



1400 K Street, Suite 400 • Sacramento, California 95814
Phone: 916.658.8200 Fax: 916.658.8240
www.cacities.org

NOTE: For city officials arriving early, please join us from 9 – 9:45 a.m for a **continental breakfast** at the League offices at 1400 K Street, 3rd floor, behind the Sacramento Convention Center

January 9, 2012

TO: Members: Housing, Community & Economic Development Policy Committee

FROM: Scott Nassif, (Chair), Council Member, Apple Valley
Kirstin Kolpitcke, League Staff (916) 658-8250

RE: **POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**
DATE: **Friday, January 20, 2012**
TIME: **10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.**
PLACE: **Sacramento Convention Center**
1400 J Street, Room 204
Sacramento, CA

Attached are the agenda and background materials for the upcoming policy committee meeting. If you plan to attend, and have not yet returned the attendance form, please contact Meg Desmond at mdesmond@cacities.org. Registration for this meeting is not required; however, your response will help us determine the meal count.

In addition, if you will be in town on Wednesday night, **please join us for a reception on January 18, 2012**, 6:00 – 7:15 p.m., at the Mayahuel Restaurant located at 1200 K Street (corner of 12th & K), Sacramento. Come network and mingle with new mayors and council members, state legislators, League Partner company representatives, League leadership and staff. Please RSVP to Emily Cole at 916.658.8283 or ecole@cacities.org with your name, title and city/organization.

Travel Informaton: Air transportation, shuttle service, driving directions, parking and hotel information are provided on the back of this letter.

We look forward to seeing you at our first meeting in 2012!

League of California Cities Policy Committee Meetings - January 19 – 20, 2012

(The League office is located directly behind the Convention Center.)

Meeting Locations: Sacramento Convention Center: 1400 J Street, Sacramento 95814 or
League of California Cities: 1400 K Street, Sacramento 95814

AIR TRANSPORTATION:

Low, refundable airfares are available through the Enhanced Local Government Airfare Program. The program requires that a city be pre-registered; check with your city's travel coordinator. This program is ticketless and includes Southwest, United and United Express. For city pairs, rates, or if your city has not yet registered, please check the League Web site at <http://www.cacities.org/travel> for details.

TRANSPORTATION FROM AIRPORT:

YOLOBUS information - <http://www.yolobus.com/m3.html> - 530/ 666-BUSS (2877)

Cost: \$2.00 each way; seniors (62+) /disabled, \$1.00

Travel time: The bus ride is approximately 20-30 minutes.

From the Airport. (Bus 42A)

Buses run every hour (at approximately 19 minutes past the hour). After departing plane, go to the island outside and locate Public Transit. This is where you will catch YOLOBUS

SUPERSHUTTLE (1-800-BLUE VAN): Upon arrival at the airport, claim your luggage then proceed to the **SuperShuttle** ground transportation booth. A representative will arrange SuperShuttle transportation to your destination. Reservations not required. **One-way ticket per person: \$13.00. Round trip ticket per person: \$26.00.**

Please note: Downtown hotels do not provide shuttle service from the airport.

CABS are quoted between \$30.00 to \$40.00 from airport to downtown.

RETURN TO AIRPORT: SuperShuttle (1-800-BLUE VAN) makes regular stops every 1/2 hour in front of these hotels, both within walking distance of the Convention Center:

Hyatt Sacramento - 1209 L Street, Sacramento - (916) 443-1234

Sheraton Grand -1230 J Street, Sacramento - (916) 447-1700

YOLOBUS: Back to Airport (Bus 42B) Pickup location: L & 13th Streets

Buses run every hour (at 5 minutes past the hour). The bus ride is approximately 20-30 minutes.

DRIVING DIRECTIONS:

Below are suggested driving directions to the Convention Center and may not be the most efficient route from your home. There are many websites which offer assistance with driving directions. Here are two that may be helpful: www.mapquest.com, and <http://maps.yahoo.com>.

From I-5: Exit "J" Street. The Convention Center is located on "J" Street (one-way) between 13th & 15th Streets.

From I-80 (West traveling East): Take I-5 North, then follow the above directions.

From I-80 (East traveling West): Take I-80 to Capitol City Freeway (right lanes), Exit 160 Downtown (right lanes). When freeway ends, merge to near left lane. Turn left on "J" Street, go 1 block.

From the South on Highway 99: Take 99 North to Business 80 West (Capitol City Freeway). Exit at 16th Street. Continue on 16th Street, and turn left on "I", then left on 13th Street.

PARKING: *(Allow time for parking; the downtown area is congested.)*

There are numerous public parking garages in the vicinity. Those **closest to the Convention Center** are located at 13th and "J" Streets - directly across from the Sheraton Grand Hotel and the Convention Center. From "J" Street (one way), turn left on 13th Street; entrances to the parking lots are on both the left and the right. The Hyatt Hotel has its own parking garage and valet parking. From "J" Street, turn right on 13th Street, then right on "L" Street. The parking garages **closest to the League offices** are on "K" Street next to the Capitol Garage, corner of 15th & "K" Streets (enter from K Street).

HOTELS:

Hyatt Sacramento, 1209 L Street, Sacramento (\$165 + taxes and fees) - Please contact Megan Dunn at mdunn@cacities.org for the online housing link to get the discounted League rate. This rate is not available by phone or at Hyatt.com. This venue is the Headquarter Hotel for the League's New Mayors & Council Members Academy from January 18 -20. **THE DISCOUNTED RATE WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE AFTER JANUARY 6, 2012.**

HOUSING, COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

Friday, January 20, 2012

10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Sacramento Convention Center, Room 204, Sacramento

Note: For city officials arriving early, please join us from 9 – 9:45 a.m. for a continental breakfast at the League offices at 1400 K Street, 3rd floor (behind the convention center).

Individuals who wish to review the full text of bills included in this packet are encouraged to do so by visiting the League's website at www.cacities.org and clicking on "Bill Search" found at the left column. Be sure to review the most recent version of the bill.

A G E N D A

I. SPECIAL ORDER: State Budget and Redevelopment Briefing for all policy committee members 10:00 – 10:45 a.m., Room 204, Sacramento Convention Center

Upon adjournment, individual policy committee meetings will begin.

