

**MEMORANDUM**

November 8, 2018

**TO:** MEMBERS, PORT COMMISSION  
Hon. Kimberly Brandon, President  
Hon. Willie Adams, Vice President  
Hon. Gail Gilman  
Hon. Victor Makras  
Hon. Doreen Woo Ho

**FROM:** Elaine Forbes  
Executive Director

**SUBJECT:** Informational presentation to review (1) the results of the 2018 Federal and State Legislative Program and, (2) the Port's Proposed 2019 Federal and State Legislative Program

**DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION:** Informational Only; No Action Required

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

On January 5, 2018, Port staff provided an informational presentation on the Port's proposed 2018 Federal and State Legislation Program and on August 24, 2018, Port staff updated the Port Commission via memorandum on next steps regarding AB 2578 (Assemblymember Chiu; Seawall Infrastructure Financing District).

The purpose of this report is to present the Port's proposed 2019 Federal and State Legislation Program.

Two of the federal priorities listed below are seeking funding through United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) via their FY 2019 Work Plan, which Port staff expect to see released by USACE on or about November 20, 2018. Port staff will provide an update through a subsequent Executive Director's Report on the outcome of these funding requests.

The Port has successfully identified potential federal funding for the Seawall Program and local funding in the form the proposed Seawall General Obligation Bond on the November ballot (Proposition A). Staff proposes seeking authorization through the

**THIS PRINT COVERS CALENDAR ITEM NO. 6C**

City's State Legislative Committee to pursue adoption of a bill similar to AB 2578 in the coming legislative session. Port and City staff were not successful in getting AB 2578 released from the Senate Appropriations Suspense File in the 2018 session.

After receiving feedback from the Port Commission on the proposed program, Port staff will collaborate with the Mayor's Director of State and Federal Legislative Affairs to seek support from the City's federal and state legislative delegation to pursue these proposals consistent with the City's 2019 legislative program.

## **STRATEGIC PLAN**

The Port's State and Federal Legislative Program supports the Strategic Plan as follows:

**Renewal:** Enhance and balance the Port's maritime and economic purpose, rich history, and its changing relationship with the City, so the waterfront continues to be a treasured destination.

*(5) Advance adaptive reuse and funding strategies to support rehabilitation of the Port's historic piers and facilities in the Embarcadero and Union Iron Works Historic Districts.*

**Livability:** Ensure Port improvements result in advances in the environment, social equity and quality of life for San Francisco residents and visitors.

*(4) Work with ferry and water transit partners to develop an expanded plan of water transportation facilities along the waterfront, including the development of the Mission Bay Ferry Landing to introduce service in the Southern Waterfront.*

**Resiliency:** Lead the City's efforts in addressing threats from earthquakes and flood risks through research and infrastructure improvements to the Seawall and Port property.

*(1) Study and plan for Seawall repairs to address seismic and flood risk.  
(4) Work with City leadership to develop resilience and adaptation strategies that support needed seismic repairs to the Port's Seawall and protect the Port and City from flood risk due to climate change and rising sea levels.*

**Economic Vitality:** Attract and retain maritime and non-maritime commerce to contribute to the long term viability of the Port and the City

*(4) Work with agency partners, plan and build a network of ferry and water taxi landings to service new land uses and special events.*

## **KEY STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE GOALS**

- Secure State Infrastructure Financing District ("IFD") and potential Cap and Trade funding for the Seawall Program

- Receive continued funding to complete the three-year USACE San Francisco Storm Risk Management Study (General Investigation)
- Ensure funding is available for the Mission Bay Ferry Landing Project
- Advocate for changes to USACE cost-benefit analysis process through studies mandated that the Water Resources Development Act that will support the Seawall Program and through continued advocacy with USACE
- Secure changes to coming California Air Resources Board at berth shoreside power regulations that recognize unique challenges at the Port of San Francisco and will allow growth in the Port's cruise industry

## **2019 PROPOSED STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

### **FEDERAL**

#### **1. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers General Investigation of the Seawall**

As part of the Seawall Program, the Port worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("USACE") on a flood risk study for a portion of the San Francisco waterfront, focused in the Ferry Building area ("CAP 103 Study"). While the CAP 103 Study identified flood risks with a federal interest, USACE recommended a larger study of flood risk along the San Francisco waterfront (a "General Investigation" or "GI"). A GI study that results in a federal interest finding is the prerequisite for significant federal funding for flood control projects for the San Francisco waterfront. Such potential funding would be authorized in the Water Resources Development Act.

