective means by which local governments can assist individuals to transition out of homelessness, and into transitional and permanent housing, is to develop a comprehensive plan that addresses the multiple factors that contribute to an individual’s state of homelessness; these factors are often unique to the individual person.

AB 210 proposes to make several changes to existing law that would eliminate some barriers to providing homelessness services. While cities and counties may currently establish multidisciplinary teams, the ability for information cross-sharing is limited because of existing healthcare privacy laws. By allowing counties to formally establish protocols for sharing confidential information, AB 210 enables homeless service providers to collaborate on treatment strategies that address the whole person, and not simply individual factors associated with that person.

The City of Long Beach provides a range of homeless supportive services at our Multi-Service Center, with the goal of transitioning individuals experiencing homelessness into permanent housing. Currently, there is no statutory authority for county departments and homeless service providers to share data on homeless youth, families, or single adults. The
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ability to share information would help to facilitate the identification, assessment, and
linkage of homeless youth, families, and individuals to the most appropriate housing and
supportive services. It also would enable county departments and agencies to know what
services homeless persons are currently receiving or have received in the past.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach supports AB 210.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc:
The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
July 13, 2017

The Honorable David Chiu  
California State Assembly  
State Capitol Building, Room 4112  
Sacramento, CA 95814  

Re: SUPPORT for AB 391 (Chiu)—Medi-Cal: Asthma Preventive Services

Dear Assemblymember Chiu,

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write to affirm the City’s support of Assembly Bill 391 (Chiu). This bill would make asthma preventive services more accessible to the State’s most vulnerable populations by providing the State Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) with statutory authority to issue reimbursements for qualified service providers, so long as the services have been initially recommended by a licensed practitioner.

Currently, over five million Californians have been diagnosed with asthma. This respiratory condition is of special concern to low-income Californians, who may be enrolled in Medi-Cal. The City of Long Beach recognizes the need for comprehensive asthma preventative services in our region and has partnered with local service providers and the Port of Long Beach to improve the livability of neighborhoods and homes along the major freeways (I-710 and I-405). Long Beach looks forward to the passage of AB 391, so that these asthma service providers may have the resources to offer a wider range of asthma preventative education services.

Customized home visit assessments and health education programs such as the Asthma Life Skills Academy (ALSAA) and the Community Asthma and Air Quality Education (CAARE) Project are critical to improving the health of families living along the I-710 and I-405 freeways. AB 391 will increase access for Medi-Cal beneficiaries to asthma education and home environmental asthma trigger assessments by enabling DHCS to cover these services that fall outside of the state’s clinical licensure system. If additional Medi-Cal resources are made available, the ALSAA and CAARE Projects could have an even more positive impact in Long Beach.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach supports AB 391 (Chiu).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mayor Robert Garcia  
City of Long Beach

cc:  
The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly  
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District  
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District  
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District  
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District  
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
July 17, 2017

The Honorable Nancy Skinner
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 2059
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Senate Bill 687 (Skinner)—Support relating to Health Facilities: Emergency Centers: Attorney General

Dear Senator Skinner:

On behalf of the Long Beach City Council, I write to express support for Senate Bill 687 (Skinner). On April 18, 2017, the City Council voted to support this legislation. The City supports the proposal to require a non-profit corporation that operates a hospital in California to obtain consent from the California State Attorney General before reducing services of or closing an emergency medical department.

Long Beach is proud to support policies that improve the quality of life of its residents by providing a healthy community in which to live, work, and play. We are aware a study in the Journal of Health Affairs has shown 26 California hospitals with emergency rooms (ERs) closed between 1999 and 2010. An additional 22 hospitals closed their ERs, but continued operating the rest of the hospital. Meanwhile, California saw a 27% increase in the total patient visits per emergency department between 1996 and 2009, and has the lowest number of emergency medical departments per capita in the nation.