II. Welcome and Introductions

III. Public Comment

IV. Overview of Parliamentary Procedures *(Handout)* *(Informational)*

V. Committee Orientation *(Attachment A)* *(Informational)*

VI. State Budget Update

- Housing Element- Betsy Strauss, Special Counsel to the League *(Informational)*
- Redevelopment- Assemblymember Huff *(Invited)* *(Informational)*

VII. State Legislative Update *(Attachment B)*

- AB 710 (Skinner) *(Action)*
- SB 244 (Wolk)- Michael Coleman, Fiscal Policy Advisor to the League *(Action)*
- Group Homes *(Action)*
- Mobile Food Trucks- Jennifer Whiting, League Legislative Representative *(Action)*
- Mobile Homes *(Informational)*

VIII. Enterprise Zones

- Cathy Creswell, Acting Director of HCD *(Informational)*

IX. Strategic Goals for 2012 *(Attachment C)* *(Informational)*

X. Review of HCED Existing Policy & Guiding Principles *(Attachment D)* *(Action)*

XI. Committee Work Program

- 2011 Work Program: Status *(Attachment E)* *(Informational)*
- 2012 Draft Work Program *(Attachment F)* *(Action)*

XII. Next Meeting: FRIDAY, March 30, 2012, Doubletree Hotel, Ontario

Brown Act Reminder: The League of California Cities' Board of Directors has a policy of complying with the spirit of open meeting laws. Generally, off-agenda items may be taken up only if:

- 1) Two-thirds of the policy committee members find a need for immediate action exists and the need to take action came to the attention of the policy committee after the agenda was prepared (Note: If fewer than two-thirds of policy committee members are present, taking up an off-agenda item requires a unanimous vote); or*
- 2) A majority of the policy committee finds an emergency (for example: work stoppage or disaster) exists.*

A majority of a city council may not, consistent with the Brown Act, discuss specific substantive issues among themselves at League meetings. Any such discussion is subject to the Brown Act and must occur in a meeting that complies with its requirements.

NOTE: Policy committee members should be aware that lunch is usually served at these meetings. The state's Fair Political Practices Commission takes the position that the value of the lunch should be reported on city officials' statement of economic interests form. Because of the service you provide at these meetings, the League takes the position that the value of the lunch should be reported as income (in return for your service to the committee) as opposed to a gift (note that this is not income for state or federal income tax purposes—just Political Reform Act reporting purposes). The League has been persistent, but unsuccessful, in attempting to change the FPPC's mind about this interpretation. As such, we feel we need to let you know about the issue so you can determine your course of action.

If you would prefer not to have to report the value of the lunches as income, we will let you know the amount so you can reimburse the League. The lunches tend to run in the \$30 to \$45 range. To review a copy of the FPPC's most recent letter on this issue, please go to www.cacities.org/FPPCletter on the League's Web site.



1400 K Street, Suite 400 • Sacramento, California 95814
 Phone: 916.658.8200 Fax: 916.658.8240
www.cacities.org

COMMITTEE ORIENTATION

January 2012

Policy Committee Subject Matter

The League has eight (8) policy committees, each with its own subject matter jurisdiction. You may refer to the “*Summary of Existing Policy and Guiding Principles*” booklet (*Summary*) to find the subject matter for each committee. This document will be updated in January 2012 and again in January 2014. Policy in the *Summary* is used to determine League legislative and regulatory positions. The *Summary*, in its entirety, is located on the League’s Web site at www.cacities.org/summary. Individual sections are located on each policy committee’s Web page, which are available at www.cacities.org/polcomm.

Policy Committee Legislative Agenda Items

League policy committees review bills or regulatory proposals on issues for which the League does not have existing policy, or for which staff members feel a policy discussion needs to occur for greater clarity or background on an issue. Staff will lobby legislation, funding proposals, or regulatory changes where existing policy provides clear direction.

Role and Responsibility of Committee Members

The strength of the League’s policy process and ability to effectively engage in the legislative process is based on the active involvement of and the expertise of city officials. We rely on your technical and policy knowledge, thoughtfulness, strategic thinking, and political savvy. Your role is to engage in thoughtful discussions at the meeting. Members should review the agenda and background material prior to the meetings, attend each meeting, and stay for the entire duration of the meeting.

Committee Recommendations on Positions on Bills

The committee’s actions or positions are a recommendation to the League Board of Directors for a formal League position. Possible committee recommendations can be:

- Support
- Oppose
- Support-if-amended (as appropriate, specific amendments may be requested)
- Oppose-unless-amended (as appropriate, specific amendments may be requested)
- No position
- Neutral

There are nuanced differences between some of these positions. For example, “*support-if-amended*” sends a very different message than “*oppose-unless-amended*.” Both positions might seek the same change but the support-if-amended position means that the League would be listed with the “supporters”

of the bill in most legislative analysis. In addition, “*no position*” and “*neutral*” have different meanings and require different actions from staff. Selection of one or the other depends in part upon what type of message or political posture the League needs to take. Staff will advise the committee about the implications of each on a case-by-case basis.

Approval by League Board Needed for All Committee Recommendations

All committee actions are recommendations to the League Board, which has the final say on all positions. Under no circumstances are individual committee members nor the committee itself authorized to speak on behalf of the League. When a committee action is supported by a large majority (e.g., 32 to 3), the recommendation is placed on the Board’s consent calendar. When the committee vote is split (e.g., 15-13), the item will be presented as an action item for the Board’s discussion. Staff will also provide information about the reasons behind the committee’s recommendation to the Board.

Most of the time, the Board adopts the recommendation of the policy committee. When the Board adopts a different position, staff will notify the committee members of the reason for the different position. This likely will be done in the next regular communication with the committee.

Some issues cut across more than one committee. When this occurs, staff will coordinate and bring a bill to more than one committee for review and recommendation. The recommendations are then forwarded to the League Board and if there is a different recommendation, the League Board resolves the difference.

Role of the Committee Chair

The chair’s role is to balance the often competing needs of the membership to have a full and thoughtful discussion on the issues within the very real time constraint. The chair will often limit debate – either in the number of speakers or the amount of time each speaker has – in order to ensure that we can move ahead on our agenda and cover the items included. We ask that when you make comments on issues before the committee that you be brief and concise and that you not repeat what has already been stated. Also, if you have already spoken on an issue, the chair may ask you to hold your comments until after new speakers are able to share their comments.

Committee Schedule and Process

Committees generally meet three times a year (January and June in Sacramento, March in Ontario), plus an abbreviated meeting at the Annual Conference (September in San Diego) to review resolutions if any are assigned to it. (The September meeting schedule will be announced in mid-July). Meetings begin at 10:00 a.m. and conclude by 3:00 p.m., although some subcommittees may meet at 9:00 a.m. Please plan to be present for the full duration of the committee meetings.