In June, through the FY 2018 USACE Workplan, the Port's Seawall Program received an initial allocation of \$500,000 in funding — a "New Start"— for the first year of a GI study. The GI is a standard \$3 million three-year federal flood risk management study of the San Francisco waterfront, of which the Port will contribute 50 percent. The scope of this GI extends beyond the 3-mile Seawall and includes all Port property. New Starts are very competitive; only two flood control New Starts were awarded nationally for FY 2018, and none were awarded the prior year.

The Port signed a Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement with USACE committing to funding the required \$1.5 million local share of General Investigation costs. The USACE has named the study *The San Francisco Storm Risk Management Study*.

The FY 2019 Work Plan for USACE, which provides funding for USACE projects, is expected to be released on or about November 20, 2018.

As part of its FY 2019 federal program, the Port has collaborated with USACE, the City and County of San Francisco's federal advocates, Holland & Knight, and members of the Port's congressional delegation to advocate for inclusion of \$700,000 in the federal FY 2019 USACE Work Plan for the second year of the General Investigation. This time next year, Port staff will advocate for the balance of funds, \$300,000 for FY 2020.

In addition, the Water Resources Development Act ("WRDA") of 2018 provides for multiple federal agencies to study the USACE process for calculating cost-benefit

analysis, a process that can greatly affect study outcomes and subsequent funding levels. Port staff is also consulting with the Seawall Program consultant team, including Jacobs Engineering and Arcadis, to explore changes to the cost-benefit analysis that may inform the Port's ongoing federal advocacy.

## **2. USACE Workplan Allocation – Pier 70, Wharves 6-8 Removal**

Under legislation sponsored by Leader Nancy Pelosi, the Port is authorized under WRDA 2007 to pursue funding for, among other facilities, the removal of Wharves 6-8 at Pier 70. These piers are old and are collapsing into the Bay. Removing these piers is a major priority for the Port Commission and the San Francisco Bay Development and Conservation Commission ("BCDC").

USACE completed a Letter Report on this pier removal project in August of 2016, identifying the project as having a total cost of \$8.56 million, with the federal share totaling \$5.7 million (\$2.86 million local match).

As part of its 2019 federal program, Port staff has requested inclusion of the full \$5.7 million for this project in the USACE FY 2019 Work Plan. The Port Commission has appropriated the required local match in the FY 2016-17 budget. Port staff expect to learn the outcome of this request on or about November 20, 2018.

## **3. USACE Continuing Authorities Program 107 – Central Basin**

The Port continues to seek a new shipyard operator for its Pier 70 shipyard, and recently issued a Request for Proposals for a new operator. Responses to the Request for Proposals are currently being evaluated. The shipyard requires dredging in the Central Basin to permit large vessels to access the Port's drydock.

Though the USACE Continuing Authorities Program 107 ("CAP 107"), the Port has qualified for a potential agreement for USACE to dredge the approaches to the drydock and maintain this dredged area.

The final agreement needed to start the Central Basin dredging project is currently ready for execution at the South Pacific Division level of USACE, however the project and agreement cannot move forward until the Port has selected a new Pier 70 shipyard operator.

Should the Port not be in a position to select an operator or should a selected operator vary substantially from current expectations, Port staff will work with USACE headquarters and our congressional delegation staff to preserve federal funding (currently set aside) to the greatest extent possible -- until such time as USACE can present a revised agreement with updated economics.

## STATE

### 1. State IFD Funding for the Seawall Program

In late August, 2018, AB 2578 (Assemblymember Chiu), the Port's Seawall Infrastructure Financing District ("IFD") bill, was held on the Suspense File in Senate Appropriations and therefore did not receive a timely Senate Floor vote in the 2018 legislative session.

Assemblymember Chiu has indicated that he is willing to entertain an effort to pass similar legislation in 2019, if the City's State Legislative Committee authorizes this approach. This section covers:

- a summary of existing IFD law;
- a summary of AB 2578, as amended;
- highlights of the City's lobbying effort;
- vote summary;
- why AB 2578 did not get off of Suspense;
- Governor's position; and
- recommended next steps.

#### Existing Port IFD Law

Since 2005, the Port has had the ability to create Infrastructure Financing Districts on Port property, allowing the capture of growth in local property tax increment to fund public improvements. After adopting a detailed financing plan, the Port's IFD Law provides for the diversion of property tax growth for the financing of facilities of *community-wide significance* and Port-specific improvements including historic rehabilitation, maritime facilities and shoreline restoration over a 45-year period.