Since visits to emergency medical departments can be inevitable at times, the City believes it is important to ensure the California State Attorney General has oversight over any closures. As a part of this oversight, SB 687 requires the Attorney General to hold at least one public hearing about the planned closure. This level of community outreach is important to our City Council.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach supports SB 687 (Skinner).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patrick H. West
CITY MANAGER

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
    The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
    The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
    The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
    The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
    The Honorable Patrick O'Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
September 6, 2017

The Honorable Christopher Holden
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 5132
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for AB 1180 (Holden): Los Angeles County Flood Control District: Taxes, Fees, and Charges

Dear Assemblymember Holden,

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in support of Assembly Bill 1180 (Holden). AB 1180 would authorize the Los Angeles County Flood Control District to levy a tax to fund stormwater infrastructure and management if approved for consideration by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. I would like to note the City’s support for AB 1180 does not equate to support for a tax at this time – however, it is in the City’s interest to support legislation that provides local governments with resources to implement stormwater best management practices, including low impact development to capture stormwater at its source and improve recreational water quality at the City’s beaches and local waterways.

Given Long Beach’s geographic location at the mouth of the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers, the City has a history of leading stormwater management efforts throughout Los Angeles County. During the 2013 effort to secure a funding mechanism for stormwater management, Long Beach had a significant role in developing the original structure of watershed advisory groups (WAGs). Long Beach recognizes AB 1180 deletes the WAG structure, and proposes to replace it with other regional groups. This structure was, and remains incredibly important to the City, as 50 percent of tax revenues are expected to be allocated to these groups to advance stormwater management initiatives.

While the City understands WAGs did not fully mature and other regional groups have developed to fill the void that was left, the City believes that it is important that any future WAG replacement structure be regionally-based, and have strong leadership with experience in municipal stormwater management of projects and programs that have watershed-wide benefits. On a related note, I would like to express the City’s strong support for provisions in AB 1180 that leave the 40 percent allocation of future stormwater revenues to cities intact. Long Beach looks forward to continuing our work with the County to develop a tax and expenditure plan that is reflective of stormwater management needs countywide.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach supports AB 1180 (Holden).

Sincerely,

Patrick H. West
CITY MANAGER

CC: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
September 28, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor, State of California
California State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for AB 1180 (Holden) – Los Angeles County Flood Control District: Taxes, Fees, and Charges

Dear Governor Brown,

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in support of Assembly Bill 1180 (Holden). AB 1180 would authorize the Los Angeles County Flood Control District to levy a tax to fund stormwater infrastructure and management if approved for consideration by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. The City’s support for AB 1180 does not unequivocally equate to support for a tax at this time; however, Long Beach does have a strong track record of supporting legislation that provides local governments with resources to implement stormwater best management practices, including low impact stormwater capture development and improvement of recreational water quality at the City’s beaches and local waterways.

Given Long Beach’s geographic location at the mouth of the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers, the City has a history of leading stormwater management efforts throughout Los Angeles County. During the 2013 effort to secure a funding mechanism for stormwater management, Long Beach had a significant role in developing the original structure of watershed advisory groups (WAGs). Long Beach recognizes AB 1180 deletes the WAG structure, and proposes to replace it with other regional groups. This structure was, and remains incredibly important to the City, as 50 percent of tax revenues are expected to be allocated to these groups to advance stormwater management initiatives.

While the City understands WAGs did not fully mature and other regional groups have developed to fill the void that was left, the City believes that it is important that any future WAG replacement structure be regionally-based, and have strong leadership with experience in municipal stormwater management of projects and programs that have watershed-wide benefits. On a related note, I would like to express the City’s strong support for provisions in AB 1180 that leave the 40 percent allocation of future stormwater revenues to cities intact. Long Beach looks forward to continuing our work with the County to develop a tax and expenditure plan that is reflective of stormwater management needs countywide.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach respectfully requests your signature on AB 1180 (Holden).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patrick H. West
CITY MANAGER

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
PATRICK H. WEST  
CITY MANAGER  
September 11, 2017  
The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.  
Governor, State of California  
State Capitol, Suite 1173  
Sacramento, CA 95814  

RE: Support for SB 231 (Hertzberg): Local Government: Fees and Charges  

Dear Governor Brown:  

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write to support Senate Bill 231 (Hertzberg). Under the Long Beach Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit, the City of Long Beach is striving to meet some of the strongest water quality guidelines in the country. Progress on new and innovative stormwater projects is largely dependent on funding, which unfortunately, has been limited, and SB 231 provides a reasonable measure of relief in this respect.  