Agendas/Disseminating Information

A meeting notice is mailed to committee members about a month to six weeks in advance of the meeting, containing travel and logistical information. An agenda packet is mailed at least one week before a meeting and also sent via e-mail. **(Note: Following the January meeting, agenda packets will only be sent via email and posted online. If you prefer a hard copy of the agendas and highlights, please contact Meg Desmond by email: mdesmond@cacities.org or phone: 916-658-8224)** Highlights that summarize committee actions are prepared by staff and provided to committee members about two to three weeks after the meetings. All materials are also available on the League’s Website: www.cacities.org/polcomm.

We encourage you to visit the League’s Web site: www.cacities.org. In addition to containing committee materials, the Website contains information on the League’s priorities and a link to track individual bills

and the League's position on them. You should also subscribe to the League's electronic newsletter *CA Cities Advocate*.

For meetings that are heavy in legislative review (generally in March/April and June), staff will try to find a balance between getting the agenda packet out early and the need to delay finalizing the agenda packet in order to include as many legislative items as possible and in their most current version. At some meetings, staff may use a supplemental agenda for last minute legislative issues. We will use e-mail as appropriate to send out late-breaking information or to gather committee input throughout the year. It is important that we have your preferred e-mail.

How to Get an Item on the Agenda

Because staff prepares background material in advance of the meeting, and prepares the agenda in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair, it is difficult to add items at the last minute. In addition, the League tries to comply with the spirit of the Brown Act in its meetings. If you wish to have the committee discuss an item, you should contact staff well in advance of the meeting in order to determine the feasibility of including it on the agenda, and if so, allow staff time to prepare the appropriate background material. Because of time constraints and a full work program before the committee, it may not always be possible to respond to such requests.

Issues Should Have Statewide Impact

Although some of you may represent your division, your department, your affiliate organization, or simply yourself, we should all keep in mind that the League must address issues of statewide impact and interest. Thus, while an issue or bill may be of interest to your city or region, if it does not have broader, statewide implications, the League likely will not engage in that policy discussion or take a position. You should keep this in mind if you wish to suggest an item for discussion.

Brown Act and Roberts Rules of Order

The League tries to comply with the spirit of the Brown Act. Thus, when the committee discusses items not already on the agenda (e.g., supplemental legislative agenda), the Chair will ask for a vote of approval to add that item to the agenda. The League also follows Roberts Rules of Order and provides a brief overview of key procedural steps in Roberts Rules as they apply to committees.

Staffing for Committee

Each committee has a staff lobbyist assigned to it. This individual is your main point of contact for logistics or questions about the agenda. Generally, each lobbyist has a "main" committee and will remain with the committee throughout the meeting. Occasionally he/she may leave the meeting to make guest appearances in other committees to discuss issues or bills. Additional staff may also be present to support the committee's work.

League Partners and Other Guests

The League Partners have a non-voting representative assigned to each policy committee and are seated at the table with other committee members. In addition, city officials, other members of the League Partners Program, and interested members of the public are welcome to attend the meetings. We provide an opportunity for our League Partners and other members of the public to offer comment on items before the committee during the designated public comment period on the agenda.

HOUSING, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Legislative Agenda
January 2012

Staff: Lobbyist: Kirstin Kolpitke (916) 658-8250

1. AB 710 (Skinner) – Local planning: infill and transit-oriented development

Bill Summary:

For new developments in transit-intensive areas, prohibits a city or county from requiring a minimum parking standard greater than the following:

- One parking space per 1,000 sq. ft. of nonresidential improvements
- One parking space per unit of residential improvements.

Allows a jurisdiction to require higher minimum parking standards if it makes findings based on substantial evidence, including a parking utilization study, which shows the parking spaces in the area have a peak occupancy that exceeds 85 percent at any point during the study period.

Provides the following general exemptions to the bill:

- The proposed project and immediately adjoining properties are restricted to development or redevelopment at a floor area ratio of below 0.75;
- The proposed project is located on a parcel or parcels on which dwelling units whose rents are restricted by recorded covenant or ordinance to levels affordable to persons and families of low or moderate income will be destroyed or removed, unless the project will provide an equal number of affordable units at the same or lower income levels with deed restrictions that will keep them affordable for at least 55 years in the case of rental units, or with equity sharing agreements in the case of ownership units; or
- The proposed project is located in whole or in part on a parcel where the owner withdrew residential rental units from rental or lease, or offering for rental or lease, pursuant to the Ellis Act within five years of application for development of the project.
- The property is within an area where a specific plan was adopted on or before December 31, 2011 and the specific plan sets off-street vehicle parking requirements for commercial and residential uses that are lower than any off-street vehicle parking requirement for commercial and residential uses that apply in the same jurisdiction outside of the transit intensive area.

Defines “transit intensive area” as within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor included in a regional transportation plan. Current law defines a “major transit stop” as a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods. This bill expands the definition to include a major transit stops included in a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Makes findings and declarations on the cost of parking and the impact of increased availability of transit on the need for parking. The findings also state that excessive governmental parking requirements reduce the viability of transit and that allowing builders to decide how much parking is needed can help to ensure sufficient parking, reduce the cost of development, and increase density.

Background:

In June of 2011, the committee voted to oppose AB 710. The committee expressed that the issue should be handled at the local level and there was no exemption for transportation facilities such as light rail or BART. The bill had no “no” votes until the League opposed the measure. The bill failed passage on the last night of session by a vote of 18-19; however, the sponsors have vowed to introduce another bill this year.

The League's main arguments against the bill were that the one size fits all approach does not work (and used examples such as the proposed LA Stadium), and that the author took amendments to the bill to exempt two projects from her own district (BART stations).

Staff Recommendation:

Have the League work with a subcommittee of members that have responded to the League's survey that their city would be negatively impacted by the legislation and authorize the League to bring back any possible compromise position back to the policy committee.

Committee Recommendation:

Board Action:

Fiscal Impact:

Negligible to major costs, depending on individual needs and requirements of cities.

Existing League Policy:

General Plans. The League supports the use of the general plan as a guide to meeting community planning needs.

Zoning. The League believes local zoning is a primary function of cities and is an essential component of home rule....State policy should leave local siting and use decisions to the city and not interfere with local prerogative beyond providing a constitutionally valid procedure for adopting local regulations.