At Pier 70, in addition to growth in the local share of property tax growth, the Port may capture growth in the State's ERAF<sup>1</sup> share of property tax growth to fund these improvements (AB 1199, Assemblymember Ammiano, 2010).

The Port tried and failed to obtain the power to capture ERAF Portwide with AB 2637 (Assemblymember Leno, 2008). That bill was also held on Suspense in Senate Appropriations, after an analysis by the same committee consultant who analyzed AB 2578 this year. AB 1199 – the more focused ask for ERAF at Pier 70 – passed the

---

<sup>1</sup> ERAF means the Educational Realignment Augmentation Fund. Starting in 1992-3, the State of California shifted a portion of property tax to ERAF to mitigate the impact of Proposition 98 which establishes state funding formulas for schools. Over time, the State has increased the amount of property tax shifted to ERAF. Because ERAF is just one source of funding the State uses to meet its school funding requirements under Proposition 98, every dollar of ERAF not collected and diverted to schools requires a backfill by the State's General Fund.

Proposition 98 is an amendment to the California Constitution passed by voters in 1998, which established a three-prong test and formulas for annual funding for K-12 education.

subsequent year as AB 1176, but was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2009. The bill was passed again in 2010 as AB 1199 and signed into law.

This prior history indicates that by working collaboratively with key Legislative leaders and staff, bills that fail on an initial effort can succeed in subsequent years.

### AB 2578 Summary

AB 2578 expands the Port's IFD capabilities to generate funding for and authorize expenditures on the Seawall Program and related flood control efforts elsewhere on Port property. Specifically, AB 2578 authorizes:

- the creation of "shoreline protection districts" within the current authority for waterfront districts in San Francisco to finance seawall and shoreline improvements, including flood control improvements;
- the ability to capture the State's ERAF Share of property tax growth to finance seawall and shoreline improvements;
- a requirement that the proposed Infrastructure Financing Plan ("IFP") for a shoreline protection district be provided to the Director of Finance and the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency; and
- other technical changes to law.

Economic analysis of nine potential development projects on Port property projected \$8.6 billion in direct and indirect taxes to the state over the proposed 45-year term of the IFD. AB 2578 would divert the ERAF share of this tax revenue, estimated at \$466 million, to the Port to complete eligible infrastructure improvements, while allowing the remaining \$8.1 billion to flow to the State General Fund.

### Highlights of the City's Lobbying Effort

Exhibit A contains a list of the contacts the Port and City made regarding AB 2578 before and during the legislative session.

The most important contacts included:

- a trip by Executive Director Forbes and Port staff in December 2017 to discuss the Seawall IFD bill and other Seawall funding strategies, which included meetings with Assemblymember Chiu, Assemblymember Ting, and Senator Wiener and their staffs, as well as members of the Governor's Department of Finance and key Assembly and Senate staff;
- Mayor London Breed's meeting with Governor Brown in July; and
- Port staff meetings with key legislative staff throughout the session.

## Vote History

Note: AB 2578 requires a 2/3 vote to allow bond issuances.

Assembly Local Government:	9-0
Assembly Appropriations:	16-0-1 (abstain)
Assembly Floor:	78-0
Senate Government and Finance:	6-1-0 (only no vote)
Senate Appropriations:	7-0 (vote to place on Suspense)
Senate Floor:	NA

## Why AB 2578 Did Not Get Off of Suspense

According to discussions with the City's State Advocate and Assemblymember Chiu's staff after AB 2578 was held on Suspense, Port staff believes the primary reason that AB 2578 was held on Suspense was due to the potential State budget impact of the bill, which would have resulted in \$465 million in reduced ERAF shift to the State over forty-five years, based on the Port's economic analysis.

From the Senate Appropriations analysis:

"Annual General Fund increases as a result of property tax increment diversion from ERAF to the San Francisco shoreline protection district, reaching \$1 million by 2022-23, growing to approximately \$8 million by 2027-28, and exceeding \$10 million annually by 2035-36. Cumulatively, the bill is expected to divert over \$465 million in ERAF property tax increment over 45 years. These amounts could be higher, to the extent that the ERAF increment growth rate exceeds 2% per year (see staff comments). Staff notes that any diversion of property tax revenues from ERAF results in a commensurate increase in state General Fund spending to backfill the local losses to schools, pursuant to the Proposition 98 minimum funding guarantees." (Note: Port's analysis indicated \$466 million over 45 years.)