By adding the definition of “sewer”, which includes stormwater, to the list of Proposition 218 exemptions, SB 231 would enable local governments to fund stormwater management, similarly to the way in which water and trash services have been funded for years. Under SB 231, “sewer” will be interpreted to include services and systems necessary to collect, treat, or dispose of sewage, industrial waste, or surface or stormwater. This change, which is proposed in SB 231, is critical to minimizing environmental and health damage caused by stormwater pollution, and maximizing the benefits of effective stormwater management. SB 231 creates a funding source for upstream cities to meet their permit requirements which in turn will positively impact the cleanliness of the water as it makes its way downstream into our beaches.  

As the second largest city in Los Angeles County, a city with an iconic coastline, and a city with the mouth of the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers within our city limits, Long Beach has been a leader in stormwater management over the last decade. The City values environmental protection, and actively supports our regional economy to which tourism contributes significantly. It is essential that stormwater draining from the rivers and into the Pacific Ocean be clean. To this end, the City of Long Beach was one of the first cities in California to adopt a Low-Impact Development Ordinance, install stormwater management infrastructure at catch basins throughout our 50-square miles of urban and suburban land, as well as explore opportunities for stormwater capture and reuse. The changes proposed by SB 231 will greatly support existing and future efforts by cities to manage stormwater.  

Given these reasons, I hope you sign SB 231 into law.  

Sincerely,  

Patrick H. West  
CITY MANAGER  

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly  
The Honorable Steve Bradford, State Senate, 35<sup>th</sup> District  
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33<sup>rd</sup> District  
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34<sup>th</sup> District  
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64<sup>th</sup> District  
The Honorable Patrick O'Donnell, State Assembly, 70<sup>th</sup> District
March 30, 2017

The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 2196
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for AB 655 (O’Donnell): California Renewables Portfolio Standard Program

Dear Assemblymember O’Donnell:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, thank you for authoring AB 655. This legislation, jointly sponsored by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), Covanta Energy and the City of Long Beach, impacts only existing waste to energy facilities in California that have consistently operated at least 20 percent below permitted pollutant concentration limits over the past five-years. For these limited facilities, AB 655 would classify energy produced as renewable energy.

Published July 3, 2012, CalRecycle Review of Waste-to-Energy and Avoided Landfill Methane Emissions, concludes, “The three existing California waste-to-energy facilities provide net avoided methane emissions over waste otherwise disposed in a California landfill.” Long Beach is proud to own and contract with Covanta Energy to operate the largest of these three waste-to-energy facilities in California. Municipal solid waste that is brought to the facilities is diverted from landfills, used as a fuel stock for producing green baseload energy, and then that energy is sold for a cost, with revenues returning to support operations and maintenance at the waste-to-energy facilities.

While the benefits of waste-to-energy, as compared to landfilling are numerous, inequities in existing State policies are severely threatening the economic viability of the facilities. The challenge is that revenue from energy sales at the facility in Long Beach will soon drop by over 70%, due to an expiring contract. Changes in the energy market since the original contract was signed have also impacted economics at the facility; throughout this time, the Southeast Resource Recovery Facility in Long Beach (SERRF) has been an asset to the City. Without legislative changes to enable marketability of the power produced at waste-to-energy facilities, the future viability of these facilities, including SERRF, will become unstable, with the potential for closure.
AB 655 presents an opportunity to bring equity to the energy market, as it relates to waste management. For years, energy produced by landfills has been classified as “renewable,” whereas energy produced by waste-to-energy facilities have not been classified as renewable. This inequity has placed waste-to-energy facilities at a disadvantage when negotiating energy pricing in contracts. By classifying power produced at limited and qualifying waste-to-energy facilities as “renewable” energy, AB 655 would eliminate this inequity. This change in State law will enable waste-to-energy operators to negotiate energy contracts on a level playing-field with landfills.