Comments:

Potential solutions include:

- requires the developers to pay for a study that shows that the parking requirements of the local government would result in over parking.
- is a pilot project for a few years.
- creates incentives, not mandates for local governments.
- allows local governments to opt out by stating the reasons in writing, uses current definition of transit intensive area, and increases the 1.0 standard.

Support-Opposition:

Support: *(as of August 26, 2011)*

CA Infill Builders Association (sponsor)

A.G. Spanos Companies

Alameda Transportation Commission

AMCAL Multi-Housing Inc.

American Institute of Architects, California Council

BRIDGE Housing Corporation

Brookfield Homes

California Apartment Association

California Building Industry Association

California Housing Consortium

California League of Conservation Voters

California ReLeaf

CIM Group, Inc.

City of El Monte

City of Pittsburgh

City of San Bernardino

Civic Enterprise Development, LLC

Codding Enterprises

Community Dynamics

Creative Housing Associates
David Taylor Interest
Domus Development
Fulcrom Properties
Greenbelt Alliance
JMA Ventures, LLC
John Stewart Company
Local Government Commission
Mogavero Notestine Associates
Natural Resources Defense Council
Newport Partners, LLC
Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern CA
Policy in Motion
Related Companies
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District
San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
TMG Partners
Township Nine at the River District
Transform
United States Green Building Council

Opposition: *(as of August 26, 2011)*

Association of California Cities- Orange County
BOCA
Bus Riders Union
California Affordable Housing Law Project
California Public Parking Association
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
City of Canyon Lake
City of Chino Hills
City of Clayton
City of Concord
City of Covina
City of Encinitas
City of Foster City
City of Goleta
City of Hesperia
City of Highland
City of Lafayette
City of Laguna Woods
City of Lakewood
City of Loma Linda
City of Long Beach
City of Los Angeles
City of Moorpark
City of Moreno Valley
City of Paramount
City of Poway
City of Red Bluff
City of San Mateo
City of Santa Clara
City of Sunnyvale
City of Upland
City of Vista
City of Wasco
City of Whittier
Coalition for Economic Survival

Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Green LA Coalition
Hollywood Community Housing Corporation
Housing California
Housing Long Beach
Korean Youth and Community Center
International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, District Council 36
Kennedy Commission
LA Voice PICO
LAANE
League of California Cities
League of California Cities, San Diego Division
Neighborhood Based CDC Coalition
People Organized for Westside Renewal
Public Advocates
Public Counsel Law Center
Search to Involve Pilipino Americans
Strategic Actions for a Just Economy
Southern California Association of Nonprofit Housing
Town of Apple Valley
T.R.U.S.T. South LA
Venice Community Housing Corporation
Watts/Century Latino Organization

2. **SB 244 (Wolk)- Local Government: land use: general plan: disadvantaged unincorporated communities**

Bill Summary:

This measure requires each city to update the land use element of its General Plan to address disadvantaged unincorporated communities by the next revision of the housing element by: identifying each island or fringe community within the city’s sphere of influence as well as including a description of the community and a map; performing an analysis of water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, and structural fire protection needs or deficiencies; and analyzing benefit assessment districts or other financing alternatives that could make the extension of services financially feasible. This measure also requires a Local Agency Formation Commission to deny an application for any annexation if it is contiguous to a disadvantaged community, unless a second application is filed for the annexation of the disadvantaged community.

A disadvantaged unincorporated community is defined as either a community that has at least 12 registered voters, according to Government Code section 56064 or as determined by the local agency formation commission that all or a part of the community has an annual median household income that is less than 80% of the statewide annual median household income.

Background:

The League opposed this bill last year, but it was signed by Governor Brown despite a Department of Finance analysis that states the “general plan requirements constitute a reimbursable mandate linked to the state-required housing element update cycle.” Since the bill went into effect on January 1, 2012, many cities may not be aware of the vast requirements of this bill until they either attempt to annex a territory contiguous to a disadvantage unincorporated community or it’s time to update the city’s housing element.

While the intent of the sponsors with regards to the annexation piece it to have cities annex these unincorporated communities, in reality, many cities may be forced to abandon annexing at all.

Staff Recommendation:

Authorize the League to work on legislation that would either remove the annexation piece from the law or would minimize the impact of the annexation piece by providing additional funding for cities annexing these territories.

Committee Recommendation:

Board Action:

Fiscal Impact:

Legislation to take out the annexation piece in SB 244 could save cities millions since an annexation contiguous to a disadvantaged community could mean 1) the city having to foot the bill to submit an application to annex the disadvantaged community and 2) the city being required to annex the disadvantaged community.

Existing League Policy:

Annexation and Incorporation. The League supports strengthening city control over urban boundaries. Sphere of Influence law should be modified to ban county development and to allow cities to annex logical growth. The Revenue and Taxation Code should not allow counties to block annexations in exchange for unreasonable property tax sharing agreements. In addition, cities should have expanded authority over adjacent lands outside of their sphere of influence regardless of jurisdictional lines so long as the land is not within another city's sphere. **Cities should not be required to incur costs for planning to meet infrastructure needs of unincorporated areas or leveraged to annex areas which would result in unfunded costs.**

Comments:

Ways to improve SB 244 include:

- Modifying the definition of “disadvantaged unincorporated community” (technical fix).
- File a claim with the Commission on State Mandates.
- Remove the annexation piece.
- Change the law that requires the first fiscal year for which a change in a city's jurisdictional boundaries first applies, the percentage change in gross taxable assessed valuation from the prior fiscal year to the current fiscal year shall be calculated solely on the basis of the city's previous jurisdictional boundaries, without regard to the change in that city's jurisdictional boundaries.