The Appropriations Suspense file is an opaque process except for those who are in the room when decisions are made about which bills will be released. The Appropriations Chair will consult with policy and finance staff, including the Governor's Department of Finance, in making decisions. In the case of AB 2578, the California Department of Finance took an *oppose* position, despite multiple meetings with City staff.

## Governor Brown's Position

Staff started this effort with the understanding that Governor Brown was unlikely to support AB 2578 due to his prior work repealing California redevelopment law. In addition to general concerns about local management of redevelopment agencies, a principle stated concern with redevelopment was its reliance on ERAF and the resulting impacts on the State budget.

Staff met primarily with the Department of Finance and representatives of the Office of Governor Brown, including Tom Dyer, who is Governor Brown's chief legislative deputy. Mr. Dyer worked for the Governor's Department of Finance during the years that redevelopment was being dissolved. Mr. Dyer repeatedly expressed concern about the

bill, and asked whether the Port could consider pursuing the bill in 2019 instead. While the Department of Finance opposed the bill, the last meeting with Mr. Dyer was more positive than prior meetings, particularly in light of the potential ramifications of AB 2578 as a source of matching funds for federal funding through WRDA and the recently announced federal New Start to study flooding along the San Francisco waterfront. Mr. Dyer also acknowledged that the Department of Finance typically looks at the direct cost of legislation (\$466 million ERAF), rather than considering the net benefit resulting from the larger revenue growth picture (\$8.1 billion net increase to the General Fund).

The Port received no formal indication as to the Governor's position on AB 2578 towards the end of the legislative session. Lt. Governor Newsom wrote a letter of support for AB 2578, which gives staff a sense of optimism regarding the next legislative session should the Port receive the authorization to proceed with another version of AB 2578.

### Recommended Next Steps

1. Utilize the time this fall to reach out to Senate Pro Tem Toni Atkins and Senator Anthony Portantino, Chair of Senate Appropriations and their respective staffs, in consultation with the Mayor's Office, the City's Lobbyist and Senator Scott Wiener.
2. Further refine the Port's financial analysis of AB 2578, including estimates of ERAF under a variety of scenarios (2% annual versus 7% annual growth) and estimates of Vehicle License Fee in-lieu revenues.
3. Further refine messaging of AB 2578, including framing of overall revenue growth forecast to the State, which independently backfills the ERAF share, and the critical need for a State contribution to a match for up to billions of dollars in federal investments in flood protection.
4. Clarify for key State budget stakeholders that the Seawall Program requires large capital expenditures at moments in time, thus requiring either 1) a significant contribution from a State bond or the State General Fund, or 2) a bondable revenue stream such as IFD tax increment.
5. Meet with key legislative staff to explore potential amendments to AB 2578 to make it more palatable to the Senate, including:
  - cap ERAF capture at initial assessed value plus 2% growth annually; and
  - examine potential avenues to avoid a General Fund backfill for captured ERAF with key legislative staff.
6. Examine other related bills, including infrastructure financing bills for areas devastated by fire, and the introduction of redevelopment law.



7. Meet with representatives of the Governor-elect after the November election.
8. Reintroduce a version of AB 2578 next year.

While staff is disappointed that AB 2578 did not succeed this year, early indications from a debrief between Assemblymember Chiu’s staff and Senate Appropriations staff indicates that it would be fruitful to discuss potential modifications to AB 2578 for a subsequent effort in 2019, subject to approval by the City’s State Legislative Committee.

As staff plans outreach efforts regarding a subsequent effort next year, staff looks forward to consulting further with Port Commissioners regarding visits to Sacramento to build support for the City’s effort.

In closing, Port staff is very grateful to Assemblymember Chiu for his efforts in support of AB 2578, and to the following individuals and organizations that wrote letters in support of AB 2578:

Mayor Mark Farrell	Waterfront Plan Working Group
Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom	San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
State Controller Betty Yee	San Francisco Eastern Neighborhoods
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association	Democratic Association
Bay Area Council	San Francisco League of Conservation
Bay Planning Coalition	Voters
California State Lands Commission	San Francisco Travel Association
Maritime Commerce Advisory Committee	South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay
Central Waterfront Advisory Group	Neighborhood Association
Northeast Waterfront Advisory Committee	Walk San Francisco

## **2. Cap and Trade appropriations for the Seawall Program**

Port staff and the City’s state advocate continue to explore Cap and Trade funding for the Seawall Program. Cap and Trade funds can now be spent on climate change adaptation and resiliency projects (formerly limited to mitigation projects). The Port is working with its Seawall team to evaluate the competitiveness of the Seawall Program for Cap and Trade funding by comparing the emissions profile for the pre-disaster Seawall Program implementation compared to reconstruction after a seismic event.