Last but not least, AB 655 is also important for supporting the viability of narcotics disposal in California. Since 1988, Long Beach has been able to use our waste-to-energy to destroy 12.5 million pounds of confiscated narcotics and drug paraphernalia for over 200 cities, counties, and state and federal law enforcement agencies. As long as the facility remains economically viable, Long Beach will continue to provide this service. However, if the facility cannot remain economically viable, we will be forced to close SERRF, and not only will additional waste be sent to landfills, but California will no longer have any options for illegal narcotic disposal.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach is proud to partner with the IBEW and Covanta Energy to sponsor AB 655. Thank you for authoring this important piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
    The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
    The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
    The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
    The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
    Assembly Committee on Natural Resources
May 24, 2017

The Honorable Ben Allen
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 5072
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for Senate Bill 705 (Allen). Solid waste: expanded polystyrene food service containers

Dear Senator Allen:

On behalf of the Long Beach City Council, I write in support of Senate Bill 705 (Allen). This bill would enact the Ocean Pollution Reduction Act of 2017, which would prohibit a food provider, on and after January 1, 2020, from dispensing prepared food to a customer in an expanded polystyrene food service container.

As a beach city, Long Beach sees the impact plastics and other forms of packaging have on our environment. It has been observed that plastic food service containers are a major component of urban litter, and often wash up in our waterways and beaches. Marine life is also known to consume small polystyrene particles, which may cause adverse impacts to human health. The challenges arising from expanded polystyrene are widely documented. The California Coastal Commission notes polystyrene is the second largest source of litter on California beaches, and the Ocean Protection Council estimates the current cost of cleaning up marine debris annually reaches $1 billion.

On December 20, 2016, the City of Long Beach took a progressive approach to addressing this issue by beginning the process to adopt our own local ordinance to prohibit the sale and distribution of expanded polystyrene in the City. Long Beach appreciates language in SB 705 to explicitly authorize local jurisdictions to adopt single-use take-out food packaging ordinances, regulations, or policies that are more restrictive than the applicable standards required by this bill. The City of Long Beach has a long history of supporting environmental legislation to the benefit of our marine environment, and we appreciate the effort to expand these policies statewide.

Sincerely,

Patrick H. West
CITY MANAGER

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
Senate Appropriations Committee
August 16, 2017

The Honorable Ricardo Lara
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 5050
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for SB 174 (Lara) - Public utilities: settlement: 2015 power outages: City of Long Beach

Dear Senator Lara:

On behalf of the City of Long Beach, I write in strong support of SB 174 (Lara). This legislation is needed to transfer penalties paid by Southern California Edison (SCE) to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for unexpected power outages in the City of Long Beach from July 15 to July 20, 2015, and July 30 to August 3, 2015, to the City of Long Beach for public infrastructure projects that promote energy efficiency in the areas affected by the power outages.

SCE’s multiple-day power outages adversely impacted 30,000 customers during the summer of 2015. As a result of these events, the City of Long Beach has been made aware SCE will soon enter into a Settlement Agreement with the CPUC. Because the CPUC does not currently have the authority to transfer settlement funds to the affected local government – in this case, the City of Long Beach – State legislation is necessary.

SB 174 enables the CPUC to transfer penalty funds paid by SCE to the CPUC, to the City of Long Beach for the benefit of communities affected by the power outages in 2015. This bill is needed to coincide with the CPUC’s approval of the Settlement Agreement so that resources benefiting the affected community can be immediately available to the communities directly impacted by SCE’s power outages.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach is proud to sponsor SB 174. Thank you for authoring this legislation.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
    The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
    The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
    The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
    The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
March 23, 2017

The Honorable Jim Beall  
Chair, Senate Committee on Transportation and Housing  
California State Capitol, Room 2209  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Jim Frazier  
Chair, Assembly Committee on Transportation  
California State Capitol, Room 3091  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for SB 1 (Beall) and AB 1 (Frazier) – Statewide Transportation Infrastructure Funding

Dear Chairman Beall and Chairman Frazier:

As Mayor of the City of Long Beach, I write in strong support of SB 1/AB 1. California’s streets, roads, and highways desperately need a stable and sustainable source of State funding to ensure that this infrastructure can be rehabilitated and maintained into the future. SB 1/AB 1 propose modest revenue increases, coupled with investments from existing revenue streams, and sensible reforms for California.