Support-Opposition:

Support: (as of September 8, 2011)

California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation (Co-Source)
Policy Link (Co-Source)
California Coalition for Rural Housing
California Pan-Ethnic Health Network
Catholic Charities Diocese of Stockton
Clean Water Action California
Committee for a Better Seville
Community Water Center
Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Food and Water Watch
Green California
Having Our Say
Natural Resources Defense Council
Planning and Conservation League
Sierra Club
Southern California Watershed Alliance
Unitarian Universalist Legislative Ministry California
United for Change in Tooleville
Urban Habitat
Urban Semillas

Winnemem Winti Tribe- Middle River People

Opposition: (as of September 8, 2011)

City of Agoura Hills
City of Avenal
City of Bakersfield
City of Bellflower
City of Beverly Hills
City of Ceres
City of Cerritos
City of Chowchilla
City of Clovis
City of El Centro
City of Exeter
City of Folsom
City of Fowler
City of Fresno
City of Gilroy
City of Glendora
City of Goleta
City of Hesperia
City of Highland
City of Jackson
City of Kingsburg
City of Lathrop
City of Farmersville
City of Lemoore
City of Livingston
City of Lodi
City of Modesto
City of Norwalk
City of Oakdale
City of Pasadena
City of Porterville
City of Rancho Cucamonga
City of Red Bluff
City of Riverbank
City of Rosemead
City of Sacramento
City of San Pablo
City of Santa Rosa
City of Selma
City of Taft
City of Torrance
City of Tulare
City of Turlock
City of Vacaville
City of Visalia
City of Vista
City of Walnut
City of Wasco
City of Waterford
City of West Covina
City of Whittier
City of Willows
City of Winters
County of Los Angeles
Cucamonga Valley Water District
League of California Cities
Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities
Orange County Local Agency Formation Commission
San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission

3. Group Homes

Bill Summary:

Over the past decade, there have been multiple attempts to assist cities with regards to the group home issue. Below is a list of some of the bills the League has been involved in supporting and the outcome.

AB 724 (Benoit, 2007) would have defined a sober living home in order to give those purporting to operate these facilities and local code and law enforcement agencies information to determine whether residences housing recovering drug and alcohol abusers are exempt from the exercise of local police powers. Failed Senate Health Committee.

SB 530 (Dutton, 2007) would have made it a policy of the state to prevent overconcentration of licensed substance abuse treatment facilities by defining overconcentration as facilities separated by a distance of 300 feet or less, and established a process for providing notice to and receiving input from affected cities and counties on license decisions by the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs. Failed Senate Health Committee.

SB 992 (Wiggins, 2007) would have required the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs to license Adult Recovery Maintenance Facilities (ARMFs) and applied existing alcohol and drug abuse recovery or treatment facilities licensure requirements to ARMFs. Vetoed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger because the bill did not ensure quality programs, increase access for safe and appropriate environments that help recovery.

SB 1000 (Harman, 2007) would have required applicants seeking a license for a recovery or treatment facility from the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (DADP) to certify that the facility is consistent with local zoning ordinances and required DADP to verify the certification. Failed Senate Health Committee.

AB 3007 (Emmerson, 2006) would have required the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs to deny an application for a new adult treatment facility or recovery program if it is determined that its location is within 300 feet of an existing facility and would result in over-concentration in the neighborhood. Failed passage in Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 987 (Karnette, 2000) would have required the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs to administer the licensure and regulation of adult recovery maintenance facilities. Failed Assembly Health Committee.

AB 2641 (Calderon, 2000) would have required the California Department of Social Services to review and consider information submitted by a city or county prior to licensing a residential care facility. Failed Senate Health and Human Services Committee.

SB 986 (Karnette, 1999) would have required the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs to license and regulate adult recovery maintenance facilities. Vetoed by Governor Gray Davis because the bill does not provide licensing fees sufficient to support requirements in the bill.

SB 1540 (Karnette, 1998) would have required state licensure of adult recovery maintenance facilities or "sober living homes" and required the Department of Social Services to develop plans regarding community care facilities. Vetoed by Governor Pete Wilson because local communities are best equipped to know the need for residential services and the benefits of the statewide database with the associated costs is not clear.

Background:

The issue of group homes comes and goes and then comes again. I have heard multiple complaints from cities regarding group homes, whether that means sober living homes or unlicensed facilities with 5 or less residents. The League has typically supported legislation that give local governments more notice, more local control with regards to siting these facilities, more information with regards to the type of tenants in these facilities.

Legislation on this topic has typically been very hard to get enacted. The few bills that do pass out of the Legislature end up getting vetoed by the Governor. However, most cities have a story to tell about an incident that never would have happened if local governments had more input in group homes. These stories, letters of support from individual cities, the right author, and a Governor that seems to have a higher signature rate of bills than any other in recent history could mean success. This Governor has been untested with regards to his position on group homes.

Staff Recommendation:

Authorize staff to consider introducing either legislation or an executive order consistent with past League positions on group homes.

Committee Recommendation:

Board Action:

Fiscal Impact:

Dependent on the requirements of each jurisdiction.

Existing League Policy:

Residential Care Facilities: The League supports permitting cities to exercise review and land use regulation of group home facilities and residential care facilities in residential neighborhoods including the application of zoning, building and safety standards. State and county licensing agencies should be required to confer with the city's planning agency in determining whether to grant a license to a community care facility. The League recognizes that better review and regulation of residential care facilities will protect both the community surrounding a facility and the residents within a facility from a poorly managed facility or the absence of state oversight.

Public Safety: Nuisance Abatement. The League supports enhanced local control over public nuisances including, but not limited to:

- Adult entertainment facilities;
- Problem alcohol establishments; and
- Properties where illegal drugs are sold.

Comments:

Support-Opposition:

Possible Support:

California Association of Addiction Recovery Resources
California Police Chiefs Association
California Peace Officers Association
League of California Cities

Possible Opposition:

California Association of Alcohol and Drug Program Executives
NAMI California
Protection and Advocacy, Inc.
Western Center on Law and Poverty

4. Local Control of Mobile Food Trucks

Bill Summary:

This bill would amend the California Vehicle Code to allow local jurisdictions to regulate the location, time, and duration of stay for mobile food trucks.

Background:

The presence of mobile food trucks, especially those providing specialty items, has increased in the past few years. Jurisdictions throughout the state are grappling with the best way to regulate mobile food trucks. While these food trucks may have a popular following among individuals, businesses complain that they block visibility and take up sometimes limited parking. Many brick and mortar restaurants claim that they create unfair competition. Some point out that mobile food trucks are businesses operating in the public right of way without paying the same fees, taxes, and assessments that normal storefront businesses are required to pay. Cities can require that mobile food trucks obtain vendor permits and/or business licenses.

Vehicle Code Section 22455 allows local jurisdictions to regulate the type of vending and the time, place, and manner of vending from vehicles upon any street for the public safety of the community. Because the vehicle code speaks specifically to public safety, cities cannot regulate food trucks – to their detriment – for any other reason. Courts have repeatedly struck down local ordinances that attempt to regulate mobile food trucks for reasons outside public safety, such as unfair competition. Interestingly, state law does allow local ordinances that favor mobile food trucks – such as designated parking areas for food trucks.