## **3. Regional Measure 3 Funds (“RM3”) – Mission Bay Ferry Landing**

Port staff is working with the Water Emergency Transportation Agency (WETA) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to support \$25 million in funding from the proposed Regional Measure 3 (“RM3”) for the Mission Bay Ferry Landing, a funding measure approved by voters in June of 2018. RM3 raised tolls on state-owned bridges to fund transportation improvements in bridge corridors.

The Mission Bay Ferry Landing will provide critical regional ferry service to the Mission Bay neighborhood, one of the fastest growing neighborhoods in San Francisco. It will sit

within a half mile of 11,000 new housing units, 7 million square feet of new office and commercial space, and more than one million square feet of new retail space. The Ferry Landing is essential to alleviate regional transportation overcrowding, and to provide transportation resiliency in the event of an earthquake or other unplanned events.

San Francisco has fully funded the design and permitting of the project. As shown below, the construction budget for the project requires up to \$25 million in funding from RM3. The Port seeks to maintain support at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for this project, including a pledge that the Mission Bay Ferry Landing will be among the first ferry projects funded through RM3. This will allow the Port to put the project out to bid in Spring of 2019. The Port needs to work with MTC and the City Attorney to understand potential bonding options for RM3 funding due to current litigation challenging MTC’s bonding authority.

<b>Funding Sources</b>	<b>(\$ millions)</b>
Secured - Planning and Design Phase Budget	\$7.0
<i>Port capital</i>	\$3.5
<i>General Fund support FY 2017-18</i>	\$3.5
Secured - Construction Phase Budget*	\$11.0
<i>General Fund support FY 2018-19</i>	\$1.2
<i>Successor Agency bond funds</i>	\$8.4
Pledged - Construction Phase Budget	\$24.7
<i>Private contributions</i>	\$4.0
<i>Regional Measure 3, up to \$25M</i>	\$25.0
<b>Total Planned Sources</b>	<b>\$45.7</b>

#### 4. California Air Resource Board (“CARB”) Regulations

Port staff is working with other California ports through the California Association of Port Authorities and has engaged with CARB staff directly on regulations CARB is promulgating to require shoreside power for cruise vessels by 2021 and other ocean-going vessels<sup>2</sup> at a later date.

In 2018, Port staff toured CARB staff through the Port of San Francisco to allow CARB staff to develop a better understanding of the Port’s current shore power facilities at Pier 27 and the challenges with developing new shore power facilities at other Port cruise berths. These discussions have already borne some positive results; CARB staff is entertaining an exemption for up to five cruise calls per year. Based on the Port’s cruise call history, staff believes that this exemption should be higher, or permitted at more than one cruise berth per port.

<sup>2</sup> Information about the CARB proposed regulation for Shore Power for Ocean-Going Vessels can be found at:

<https://www.arb.ca.gov/ports/shorepower/shorepower.htm>

Port staff will reengage with CAPA, the City's advocates at Shay Yoder Antwih and other cruise industry advocates to explore changes to the proposed CARB rule for Shore Power for Ocean-Going Vessels that would prevent the Port of San Francisco from needing to turn away cruise calls starting in 2021 while the industry transitions to cleaner fuels such as Liquefied Natural Gas ("LNG").

Port staff will also work with industry representatives to examine the air quality benefits of LNG cruise vessels compared to current fleets. In May 2018, CARB issued a draft study titled *Technology Assessment: Ocean-Going Vessels* with a preliminary – but incomplete – assessment of LNG cruise vessels. CARB has indicated that additional air quality data is needed to evaluate LNG ocean-going vessels. The Port will consult with CAPA to determine the potential for additional air quality data to support recognition of LNG vessels within the planned CARB rules for ocean-going vessels.

## **NEXT STEPS**

After receiving feedback from the Port Commission on the proposed program, Port staff will collaborate with the Mayor's Director of State and Federal Legislative Affairs to seek support from the City's federal and state legislative delegation to pursue these proposals consistent with the City's 2018 legislative program.