While gas tax revenues have slowly, but steadily, declined over the years, the need for maintaining California’s transportation infrastructure has remained. In fact, in Long Beach, voters have made it apparent that investments to State and local infrastructure are long overdue. The Long Beach electorate voted to adopt a new 1% local sales tax in June 2016 to fund improvements to transportation, parks, and public safety; adoption of SB 1/AB 1 would be consistent with this interest.

Long Beach has 177 miles of major roads and 609 miles of local roads that support our economy. On average, this infrastructure can be rated as “fair,” and at the optimum point for repair. While the City has committed local funding to an aggressive infrastructure investment plan, State funding is needed to maximize the benefits. Now is the time for California to adopt a robust transportation investment package that provides equal funding to cities and the State, for improvements to local streets and roads, and State highways, respectively.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach is proud to support SB 1/AB 1. Thank you for all you have done to make transportation infrastructure a priority for California and our cities.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Garcia
City of Long Beach

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
The Honorable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
The Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District

562.570.6801 | mayor@longbeach.gov | @LBMayorsOffice
333 West Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, California 90802
June 22, 2017

The Honorable Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry, Chair
California State Assembly Committee on Local Government
1020 N Street, Room 157
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for SB 268 (Mendoza) – Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Dear Chair Aguiar-Curry:

On behalf of the Long Beach City Council, I write in support of SB 268 (Mendoza). This bill seeks to add additional representatives to the governing board of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). Over the past decade, the Long Beach City Council has expressed an interest in having a dedicated seat for the City of Long Beach on the Metro Board of Directors.

In recognition that the bill includes a dedicated seat for the City of Long Beach, the Long Beach City Council unanimously voted to support this legislation. Long Beach generally supports legislation that maximizes the City’s representation on State and regional boards with jurisdiction over issues relevant to Long Beach. Metro serves as the largest metropolitan transportation planning organization in the nation, and its governing board is currently comprised of 13 voting members and one ex-officio member. This structure does not provide a permanent seat for the City of Long Beach, which is the second largest city in Los Angeles County and includes the Port of Long Beach. Currently, the City of Long Beach shares representation with 25 cities, mostly from the Gateway Council of Governments, but also from the surrounding area as part of the Southeast Long Beach Sector. The City desires a permanent seat on the Metro Board of Directors.

A permanent seat on the Metro Board of Directors would provide the City of Long Beach with an opportunity to establish a consistent presence at Metro to the benefit of regional transportation issues affecting Los Angeles County, and because Long Beach borders the County of Orange, to an extent, Orange County. Key issues impacting Long Beach that come before the Metro Board of Directors include funding for infrastructure improvements and safety along the Metro Blue Line and at Blue Line Stations, as well as funding for municipal operators, including Long Beach Transit, which shares connecting stations with the Orange County Transit Authority.

In furtherance of our commitment to regional collaboration, Long Beach values our partnership with the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, and appreciates that SB 268 maintains county representation for all 5 supervisors. We also acknowledge and support the community member seat on the board.
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With that said, Long Beach would like to share our preference for a smaller percentage increase to the number of voting members proposed by this bill. As the Metro board currently includes 13 voting members, the increase to 21 voting members nearly doubles the voting membership. The City prefers a more limited increase, while maintaining a permanent seat for the City of Long Beach, as the second largest city in Los Angeles County.

Given these reasons, the City of Long Beach supports SB 268 (Mendoza).

Sincerely,

Patrick H. West
CITY MANAGER

cc: The Honorable Speaker Anthony Rendon, State Assembly
     The Honorable Tony Mendoza, State Senate, 32nd District
     The Honorable Steven Bradford, State Senate, 35th District
     The Honororable Ricardo Lara, State Senate, 33rd District
     The Honorable Janet Nguyen, State Senate, 34th District
     The Honorable Mike Gipson, State Assembly, 64th District
     The Honorable Patrick O' Donnell, State Assembly, 70th District
     Assembly Local Government Committee Members