Mobile food trucks are also governed by the Health and Safety Code, which includes requirement for restroom facilities for employees and allows Health Departments to conduct periodic health and safety inspections. But the Health and Safety Code does not provide for regulation of time, place, and manner.

Staff Recommendation:

Support, and discuss possible sponsorship. The sponsor of the bill has approached staff to request that the League be a co-sponsor. While current League policy – specifically the League’s mission – already backs a position of support, staff is asking for direction from the committee regarding sponsorship.

Committee Recommendation:

Board Action:

Fiscal Impact:

Dependent on the requirements of each jurisdiction.

Existing League Policy:

Mission: The vitality of cities is dependent upon their fiscal stability and local autonomy.

Zoning. The League believes local zoning is a primary function of cities and is an essential component of home rule. The process of adoption, implementation and enforcement of zoning ordinances should be open and fair to the public and enhance the responsiveness of local decision-makers. State policy should leave local siting and use decisions to the city and not interfere with local prerogative beyond providing a constitutionally valid procedure for adopting local regulations. State agency siting of facilities, including campuses and office buildings, should be subject to local notice and hearing requirements in order to meet concerns of the local community.

Comments:

A note on zoning. Cities have the authority, and responsibility, to zone their cities. However, mobile food vending trucks are constantly on the move, and therefore cannot be zoned for. The committee

may want to discuss if there are any negative impacts derived from this fact, and if there are any ways to compensate through legislation.

Community impacts. The community impact of mobile food vendors is different in every jurisdiction. It is not infrequent that mobile food trucks are considered an asset to a community, while many other jurisdictions are struggling with increased loitering and unhappy businesses. It seems appropriate that local jurisdictions have more leeway in how they regulate this growing business sector.

Possible Support-Opposition:

Support:

City of Santa Monica (sponsor)

Business community – *possibly*

Opposition:

Food truck operators - *likely*



1400 K Street, Suite 400 • Sacramento, California 95814
Phone: 916.658.8200 Fax: 916.658.8240
www.cacities.org

2012 LEAGUE STRATEGIC GOALS¹

Support Sustainable and Secure Public Employee Pensions and Benefits.

Work in partnership with state leaders and other stakeholders to promote sustainable and secure public pensions and other post-employment benefits (OPEBs) to help ensure responsive and affordable public services for the people of our state and cities.

Promote Local Control for Strong Cities. Support or oppose legislation and proposed constitutional amendments based on whether they advance maximum local control by city governments over city revenues, land use, redevelopment and other private activities to advance the public health, safety and welfare of city residents.

Build Strong Partnerships for a Stronger Golden State. Collaborate with other public and private groups and leaders to reform the structure and governance, and promote transparency, fiscal integrity and responsiveness of our state government and intergovernmental system.

¹ Adopted by the League Board of Directors in San Diego, November 18, 2011

SUMMARY OF EXISTING POLICIES AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Update – 2012 DRAFT

Every two years, the League updates its “summary of Existing Policies and Guiding Principles” to reflect new League policy adopted during the past two years. The purpose of this update is *not* to develop new League policy or revisit existing League policy. The document provided indicates new policy adopted during the past two years in **bold underlining** or **bold strikeouts**. This is new policy that has been adopted through Annual Conference Resolutions, League positions on bills approved by the League Board of Directors, or broad League policy approved by the League Board of Directors over the last two years.

Committee members should review the proposed update and consider whether it accurately reflects the actions taken by the policy committee (and League Board) over the last two years, and whether there are any missing policy items or errors in describing policy. Committee members who wish to propose new League policy or to revisit existing League policy should suggest that the issue be placed on an agenda for a future policy committee meeting, as opposed to attempting to modify the policy through this update.

#####

Housing, Community and Economic Development

Scope of Responsibility

The principle behind the policies reviewed by the Committee on Housing, Community and Economic Development (HCED) is to foster local control of community planning decisions as they relate to land use and economic development. The issues within the purview of the HCED Committee include general plans and zoning, housing, rent control, subdivision map act, residential care facilities, other land use regulation, development fees including school fee adequacy, annexation and incorporation policy, development agreements, building standards including seismic safety standards, economic development policy including redevelopment and enterprise zones, military base closure and reuse, mobile home regulation, and sign regulation.

Summary of Existing Policy and Guiding Principles

Planning And Zoning

- **General Plans.** The League supports the use of the general plan as a guide to meeting community planning needs. A city’s general plan should guide the individual city’s land use planning and strategic decision-making. A city’s general plan should not be subject to mandatory review by regional or state agencies. General plan requirements should be flexible and provide guidance to local communities without requiring inappropriate levels of detail or mandating new topics or elements. The League supports guidance by expert state agencies in a consultation format but opposes granting mandatory review, certification or other approval

authority
to another level of government.

- Water Supply and Land Use Planning. The League supports having the best information available on the reliability of water supplies when land use decisions are made by local agencies, while protecting and retaining local land use decision-making authority.
- Zoning. The League believes local zoning is a primary function of cities and is an essential component of home rule. The process of adoption, implementation and enforcement of zoning ordinances should be open and fair to the public and enhance the responsiveness of local decision-makers. State policy should leave local siting and use decisions to the city and not interfere with local prerogative beyond providing a constitutionally valid procedure for adopting local regulations. State agency siting of facilities, including campuses and office buildings, should be subject to local notice and hearing requirements in order to meet concerns of the local community.

Housing Element

- Housing issues should be addressed in the general plan as other planning issues are. The housing element should be prepared for the benefit of local governments and should have equal status with the other elements of the general plan.
- The projections of regional and local growth and the allocations of housing units should account for state and local planning factors and should be subject to a formal hearing and appeal process to ensure that they are realistic. Cities should be allowed to work together to allocate housing units among themselves within a subregion. Appeals should be heard by politically accountable officials at the state and regional levels.
- Cities should focus their efforts on facilitating the production of below market rate housing units. Local government efforts should be subject to realistic performance standards, not to arbitrary state agency review of the housing element. Local government housing efforts should be rewarded by incentives. These incentives should include streamlining by not being subject to the Department of Housing and Community Development review, priority ranking for discretionary funds, and new discretionary funds available for general fund purposes.

The League supports and encourages legislation that:

- Implements comprehensive reforms to the housing element process that:
 - Address conflicts between local growth projections and state regional housing need numbers;
 - Resolve the problems associated with the distribution of RHNA units within a council of governments;
 - Achieve improvements to the housing element review process;
 - Develop a neutral dispute resolution process and fair enforcement alternatives to deal with disputes over questions of compliance;
 - Require state laws and policies which affect housing and land use to be internally consistent;
 - Establish additional legal protections to local agencies that approve affordable housing

and that establish local pro-active affordable housing policies; and

- o Authorize communities which achieve quantifiable affordable housing production levels to self-certify their housing elements without being subject to state review.