Port staff will return to the Port Commission in the spring for the next update on activities related to implementation of the Port's federal and state legislation program.

Prepared by: Daley Dunham, Special Projects Manager  
Brad Benson, Director of Special Projects

**Exhibit A: AB 2578 Meetings**  
Prepared by Shaw/Yoder/Antwih

**December 25, 2017** – Meetings in Sacramento, attended by Elaine Forbes, Katie Angotti, Brad Benson, Daley Dunham

Office of Assemblymember Phil Ting:

Irene Ho, Chief of Staff  
Christian Griffith, Chief Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee

Office of Senator Scott Wiener:

Krista Pfefferkorn, Chief of Staff  
Angela Hill, Fellow

Office of Senate President Pro Tempore Kevin de León:

Kip Lipper, Chief Policy Advisor

Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon:

Katie Kolitsos, Policy Consultant  
Marie Liu, Policy Consultant

Office of Governor Brown and Department of Finance:

Kim Craig, Deputy Cabinet Secretary  
Tom Dyer, Chief Deputy Legislative Secretary  
Amy Costa, Chief Deputy Director  
Matt Almy, Budget Analyst  
Karen Finn, Program Budget Manager

**January - March, 2018** – Numerous meetings and conference calls with key legislative staff, participated in by Brad Benson, Eileen Malley (Port General Counsel, City Attorney's Office), and Chris Lynch (Jones Hall)

Office of Legislative Counsel:

Mari Guzman, Deputy Legislative Counsel (bill drafting)

Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon:

Katie Kolitsos, Policy Consultant (bill drafting)

**February 15, 2018** – Assembly Bill 2578 (Chiu) introduced as a “spot” bill

**March 14, 2018** – Meeting in Sacramento, attended by Brad Benson

Assembly Local Government Committee:

Debbie Michel, Dem. Committee Consultant

**March 22, 2018** – Assembly Bill 2578 (Chiu) amended into substantive version

**Weeks of April 2 and April 9, 2018** – Numerous meetings and conference calls with legislators (and their staff) on the Assembly Local Government Committee, some attended by Brad Benson (in Sacramento Friday, April 6)

Assembly Local Government Committee:  
Members and William Weber, Rep. Committee Consultant

**April 12, 2018** – Assembly Local Government Committee hearing, attended by Brad Benson

Assembly Local Government Committee:  
AB 2578 passed by committee

**April 25, 2018** – Meeting in Sacramento, attended by Brad Benson

Assembly Appropriations Committee:  
Jennifer Swenson, committee consultant

**May 2, 2018** – Assembly Appropriations Committee hearing

Assembly Appropriations Committee:  
AB 2578 sent to “suspense calendar” by committee

**May 25, 2018** – Assembly Appropriations Committee hearing

Assembly Appropriations Committee:  
AB 2578 passed by committee

**May 30, 2018** – Assembly

Assembly Floor:  
AB 2578 passed by full Assembly

**June 7, 2018** – Meeting in Sacramento, attended by Katie Angotti, Brad Benson, Katie Petrucione, and Steven Reel

Office of Governor Brown:  
Tom Dyer, Chief Deputy Legislative Secretary

**June 11, 2018** – Meeting in Sacramento, attended by Brad Benson and Daley Dunham

Senate Governance & Finance Committee:  
Colin Grinnell, chief committee consultant

Office of Senate President Pro Tempore Toni Atkins:  
Misa Lennox, local government consultant

**June 20, 2018** – Senate Governance & Finance Committee hearing, attended by Brad Benson

Senate Governance & Finance Committee:  
AB 2578 passed by committee

**June 28, 2018** – Meeting in Sacramento, attended by Mayor-elect London Breed

Office of Governor Brown:  
Governor Jerry Brown

**July 20, 2018** – Meeting in Sacramento, attended by Elaine Forbes and Brad Benson

Senate Appropriations Committee:  
Mark McKenzie, committee staff director

**August 6, 2018** – Senate Appropriations Committee hearing

Senate Appropriations Committee:  
AB 2578 referred to “suspense calendar” by committee

**August 15, 2018** – Meeting in Sacramento, attended by Daley Dunham and Meghan Wallace

Office of Governor Brown:  
Tom Dyer, Chief Deputy Legislative Secretary

**August 16, 2018** – Senate Appropriations Committee hearing

Senate Governance & Finance Committee:  
AB 2578 held in committee by committee