

April 21, 2016
Issue #30

IN THIS ISSUE:

- Page 4: U.S. Communities Holding Summit on April 28 in Fresno to Educate Local Government Agency Officials on Program's Cost-Saving Benefits
- Page 5: Bills Regulating Use of Body Cameras Advancing, League Engages to Ensure Balance between Local Control, Transparency and the Public's Right to Know
- Page 6: 2017 City Managers Department Meeting Call for Proposals Now Open
- Page 7: California City Solutions: Gilroy's Task Force Steers Youth Towards Away from Gangs

League-Sponsored Bill to Address Placement of Alcohol and Drug Recovery Homes in Residential Neighborhoods Passes Assembly Health Committee
Sober Living Home Licensing Measure Also Passes

[AB 2403](#), a League-sponsored bill by Assembly Member Richard Bloom (D-Santa Monica) to help restore balance between residential character of neighborhoods and the availability of small licensed alcohol and drug recovery group homes, passed out of the Assembly Committee on Health Tuesday with a 15-0 vote. At the same hearing, the committee also approved [AB 2255](#) (Melendez), also supported by the League, which would establish a process whereby sober living homes can apply for state certification. *For more, see Page 2.*



Bills in Committee: April 25-29

With the Legislature's policy committees now in full swing, the League will begin regularly updating members on upcoming hearings on bills of interest to cities. [A full listing](#) of Senate and Assembly hearings is available online. Hearing times are subject to change. *For more, see Page 3.*



San Diego Releases Comprehensive Action Plan to Reduce Affordable and Market-Rate Housing Costs

There is a great deal of talk these days about the housing affordability crisis, but San Diego leaders are working to implement a new plan to address it for both affordable and market-rate housing. The League's Housing, Community and Economic Development Policy Committee received an overview of the plan recently from Richard Gentry, president and CEO of the San Diego Housing Commission (SDHC). Entitled "[Addressing the Housing Affordability Crisis in San Diego](#)," it presents an 11-step action plan of primarily local actions that if implemented could reduce the cost of affordable housing construction by an estimated \$36,000 to \$174,000 per unit and reduce market-rate housing costs by \$23,000 to \$51,000 per unit. *For more, see Page 3.*

League Resolution Inspires Legislative Action

AB 2403 is a product of [a resolution](#) passed by the League's General Assembly last October during the annual conference, sponsored by the city of Malibu. The resolution addressed a long-standing challenge facing many cities throughout California — how to maintain the character of residential neighborhoods while incorporating various group home facilities serving residents' needs, including people recovering from substance addiction.

Addressing overconcentration of such facilities is the key issue, and arises when businesses, using the exemption in state law provided to facilities housing six-or fewer, create multi-structure, campus-style facilities within a residentially zoned neighborhood. Such facilities change the character of residential neighborhoods bringing more traffic, noise and disruption akin to a hospital zone or busy commercial center. Also, undermined is the therapeutic environment for group home residents when a neighborhood loses its residential character and takes on a more institutional setting.

AB 2403 Offers Balanced Solution

Under AB 2403 cities and counties would be notified of state license applications for alcohol and drug recovery homes as well as have the opportunity to ensure that any two such facilities are separated by at least 300 feet, thus prohibiting overconcentration. This noticing and distancing provision is consistent with current California law for other types of group homes and would protect residential character of existing neighborhoods and avoid creating institutional settings which also undermine the therapeutic and recovery-oriented environment that a residential neighborhood can provide.

Although some of the bill's opponents have argued otherwise, this bill is consistent with the federal Fair Housing Act (FHA). Legislative counsel has opined that regulations that benefit the protected class do not violate the FHA. AB 2403 is consistent with such rulings in that it advances state policy favoring the residential/social care model by preserving the integrity of the therapeutic environment of the residential neighborhoods, a core component of the social care model of group homes.

To view the support and oppose discussion on the bill to get an idea of the larger dynamics on this issue, please watch the [full video of AB 2403](#) being heard in the Assembly Committee on Health from April 19. The video starts with the author's presentation, followed by support testimony from Malibu Mayor Pro Tem Lou La Monte and representatives from the city of Malibu, along with other supporting witnesses testifying.

AB 2255 (Melendez) Addresses Unlicensed Sober Living Facilities

While AB 2403 addresses overconcentration of licensed facilities, AB 2255 is aimed at improving the regulation of "sober living homes," which locate in residential neighborhoods but are not required to be licensed. Poorly-managed facilities can create significant disruption for adjacent neighbors and offer questionable levels of care to individuals seeking recovery. AB 2255 would establish a process whereby sober living homes can apply for state certification, which can help improve the quality of such facilities for both residents and neighbors.

Next Steps

AB 2403 and AB 2255 both move to the Assembly Committee on Appropriations. The League urges cities to support these measures. A sample letter, along with the League's support letter and the bill text, for each bill, can be found at www.cacities.org/billsearch. Plug in AB 2403 and AB 2255 into the search function to access these materials.

'Hearings' Continued from Page 1...

Additional information about the important bills the League is tracking is available in the [2016 Hot and Priority Bill List](#). Published on April 15, this list will continually be updated throughout the remainder of the Legislative Session. Bill language and any available position letters on legislation can be found through the bill search function on the [League's website](#).

Monday, April 25

Assembly Committee on Banking and Finance, 3:30 p.m., State Capitol, Room 127

- **AB 2693 (Dababneh) Contractual assessments.** *League position: Oppose.*

Tuesday, April 26

Assembly Committee on Judiciary Committee, 9 a.m. State Capitol, Room 447

- **AB 2296 (Low) Digital signatures.** *League position: Support.*

Wednesday, April 27

Assembly Committee on Appropriation, 9 a.m., State Capitol, Room 4202

- **AB 2228 (Cooley) Code enforcement officers.** *League position: Support.*

Assembly Committee on Housing and Community Development, 9 a.m., State Capitol, Room 126

- **AB 2492 (Alejo) Community revitalization.** *League position: Support.*

Assembly Committee on Local Government, 1:30 p.m., State Capitol, Room 447

- **AB 2557 (Santiago) Zoning regulations: interim ordinances.** *League position: Oppose.*

Senate Committee on Health, 1:30 p.m., State Capitol, Room 4203

- **SB 1283 (Bates) Substance abuse; structured sober living homes.** *League position: Support.*

'Housing Plan' Continued from Page 1...

The action plan resulted from including an objective in SDHC's 2014-16 agency-wide Strategic Plan that read: "Ensure that the most effective and cost-efficient business practices are in place to create and preserve quality affordable housing" in the city of San Diego. The agency agreed that while San Diego needs affordable housing for low-income workforce families, it also needs housing affordability for the middle class.

After spending much of 2015 studying the issue, it became clear the housing affordability crisis had broader and more significant impacts to all sectors of the city, including:

- San Diego has an affordability gap of \$2.4 billion, or 2.5 percent of the city's Gross Domestic Product. If housing were available at an affordable cost to all San Diegans, city households would have \$2.4 billion more in disposable income to spend in the local economy, creating jobs and supporting local businesses.
- A lack of affordable inventory is causing long commutes and congested freeways, contributing to Greenhouse Gas emissions.
- As prices escalate, the threshold of income needed to avoid homelessness rises, potentially pushing more people on the streets.

The report was presented on Dec. 9, 2015 to the San Diego City Council's Smart Growth and Land Use Committee, which voted unanimously to direct city staff to work with SDHC to explore how the report's recommendations could be crafted into city ordinances or advocated at the federal or state levels. San Diego City Council committee members described the report as a "common sense" way of lowering construction costs.

The eight city and three state and federal recommendations in the action plan at-a-glance include:

1. **Set Goals.** Have the San Diego City Council set annual goals for housing production, with a scorecard to track progress in meeting the goals.
2. **Incentivize 80/20 Developments.** Introduce tax rebates and exemptions to encourage 80/20 developments, in which 80 percent of units are at market-rate and 20 percent are affordable. This could reduce the cost of the affordable housing by \$56,000-\$85,000 per unit.
3. **Defer Fees Until Occupancy.** Defer development fees, permit fees and other fees until after construction, saving up to \$2,000-\$6,000 per unit.
4. **Shrink Parking Requirements.** Reduce parking requirements for housing developments by using alternatives such as tandem parking and car-sharing programs, saving up to \$5,000-\$10,000 per unit.
5. **Rethink Mixed Use Requirements.** Reduce requirements on developers, where applicable, to include commercial space in multifamily complexes, which could save \$11,000-\$19,000 per unit.
6. **Free Up More Land for Development.** Open more vacant or underutilized land for development, which could reduce the cost of affordable housing by \$27,000-\$39,000 per unit.
7. **Streamline Permits.** Shorten the permit approval process by allowing conceptual reviews of discretionary building permits, self-certification, online permitting, etc., to save \$5,000-\$9,000 per unit.
8. **Use Master EIRs.** Approve Master Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs), which can reduce the time and expense of reviewing individual EIRs, saving \$3,000-\$6,000 per unit.
9. **Reform CEQA.** Reform the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to reduce duplicative lawsuits, require disclosure of identity of plaintiffs, and allow technical errors to be corrected without invalidating project approvals.
10. **Align State Housing Policy Oversight.** Align the state government's oversight over housing policy, which is now split between five agencies.
11. **Increase State and Federal Funding.** Increase state and federal resources such as the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Continuum of Care to address homeless and Low-Income Housing Tax Credits to support the development of affordable housing.

[The full report is available online.](#)

U.S. Communities Holding Summit on April 28 in Fresno to Educate Local Government Agency Officials on Program's Cost-Saving Benefits

Additional Summits to be held in Rancho Cucamonga and Dublin

U.S. Communities, the League of California Cities[®] and the California State Association of Counties sponsored government purchasing alliance, on April 28 in Fresno, is hosting a free regional event to learn how to save time and money through U.S. Communities program.

During this three-hour event, you will be able to network, ask questions and share feedback as you:

- Learn when to use cooperative contracts;
- Connect with other local agencies currently using cooperative purchasing and find out what is working for their organization;
- Learn about the online e-commerce marketplace;
- Meet your local U.S. Communities program manager; and
- Connect with 12 of U.S. Communities' 40 suppliers to learn about and receive their lowest overall government pricing for these products and services:
 - Facilities
 - Office and school solutions
 - Technology
 - Safety and security
 - Specialty

This educational event will be of special interest to:

- Parks and recreation officials;
- Public works directors;
- Facilities managers;
- Fleet managers; and
- Procurement officers.

Event Details

Thursday, April 28, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Meeting will be held at the Fresno Unified School District at 4480 N. Brawley Ave in Fresno.

[Register online](#). Lunch will be provided.

Future Summits Scheduled

U.S. Communities will be holding summits in Southern and Northern California:

- May 24: Rancho Cucamonga at the Victoria Gardens Cultural Center. [Registration now open](#).
- June 8: Dublin. Information coming soon.

About U.S. Communities

The U.S. Communities Government Purchasing Alliance, a strategic partner of the League of California Cities is a government purchasing cooperative that reduces the cost of goods and services by aggregating the purchasing power of public agencies nationwide. U.S. Communities provides world class procurement resources and solutions to local and state government agencies, school districts (K-12), higher education, and nonprofits. State and local governments have access to a broad line of competitively solicited contracts with best in class national suppliers.

Learn more about U.S. Communities at www.uscommunities.org/lcc.

Bills Regulating Use of Body Cameras Advancing; League Engages to Ensure Balance between Local Control, Transparency and the Public's Right to Know

Body cameras were a major topic in two legislative policy committee hearings this week in Sacramento with the League monitoring both closely before the board of directors adopts official positions at its upcoming meeting on April 27. This technology, which is being utilized by many law enforcement agencies throughout the country and in California, can serve to both protect the public and peace officers. The two bills, [AB 2611](#) (Low) and [AB 1957](#) (Quirk), address various aspects of how body camera recordings are used and under what circumstances those recordings may be release to the public.

AB 2611

The Assembly Committee Privacy and Consumer Protection passed AB 2611 on April 19, sending it next to the Assembly Committee on Appropriations. This bill would significantly expand an exemption under the California Public Records Act (CPRA) for investigatory or security files created by law enforcement agencies, protecting from disclosure any audio or video recording created during an investigation, intelligence-gathering operation, or security procedure. It will apply to data gathered by body cameras, dashboard cameras, drones, and mobile cell phone towers called Stingrays.

The League acknowledges that the bill protects the privacy of law enforcement officers and their families and could protect cities against significant compliance costs. However, AB 2611 lacks clear guidelines for law enforcement on how the exemption should apply to stingray technology, which enables law enforcement to control mobile wireless devices. The measure expressly

includes within the scope of the exemption video or data depicting great bodily injury to, or the death of, a police officer in the line of duty.

AB 2611 would also remedy a deficiency in the CPRA, which lacks privacy protections for victims who are also witnesses, nor does it reflect the latest technologies such as body cameras or dashboard camera in the context of the release of information.

The challenge lies in the fact that as written, AB 2611 could be subject to a rather broad interpretation as to what data should fall within the scope of the exemption. The general public and the Legislature have previously raised issues with the degree to which state and local law enforcement are capable of unfettered, warrantless intelligence gathering via devices such as Stingrays. This technology is capable at a minimum of blocking cellphones, intercepting and reading emails and texts and draining the batteries of mobile devices to render them inoperative. Concerns have been voiced from within the law enforcement community that definite regulations should be placed on their use of this technology.

AB 1957

The Assembly Committee on Judiciary on April 19 passed AB 1957, sending it to the Assembly Committee on Appropriations next.

AB 1957 would require state and local law enforcement agencies to make body worn camera footage available 60 days after the commencement of an investigation into misconduct that uses or involves that footage. The measure is in response to an incident in the city of Chicago in 2014 when an officer shot and killed an armed suspect who was running away in pursuit. Dash camera footage from several police vehicles was withheld for 13 months but was later released after demands from independent investigators and public watchdog groups were made. After the public release of the footage the officer was then charged with second degree murder and the police chief was terminated. In the wake of this and other similar incidences across the nation pro body camera transparency policy trends are becoming more and more prevalent.

While the League supports transparency and the public's right to know, concerns have been raised regarding a two provisions of the bill. The judicial review section of the measure would take away local authority to determine when a video is released, who and what is redacted from body cam footage. In addition, there is a problematic provision that would require video footage to be released 60 days from the commencement of an investigation of the incident. This is troubling because 60 days may not be an adequate amount of time for a full investigation to be completed — disclosure of evidence may deny due process, taint and investigation or lead to civil litigation for the public agency in question.

Under the CPRA, public records must be open to inspection at all times during the office hours of a state or local agency and that the public has a right to inspect any record. Existing law exempts from the disclosure requirements records of complaints to, or investigations conducted by, or records of intelligence information or security procedures of, law enforcement agencies, including the Attorney General and state or local police agencies.

Next Steps

The League board of directors will be examining both bills next week during its meeting on April 27. Once official positions are taken, the League will post letters online.

2017 City Managers Department Meeting Call for Proposals Now Open

Deadline to Submit Ideas is June 6

The League of California Cities[®] is now taking submissions for session proposals and speakers for the 2017 City Managers Department meeting which will be held Feb. 8-10 at the Hyatt Regency in Monterey. The call for proposals offers a chance to share best practices, innovative approaches, as well as research and information with managers at their largest annual gathering in California.

This conference is geared toward California city managers and others in the profession and focuses on current issues and timely topics to assist officials in their daily roles and operations within their city.

Submissions, non-commercial in nature, from any individual, group, business or organization on any topic are welcome. The Program Planning Advisory Committee will consider the educational value of each proposal and the extent to which it presents new and/or significant information.

Sessions may not include sales, commercialism or product promotion of any kind. Ideas need to be fully completed and [submitted through the online proposal form](#) by Monday, June 6 to be considered by the committee.

There is a limit to the amount of words allowed within the title and description of each proposal. The League recommends that proposals are first written in a word-processing program and then pasted into the online form.

A "Topic Suggestions" has been added to the proposal guidelines which are areas of current interest to this group.

Visit www.cacities.org/citymanagersproposal for additional information and to submit ideas.

If you have any questions please contact [Dayna Casper](#) at (916) 658-8227.

California City Solutions: Gilroy's Task Force Steers Youth Away from Gangs

This story is part of an ongoing series featuring Helen Putnam Award entries. The 2015 entries are available on the League's website as a resource for cities in a searchable database called [California City Solutions](#). The city of Gilroy's South County Youth Task Force was submitted in 2015 for the CCS Partnership Intergovernmental Collaboration award category.

The city of Gilroy formed the South County Youth Task Force (SCYTF) as a collaborative effort of participating agencies to provide positive, supportive alternatives to gang recruitment of youth in South Santa Clara County. Task force members include a diverse range of private citizens, representatives from city, county and state government, local community-based organizations, schools, parents, faith community and local law enforcement. With initial primary funding from several local agencies and school districts, the program has been expanded by three consecutive grants. The regional program is making positive, quantifiable inroads into steering at-risk youth towards positive alternatives to gang involvement.

Southern Santa Clara County has become a target for recruiting young gang members. This area encompasses the cities of Gilroy (population 51,000), Morgan Hill (population 38,000), the unincorporated area of San Martin (population 7,000) and a largely unpopulated rural area. One-quarter of Gilroy's residents were born outside the United States, primarily Mexico and 43 percent speak a language other than English in the home. One in five Morgan Hill residents is foreign born. Local schools experience high truancy, suspension and expulsion rates, and low graduation rates. This set the stage for unsupervised youth with lots of unstructured time and poor job prospects.

Gang activity has had a negative and growing impact on the cities and surrounding communities. Between 2011 and 2012, many leaders from South County's largest gang were removed from the streets through two successful regional law enforcement operations totaling more than 150 arrests. Gilroy's violent crime rates dropped by 4 percent in 2012 and non-violent crime by 16 percent. Gang crime in unincorporated rural areas, however spiked by 36 percent in 2012, with 43 percent of the 51 incidents perpetrated by youth ages 15-19.

Gilroy has the most validated gang members of any city in the Santa Clara County per capita, with 975 documented gang members and associates. Intensifying the local gang situation are returning/older gang members as a result of AB 109. Since the 2011-12 arrests, local gangs have been heavily recruiting youth to fill their ranks.

The city's post-arrest crime decrease disappeared, replaced with a 20 percent spike in violent crimes in 2014. The bulk of supportive social services and resources are located in San Jose, about 30 miles north of Gilroy. This requires a three-plus hour multi-transfer round trip by public transportation at \$6 per person for those seeking services.

SCYTF determined early on that CalGrip would be the only meaningful funding source to achieve the needed prevention and intervention services to South County. While economies are slowly rebounding from the Great Recession, South County cities lagged behind the rest of the county as residents were particularly hard hit by unemployment and foreclosures.

Gilroy received its first CalGrip grant for 2011-13, which totaled \$250,000. The funds were used to put infrastructure in place, form a regional policy team and develop a Strategic Plan. Additionally, case management services were provided to 30 youth, with 150 youth participating in group support activities.

A second CalGrip grant, totaling \$500,000, was awarded for 2014-15. This provided financial resources to develop a technical team which provides programming, parent support and training, two full-time intervention workers, one full-time probation officer, and one full-time SCYTF coordinator. New partnerships were also developed with the Gilroy Foundation and the Gilroy Rotary Club.

Another initiative developed was Safe Schools, Safe Streets and Safe Youth, which included development of a crisis response and communication protocol aimed at preventing and de-escalating incidences of violence on and around school campuses. This initiative also increased communication with parents, family and the community, evening socialization with targeted youth, evidence-based support groups, engagement in community activities and the inclusion of the faith-based community.

As a direct result of the success and accomplishments realized under the first two grants, a third CalGrip grant, totaling \$1,500,000 was awarded for 2015-17. Primary goals under this grant are:

- To prevent gang involvement in hot spot neighborhoods and schools by increasing pro-social opportunities for youth and their families;
- To intervene early with high-risk youth and intervene intensively with gang impacted youth by increasing opportunities for these youth for positive futures; and
- To reduce gang activity and climate with chronic offenders by working with high-risk/gang-involved individuals to reduce negative behaviors.

Additional goals are to develop new community-based partnerships, provide seed money to organize faith-based collaborations, provide new evidence-base, culturally responsive trainings and financial support for community policing efforts.

Agencies that contribute financially to SCYTF include the cities of Gilroy and Morgan Hill, Santa Clara County, the Gilroy Unified School District, the Morgan Hill Unified School District and the Gilroy Youth Task Force.

The project has several goals and measurable objectives to achieve.

The South County One Neighborhood Empowered (ONE) Project. This initiative has qualitative and quantitative goals and specific quantifiable objectives. The project design reflects three overarching goals guided by SCYTF's Strategic Plan:

1. Improve/increase service coordination and effectiveness;
2. Expand and enhance support services for youth in multiple "hot spots;" and
3. Change systems and improve capacity and expertise of Community Based organizations, law enforcement, parents, faith-based organizations, youth and school personnel with evidence based programming.

ONE has engaged a third-party evaluation team, Community Crime Prevention Associates (CCPA) that is nationally known and recognized for its experience evaluating community and crime prevention efforts. CCPA has evaluated and assisted the San Jose Gang Task Force to

improve its operation and effectiveness for 28 years, and the Santa Clara County Juvenile Probation Department for 18 years. The CCPA evaluation scope covers three areas:

1. Effort (what inputs and activities produce effects);
2. Effect (what happens as a result of the inputs); and
3. Results (change over time).

CCPA employs a survey of adolescent developmental assets and evaluates each service activity on a quarterly basis for goals met, and indicates corrective actions as needed.

Key ONE project level process and success indicators include but are not limited to numbers of participants and staff (for each program and collectively), number and type of primary, secondary and tertiary services available as a result of the ONE project, units of service delivered, cost per unit of service, client length of participation and completion rates, percentage of goals achieved by individual participants, truancy and expulsion rates, number of referrals and rate of successful enrollment for service delivery. ONE will also do comparative annual reviews of key gang crime indicators for the targeted hot spots.

The services put into place under this program have begun to yield results with 85 percent of participating students increased their participation at school and 92 percent increased their ability to choose friends who make positive choices. In six months, more than 1,800 contacts were made at the street and school level with gang involved or high risk youth. More than 150 unduplicated youth have been served with tailored intervention services.