Housing Finance

- The League supports legislation and state and federal programs that assist in providing financing for affordable housing, including the development of fiscal tools and incentives to assist local governments in their efforts to encourage housing and finance the infrastructure to support housing, as well as establishing an ongoing state commitment for funding affordable housing.
- The League supports the re-establishment of federal tax incentives which were in effect prior to 1986 which encouraged private development and ownership of rental housing.
- The League supports property tax assessment policies that match local affordable housing policies.

Economic Development

- Job Creation, Retention and Expansion. The League supports legislation that will provide tangible and productive tools and incentives to support job creation and retention in housing-rich, jobs-poor communities, such as the awarding of direct grants to fund the development of infrastructure that results in the creation and retention of jobs; the elimination of matching dollar requirements for economic development and infrastructure state grants; the provision of grant funding for infrastructure planning and design and the creation of economic development strategies; and, allowing cities the maximum flexibility in the use of state funds toward local priorities that support job creation. The League also encourages the state to adopt policies and programs that establish a comprehensive solution to the infrastructure and jobs/housing needs of all communities within the state.
- Redevelopment. The League supports continuing flexibility in the use of redevelopment authority. Redevelopment authority has been one of the few tools that cities have been provided that encourages economic development. The League opposes limiting authority or increasing the liability of redevelopment agencies.
- Enterprise Zones. The League supports the expansion of enterprise zones to assist city economic development. The definition of enterprise zones should be expanded to include a range of activities including base closure and gang suppression.

Eminent Domain

- The League supports enactment of fair eminent domain reforms that protect homeowners, and opposes proposals that would cripple the ability of state and local agencies to manage development.

Rent Control

- The League opposes legislation that restricts the ability of cities to enact rent control ordinances for mobile homes and stick-built housing that are tailored to meet local conditions and circumstances.
- The League opposes legislation that would require a city to adopt a mobile home rent control ordinance.

Subdivision Map Act

- The League supports maximizing local control over subdivisions and public improvement financing. Discretion over the conditions and length of subdivision and parcel maps should be retained by cities.

Residential Care Facilities

- The League supports permitting cities to exercise review and land use regulation of group home facilities and residential care facilities in residential neighborhoods including the application of zoning, building and safety standards. State and county licensing agencies should be required to confer with the city's planning agency in determining whether to grant a license to a community care facility. The League recognizes that better review and regulation of residential care facilities will protect both the community surrounding a facility and the residents within a facility from a poorly managed facility or the absence of state oversight.
- The League supports state legislation to require a minimum distance of 300 feet between all new and existing residential care facilities. **The League supports notification of cities about conditional release participants residing in group homes.**¹

Development Fees

- The League supports providing local discretion in the assessment, collection and usage of development fees. The state should provide infrastructure funding to help local communities meet California's growth demands and to increase housing affordability. The League opposes limiting the ability of cities to levy fees to provide for infrastructure or services.
- The League recognizes that school facilities are a component of a community's infrastructure and must be maintained to foster positive outcomes for youth and economic development. The League supports maintaining city discretion over the extent to which legislative authority should be exercised to fully mitigate impacts from development to the adequacy of school facilities. Consistent with maintaining discretion, cities should maintain the ability to condition and deny projects that the city determines inadequately mitigate impacts to community schools.
- The League opposes the elimination of any development fee or tax including excise taxes. Tax shifts and initiative measures have severely limited city abilities to provide for

¹ Support for SB 1265.

community needs. The state must ensure that cities have adequate revenues for local infrastructure and services.

Annexation and Incorporation

- The League supports strengthening city control over urban boundaries. Sphere of Influence law should be modified to ban county development and to allow cities to annex logical growth. The Revenue and Taxation Code should not allow counties to block annexations in exchange for unreasonable property tax sharing agreements. In addition, cities should have expanded authority over adjacent lands outside of their sphere of influence regardless of jurisdictional lines so long as the land is not within another city's sphere. **Cities should not be required to incur costs for planning to meet infrastructure needs of unincorporated areas or leveraged to annex areas which would result in unfunded costs.**²
- The League supports facilitating the incorporation of cities that have met procedural requirements and voter approval. **The League opposes efforts by the Legislature to disincorporate a city for any reason, unless requested by the affected city.**³

Development Agreements

- The League recognizes voluntary development agreements as one tool for providing flexibility in development approvals.

Building Standards

- The League supports flexibility in the adoption and implementation of health and safety standards contained in the building codes. Statutes should maximize local control over standards applying to local conditions. The League opposes new standards imposed by statute rather than regulation.
- The League opposes attempts to have multiple state agencies develop specific or subject related building standards. New building standards should be proposed through the California Standards Commission.
- The League supports authorizing cities to adopt independent occupancy standards to prevent overcrowding and associated health and safety hazards, including fire-related fatalities.

Housing for Homeless

- Housing and programs for homeless and other extremely low-income populations are necessary to ensure quality of life and economic viability for all Californians.
- Homelessness is a statewide problem that disproportionately impacts specific communities. The state should make funding and other resources available to help assure that local governments have the capacity to address the needs of the homeless in their communities.

² Opposition to AB 853 and SB 244.

³ Opposition to AB 46-Vernon.

- Homeless housing is an issue that eludes a statewide, one-size-fits-all solution, and collaboration between local jurisdictions should be encouraged.
- State and federal funding programs should be designed to reflect responsibilities imposed by state and federal law.

Military Base Closure And Reuse

- Base Closures and Reuse: The League supports local decision-making over military base closure and reuse. The affected cities independently or subregionally should work together towards efficient reuse planning.
- Economic Reuse: The League supports incentives for broad economic reuse of closed military facilities. Cities should work on a regional and interstate basis to maintain economic productivity. Economic reuse includes both reuse of military facilities and the retooling of related industries to continue to provide jobs for residents of California's cities.

Mobile Home Regulation

- The League supports initiatives that maintain cities as the enforcement authority for mobile home regulation.
- The League supports the preservation of existing mobile home parks as an important source of affordable housing.

Sign Regulation

- The League supports the authority of cities to regulate billboards and other signage. The League opposes mandatory local abatement programs.

Principles for Smart Growth:

1. Well-Planned New Growth. Recognize and preserve open space, watersheds, environmental habitats, and agricultural lands, while accommodating new growth in compact forms, in a manner that:
 - De-emphasizes automobile dependency;
 - Integrates the new growth into existing communities;
 - Creates a diversity of affordable housing near employment centers; and
 - Provides job opportunities for people of all ages and income levels.
2. Maximize Existing Infrastructure. Accommodate additional growth by first focusing on the use and reuse of existing urbanized lands supplied with infrastructure, with an emphasis on reinvesting in the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing infrastructure.
3. Support Vibrant City Centers. Give preference to the redevelopment and reuse of city centers and existing transportation corridors by supporting and encouraging:
 - Mixed use development;

- Housing opportunities for all income levels;
 - Safe, reliable and efficient multi-modal transportation systems; and
 - Retaining existing businesses and promoting new business opportunities that produce quality local jobs.
4. Coordinated Planning For Regional Impacts. Coordinate planning with neighboring cities, counties, and other governmental entities so that there are agreed upon regional strategies and policies for dealing with the regional impacts of growth on transportation, housing, schools, air, water, wastewater, solid waste, natural resources, agricultural lands and open space.
 5. Support High-Quality Education and School Facilities. Develop and maintain high quality public education and neighborhood-accessible school facilities as a critical determinant in:
 - Making communities attractive to families;
 - Maintaining a desirable and livable community;
 - Promoting life-long learning opportunities;
 - Enhancing economic development; and
 - Providing a work force qualified to meet the full range of job skills required in the future economy.
 6. Build Strong Communities. Support and embrace the development of strong families and socially and ethnically diverse communities, by:
 - Working to provide a balance of jobs and housing within the community;
 - Avoiding the displacement of existing residents;
 - Reducing commute times;
 - Promoting community involvement;
 - Enhancing public safety; and
 - Providing and supporting educational, mentoring and recreational opportunities.
 7. Emphasize Joint Use of Facilities. Emphasize the joint use of existing compatible public facilities operated by cities, schools, counties and state agencies, and take advantage of opportunities to form partnerships with private businesses and nonprofit agencies to maximize the community benefit of existing public and private facilities.
 8. Support Entrepreneurial/Creative Efforts. Support local economic development efforts and endeavors to create new products, services and businesses that will expand the wealth and job opportunities for all social and economic levels.
 9. Encourage Full Community Participation. Foster an open and inclusive community dialogue and promote alliances and partnerships to meet community needs.
 10. Establish a Secure Local Revenue Base. Support the establishment of a secure, balanced and discretionary local revenue base necessary to provide the full range of needed services and quality land use decisions.

Note: The League will review new legislation to determine how it relates to existing League policies and guiding principles. In addition, because this document is updated every two years to include policies and guiding principles adopted by the League during the previous two years, there may be new, evolving policies under consideration or adopted by the League that are not reflected in the current version of this document. However, all policies adopted by the League Board of Directors or the League's

General Assembly become League policy and are binding on the League, regardless of when they are adopted and whether they appear in the current version of “Summary of Existing Policies and Guiding Principles.”



1400 K Street, Suite 400 • Sacramento, California 95814
 Phone: 916.658.8200 Fax: 916.658.8240
www.cacities.org

COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

2011 Work Program

1. **2011 LEAGUE OF CITIES STRATEGIC GOALS** The Housing, Community, and Economic Development Policy Committee will undertake the following actions related to the League's strategic goals adopted for the 2010 year:

- *Strong Partnerships for a Stronger Golden State.* Collaborate and partner with other public and private groups and leaders to reform and revitalize the structure, governance, fiscal integrity and responsiveness of our state government and intergovernmental system.
- *Sustainable and Secure Public Pension Systems.* Work in partnership with other groups and stakeholders to promote sustainable and secure public pension systems to help ensure responsive and affordable public services for the people of our state and cities.
- *Responsive and Accessible League Services.* Implement distance learning, meeting and other cost-effective strategies to deliver even more responsive and accessible League educational, information and advocacy services to the city officials of California.

Additionally, the committee will focus on the following:

2. **ACCESSIBLE LEAGUE SERVICES FOCUS.**

The Committee will put on an agenda a discussion that focuses on how the League can more effectively reach out to the membership to enhance advocacy services to city officials in California.

3. **PENDING LEGISLATION**

Review pending legislation and take action, where appropriate, on all issues within the sphere of housing, community and economic development. Special attention will be paid to legislation relating the housing element, local land use control, mobile home park issues, developer fees, costs of water supply (including other water issues), regional planning, annexation issues, infill and transit-oriented development, climate change, and the impacts of the state budget discussions on local planning, housing and land use. League staff will also provide updates regarding the actions of the Strategic Growth Council and will encourage the involvement of committee members as deemed appropriate.

4. **SPEAKERS & EDUCATION**

Invite and work with key members of the Legislature and state offices on issues of importance to the committee. Additionally, the committee will be responsible for educating guests and speakers during policy committee meetings about local city needs.

5. **MOBILE HOMES**

The Committee will make a commitment to form a subcommittee or have some special look at the mobile home issue, including the issue of classifying mobile homes as affordable housing.

6. **FISCALIZATION OF LAND USE**

The Committee will focus on the issues of fiscalization of land use and local economic development as these issues will often be intertwined with governance reform discussions.

2012 Draft Work Program

The League board of directors met in joint session on Nov. 16 through Nov. 18 with the leaders of the divisions, departments, policy committees and caucuses of the League to chart a strategic course for 2012. The combined leadership of the League (known as the "League Leaders") endorsed three strategic goals for 2012 that will guide the League's advocacy and education efforts.

During its meeting on Friday, Nov. 18, the board formally adopted the three goals listed below.

- **Support Sustainable and Secure Public Employee Pensions and Benefits.** Work in partnership with state leaders and other stakeholders to promote sustainable and secure public pensions and other post-employment benefits (OPEBs) to help ensure responsive and affordable public services for the people of our state and cities.
- **Promote Local Control for Strong Cities .** Support or oppose legislation and proposed constitutional amendments based on whether they advance maximum local control by city governments over city revenues, land use, redevelopment and other private activities to advance the public health, safety and welfare of city residents.
- **Build Strong Partnerships for a Stronger Golden State.** Collaborate with other public and private groups and leaders to reform the structure and governance, and promote transparency, fiscal integrity and responsiveness of our state government and intergovernmental system.

Additionally, the committee will focus on the following: