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.

AGENDA

SPECIAL ORDER: State Budget and Issues 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

I. Welcome and Introductions

II. Public Comment

III. Police Chiefs/Grocers Ballot Measure Update (Attachment A) Informational
Representatives California Grocers Association and California Police Chiefs Association

IV. Disaster/Emergency Response Budget and Legislation Update (Attachment B) Informational
The League has been working with Fire Chiefs, California Professional Firefighters and other groups to lobby for additional budget resources for disaster response. Other related post-disaster legislation is pending. League staff will update the committee.

V. Drone Policy Discussion (Attachment C) Action
Over the last month, a task force comprised of representatives from the TCPW and Public Safety policy committees have been working with League staff on a proposed framework for drone regulation. The TCPW and Public Safety Committees are being asked to review the draft recommendations for input. Derek Dolfie, League Policy Analyst, will present.

VI. Homelessness Update Informational
Melissa Kuehne, Communications & Development Manager – Institute for Local Government
A. Legislative funding efforts to address homeless and mental health.
B. Steps locals can take to address homelessness (From League/CSAC Taskforce Recommendations) http://www.ca-ilg.org/homelessness-0

VII. (12:30 p.m.) Sacramento’s Experience: Efforts to Improve Relations Between Law Enforcement and Community Residents Informational
Chief Daniel Hahn, Sacramento Police Department
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uo7O3r3hyk&feature=youtu.be

VIII. State Legislative Agenda (Attachment D)
A. AB 931 (Weber) Criminal Procedure: Use of Force Action
B. SB 1421 (Skinner) Peace Officers: Release of Records Action
IX. State Legislative Update (Attachment E)

A. SB 1302 (Lara) – Cannabis: Local Jurisdiction: Prohibitions on Delivery  
B. AB 1968 (Low) – Mental Health: Firearms  
C. AB 2256 (Santiago) – Law enforcement agencies: Opioid Antagonist  
D. Other Cannabis Bills

Informational

Next Meeting (tent.): Annual Conference, Long Beach, September 12

Staff will notify committee members after July 20th if the policy committee will be meeting in September.

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). 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 may reimburse the League.

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.

Informational Items: Any agenda item listed for information purposes may be acted upon by the Policy Committee if the Chair determines such action is warranted and conforms with current League policy. If the committee wishes to revise League policy or adopt new policy for an item listed as informational, committees are encouraged to delay action until the next meeting to allow for preparation of a full analysis of the item.
Police Chiefs-Grocers Initiative - Update
Reducing Crime and Keeping Californians Safe Act of 2018

Bill Summary:
This measure would broaden the definition of violent felonies to reflect a wider universe of offenses; address serial theft by enacting provisions facilitating prosecution for repeat offenses; address organized retail theft; alter the rules for granting parole to non-violent offenders; authorize DNA collection upon arrest for specified misdemeanors; and enact changes to the management of the post-release community supervision population of offenders.

Board Action and Political Update:
In April, the Public Safety policy committee voted to support the initiative and it was sent to the Board for ratification. At the April Board meeting, Governor Jerry Brown spoke about this issue and expressed his concerns with the measure. During the discussion, Governor Brown agreed to meet with the Police Chiefs to discuss his concerns with the measure, since the Police Chiefs were interested in exploring a possible compromise. However, a meeting with the Governor on this issue has not yet happened. As of now, there is no meeting scheduled with the Governor.

The initiative has just turned in signatures for verification and is expected to qualify for the November ballot.
Disaster and Emergency Response Budget and Legislation Update:

The wildfires in Northern and Southern California in October and December were the most costly and destructive in California history. California no longer has a traditional fire season that spikes in the highest heat of the summer and early fall. As last year’s October and December destructive and costly wildfires illustrate, extreme fire conditions has become a year-round concern.

The costs of responding to extreme disasters are staggering. It is estimated that the disaster response costs for the October-December 2017 fires is $1.8 billion. This does not include the nearly $12 billion in losses claimed on insurance policies.

Legislation:
More than 70 bills were introduced in the 2018 legislative session that can be categorized as relating to better emergency preparedness, property insurance, and utilities.

While the League has existing policy that addresses fire services, emergency services and emergency preparedness, the League’s Policy Committees and Board are working to fill in gaps that have been identified in certain areas.

In April, Policy Committees recommended, and the Board approved, policy related to better natural disaster preparation and residential property insurance. The Environmental Quality and Transportation, Communications, and Public Works policy committees discussed liability standards for utilities and directed staff to draft policy for consideration.

Budget
The risk of ongoing fire danger has led the newly-formed Disaster Readiness for Safer Communities (DRiSC), which the League of California Cities is a part of, to mobilize and urge a $100 million appropriation to the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to assist local agencies prepare for and respond to fire emergencies.

With the Legislature aiming to finalize the State Budget by June 15, the League is part of an effort to urge lawmakers to appropriate $100 million for fire prevention and mutual aid support. This budget request is a cost effective investment that can save lives, structures and reduce the cost of disaster response.

Talking Points
Cities are encouraged to call your legislators and legislative leadership, as well as send letters to the Governor and legislative leadership. Below are some sample talking points for discussing this issue:

- I urge Assembly Member/Senator [NAME] to support an additional $100 million to the Office of Emergency Services (OES) for local fire prepositioning and emergency communications upgrades and include it in the State Budget.
$100 million in funding is needed to allow local fire agencies to employ pre-positioning as a disaster readiness strategy and to equip them with the 21st century tools they need to get in front of fast-moving fires and other disasters.

Getting help to a disaster in a few hours is no longer enough to protect communities. We need help in the initial minutes of a disaster. Waiting for a disaster to strike is no longer an acceptable strategy. We can save lives and protect communities by pre-positioning firefighters and equipment in areas where high risks are predicted.

We ask that Assembly Member/Senator [NAME] ask Senator Atkins/Speaker Rendon to include the $100 million in the Budget.
League Drone Policy

The League believes that Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS), or “drones,” are an important technology that can be used in a number of beneficial ways for recreational, commercial and governmental purposes. Given the proliferation of this technology, while respecting the jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), it is important for local agencies and the state to craft a regulatory framework that provides for the appropriate uses of this technology, while also addressing important public safety, nuisance and other issues that arise as drones are increasingly used for recreational, business, and governmental purposes.

This policy sets out a regulation framework for the state, cities, and counties. There are suggested minimum rules for the state to enact that would be enforceable by local agencies; and other regulations that local agencies would have discretionary authority to pursue. A statewide drone regulatory framework should not limit any power of the state or local agencies to regulate operations of drones if such the regulations do not conflict with the provisions of this framework.

I. Minimum Statewide Standards:
   A. Statewide framework should clarify that no local agency can outright ban drones.
   B. Required Registration: The state should require drone operators to register under the FAA’s registration system. The state should seek approval from the FAA to allow local agencies to enforce the FAA’s registration requirement. If the FAA eliminates drone registration at the federal level, the State should then develop a statewide drone registration system. If the state fails to develop a uniform drone registration system, then local agencies must be able to develop their own. Local agencies should have the authority to require all drone operators to show proof of federal registration to local law enforcement officials. Failure to show proof of registration should be a correctable violation for first time offenders.
   C. The state should establish a statute that grants governmental immunity for local jurisdictions that designate drone recreational areas, as long as signs are posted notifying the public that drones may be flying overhead and they are entering at their own risk.
   D. Safety: An important state goal must be the protection of citizens through the prohibition against careless and reckless operations that endanger life or property.
      i. No person may operate a drone over a human being unless that human being is:
         1. Directly participating in the operation of the drone; or
         2. Located under a covered structure or inside a stationary vehicle that can provide reasonable protection from a falling drone.
         3. Located in an area that has been designated as a drone-recreational area by a local agency
         4. Clarified exemptions for drone operators who have obtained a Part 107 certificate of waiver from the FAA
      ii. A person shall not weaponize a drone or operate a weaponized drone.
   E. Prohibit the operation of a drone by a person under the influence of alcohol or drugs that impair the ability of a person to operate a drone.
   F. Require, pursuant to federal law, a person to be 16 years of age or older to operate a drone independently. For those under the age of 16, require a person over the age of 21 and a registered drone operator with the FAA, to be present.
   G. Require a visual line of sight by the drone operator and/or pilot to operate a drone.
H. A statewide framework should incorporate definitions for hobbyists or recreationalists, government, and commercial use of drones pursuant to federal law definitions. A commercial definition should encompass commercial uses such as insurance companies, realtors, photographers, etc.
I. Insurance Requirements: Require the state to establish requirements for minimum insurance coverage that must be maintained by business and government drone operators.
J. Future uses: A state framework should not prevent or prohibit future drone uses. Cities want to be engaged in the policy discussion on the use of drones for commercial drone deliveries and long distance drone use.
K. Protection of Privacy: Ensure that the privacy protections in Section 1708.8 of the Civil Code apply to all drone operators.
L. State’s framework also needs to establish standards for how video, photo, and sound recordings obtained by government drones are treated under the California Public Records Act, as well as state records retention laws.
M. Clarify that any state law that allows for the use of drones does not authorize drone use in any areas that are prohibited by federal law.

II. Enforcement: Local agency law enforcement has the authorization to enforce state and local drone laws.

III. Role of Local Regulation:
A. Time, Place, Manner Restrictions: Local agencies should retain the ability to impose reasonable time, place, and manner limitations on low-altitude, at or under 400 feet, drone operations within their jurisdictions.
B. Outreach and Education: Local agencies shall ensure that information is readily available so that operators are aware of, and accountable to, local rules.
C. Local agencies should have the ability to enact and enforce rules of general applicability in a manner that addresses unsafe drone operations, such as trespass, nuisance, or noise, and includes the ability to:
   i. Appropriately plan for recreational, hobbyist, and commercial drone use during parades, public holiday celebrations or other local agency wide civic events. Designate no fly zones around “critical infrastructure” (such as water treatment or electricity generating facilities) or as otherwise defined by state and federal law.
   ii. Establish clear rules for hobbyists or recreationalists through the adoption of reasonable “community based safety guidelines.” For hobbyists, a local agency could also designate their own areas in parks, open spaces or on beaches for drone operation.
   iii. Require a public or private entity to apply for an event permit to fly over specified areas with specified date, time, location, and purpose.
   iv. Local agencies should have the authority to track commercial drone users, by requesting information on drone use from businesses that are required to obtain a business license or pay a business license tax within a jurisdiction. Local agencies should retain the authority to require commercial operators to provide advance notice to the local agency before flying within the local jurisdiction for

---

1 For hobbyists and recreationalists, see Special Rule for Model Aircraft (Public Law 112-95 Section 336). For commercial and government use, see 14 CFR (107).
commercial use. Notice may include, but is not limited to date, time, location of the flight, and operator’s contact information.

D. Local agencies should adopt drone use guidelines in order to inform residents on local agencies’ use of drones by including, but not limited to, law enforcement, fire, emergency medical, first responders, and public works officials. These guidelines should be easily accessible to the public.

E. As technology permits, to promote transparency to the public, local agencies are encouraged to pursue the development and use of real-time drone tracking systems to ensure residents can look up the details of drones operating in a given area.
1. **AB 931 (Weber) Criminal Procedure: Use of Force by Peace Officers**

**Bill Summary:**
AB 931 (Weber) would limit the use of deadly force by a peace officer to those situations where it is necessary to prevent imminent and serious bodily injury or death to the officer or to a third party, as specified.

**Existing Law:**
Existing law authorizes a peace officer to use reasonable force to effect an arrest, to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance. Existing law does not require an officer to retreat or desist from an attempt to make an arrest because of resistance or threatened resistance of the person being arrested.

Under existing law, the use of deadly force resulting in the death of a person is justified when it was “necessarily committed” in: 1) overcoming actual resistance to an arrest, 2) apprehending a felon who had escaped from custody, or 3) arresting a person charged with a felony and who was fleeing from justice or resisting arrest.

Existing case law prohibits the use of deadly force by a peace officer unless, among other criteria, there is a reasonable fear of death or serious bodily harm to the officer or another person.

**Bill Description:**
AB 931 would change the current use of force standard to authorize deadly force only when it is “necessary” to prevent imminent death or serious bodily injury. More specifically, the bill does the following three things:

1) Prohibit the use of deadly force by a peace officer in a situation where an individual poses a risk only to himself or herself

2) Limit the use of deadly force by a peace officer against a person fleeing from arrest or imprisonment to only those situations in which the officer has probable cause to believe that the person has committed, or intends to commit, a felony involving serious bodily injury or death, and there is an imminent risk of serious bodily injury or death to the officer or to another person if the subject is not immediately apprehended.

3) Makes a homicide committed by a peace officer justifiable only if the officer’s use of deadly force was necessary given the “totality of the circumstances,” as specified, but would exclude those situations in which the gross negligence of the officer contributes to creating the necessity.

**Background:**
Every officer-involved shooting (OIS) is a tragedy. Following the incident on March 18, 2018 in which an unarmed black man, Stephon Clark, was killed by police in Sacramento, Assembly Members introduced AB 931 as a statutory amendment that would significantly restrict officer use of deadly force to only that which is “necessary.” While this certainly rallied the protesters and appealed to the anti-police groups, it has understandably raised great concern by law enforcement—and likely resulted in
furthering the divide between parties that should be allies, not adversaries, when trying to promote the collective goal of safeguarding human life.

**According to the Author:**
“There is growing recognition among policing experts that the current law authorizing police officers to use deadly force does not protect against unnecessary loss of life. AB 931 will change that standard to authorize deadly force only when it is necessary to prevent imminent death or serious bodily injury.

Under current law, police can use deadly force whenever an “objectively reasonable” officer would have done so under the same circumstances – regardless of whether there was an immediate threat to life or bodily security, or whether there were available alternatives. This standard provides legal cover for killings that can be reasonably justified under the law, but were not necessary.”

**Opponents Argue:**
“Any loss of life is a tragedy. Officers are expected to protect life in every instance, and our policy and training is set to accomplish that goal. However, policy and training are different than a legal standard meant to judge, in hindsight, how an officer reacted in a split-second to a dangerous situation. In that case, we must recognize the inherent uncertainty of those moments, which is why we have a current legal standard that measures these reactions against what we can expect from any reasonable person, trained as a peace-officer, and under those circumstances. Anything above this puts our officers in almost an untenable position, which in turn places everyone in danger.”

**Fiscal Impact:**
Unknown.

**Existing League Policy:**
The League is silent on policy relating to peace officer conduct, including use of force.

**Support and Opposition:**
Support:
- ACLU of California (sponsor)
- Alliance for Boys and Men of Color/PolicyLink (sponsor)
- Anti-Police Terror Project (sponsor)
- Black Lives Matter – California (sponsor)
- Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ) (sponsor)
- PICO California (sponsor)
- Youth Justice Coalition (sponsor)
- Advancement Project California
- Alliance San Diego
- Amnesty International USA
- Berkeley City Council

Support:
- Black American Political Association of California – Sacramento Chapter
- California Association of African American Superintendents and Administrators
- California Calls
- California Faculty Association
- Californians United for a Responsible Budget
- Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
- Center on Policy Initiatives
- Chinese for Affirmative Action
- Climate Action Campaign
- Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights
- Coleman Advocates for Children & Youth
Comments:
Even if this bill fails, the issue of officer-involved shootings (OIS) is not going away. The challenge for California lawmakers is to craft language that effectively raises the standard of performance without needlessly endangering the lives of officers or putting them in such fear of being criminally charged that they are unable to carry out their duties. Such a bill might be worthy of support, but it would have to include participation from the entities that are directly affected and responsible for implementing such changes—law enforcement.

Unfortunately, the author did not inform, let alone attempt to consult law enforcement entities prior to the introduction of this bill. While some of these entities would have been willing to engage the author in dialogue with the hope of finding a path forward, these entities, by and large, felt blindsided with the proposed changes in AB 931.
Consequently, while the author may be well-intentioned in seeking to curb the number of persons killed by police use of force—particularly those who are unarmed—haphazardly drafting proposed legislation to drastically change police use of force standards, on the heels of a high-profile OIS and without the input of law enforcement, is not a wise approach.

Staff Recommendation:

Committee Recommendation:

2. **SB 1421 (Skinner) Peace officers: release of records**

Bill Summary:
SB 1421 will allow public access to the investigation records related to a law enforcement officer’s use of deadly force, discharge of a firearm, on the job sexual assault, or work-related dishonesty. This bill would provide for the release of police personnel files under various circumstances.

Bill Description:
This bill permits inspection of specified peace and custodial officer records pursuant to the California Public Records Act (CPRA). SB 1421 allows the public to access records relating to law enforcement if they involve the following:

1. Incidents involving the discharge of a firearm or electronic control weapons by an officer;
2. Incidents involving strikes of impact weapons or projectiles to the head or neck area;
3. Incidents of deadly force or serious bodily injury by an officer;
4. Incidents of sustained sexual assault by an officer; or
5. Incidents relating to sustained findings of dishonesty by a peace officer, which includes perjury, false statements, false reports, and evidence tampering.

To account for privacy and safety interests, SB 1421 allows withholding these records if there is a risk of danger to an officer or someone else, or if disclosure would represent an unwarranted invasion of an officer’s privacy.

All reports of the investigation or analysis of the evidence or the conduct, and any findings, recommended findings, discipline, or corrective action taken shall also be disclosed if requested pursuant to the CPRA.

This Bill:
Provides for redaction of records under the following circumstances:
1. To remove personal data or information, such as a home address, telephone number, or identities of family members, other than the names and work-related information of officers.
2. To preserve the anonymity of complainants and witnesses.
3. To protect confidential medical, financial, or other information of which disclosure is specifically prohibited by federal law or would cause an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy that clearly outweighs the strong public interest in records about misconduct by peace officers and custodial officers.
4. Where there is a specific, articulable, and particularized reason to believe that disclosure of the record would pose a significant danger to the physical safety of the officer or another person.

Permits a law enforcement agency to withhold a record that may otherwise be disclosed during an investigation into the use of force by a peace officer, until the investigating agency determines whether the use of force violated the law or agency policy. Additionally the agency may withhold a record until the district attorney determines whether to file criminal charges for the use of force. Specifies a process for continued withholding of records if there is an active and ongoing investigation.

**Background:**
The high profile shootings of unarmed black men by police officers has sparked a backlash by organizations such as Black Lives Matter and the American Civil Liberties Union. Many bills were introduced in response to these incidents. While this bill had been in the works for a few months prior, it was coincidentally introduced immediately after the killing of Stephon Clark in Sacramento, California. The City of Sacramento and the Sacramento Police Department were criticized regarding their response to the incident and how they disciplined the officers who were involved in the shooting. In the immediate aftermath, members of the community have demanded more transparency and accountability on the part of local law enforcement.

Under current law, the public may not access, for example, records related to officer-involved shootings, or when an officer has been found to have committed sexual assault on the job. In contrast, there is public access to records for all other categories of public employees, including those involving disciplinary actions.

Many states recognize that disclosure of critical incidents is an element of peace officer oversight, with 28 states allowing some access to peace officer internal investigation records. Alabama, Connecticut, Minnesota, North Dakota, Ohio, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Wisconsin, Utah, and Washington, for example, have disclosure laws that are more extensive than what is being proposed in SB 1421. In addition to these 12 states, 15 states allow for disclosure of a limited set of disciplinary records, as is proposed in SB 1421.

The vast majority of California peace officers have excellent records and have never used serious force. According to the author, providing a level of transparency can help establish better trust and increased accountability between local agencies and the communities they serve.

**Fiscal Impact:**
According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

1. State agencies: Costs to individual state departments that employ officers vary, ranging from minor and absorbable to a potentially-significant increase in ongoing workload necessitating the hiring of additional personnel to respond to a greater number of CPRA requests and review and redact the records accordingly. (General Fund, special funds*)

2. Local agencies: Potentially-major ongoing non-reimbursable local costs, potentially in the millions of dollars statewide given the large number of local agencies employing officers (482 cities and 58 counties) that would be
responding to a greater number of CPRA requests for personnel and other records related to specified sustained findings against officers and reports, investigations, and findings related to specified incidents. (Local funds)

a. Motor Vehicle Account and various special funds

Existing League Policy:
The League opposes legislation making it a misdemeanor to disclose peace officer personnel records and citizen complaint records, as well as prohibiting the use of documents or information obtained in violation of this procedure in any administrative proceeding against a peace officer, and any measure that makes it more difficult to discipline the misconduct of police officers.

The League supports maintaining the confidentiality of personnel matters and protecting public safety personnel discipline records from public disclosure.

Public trust and confidence in government is essential to the vitality of a democratic system and is the reason ethics laws hold public officials to high standards.

Laws alone cannot foresee or prevent all actions that might diminish the public’s trust in governmental institutions.

Transparency laws impose the minimum standards of conduct; to preserve public trust, public officials should aspire to conduct that exceeds minimum standards.

State revisions to laws governing local agency transparency and ethics should address material and documented inadequacies in those laws and have a reasonable relationship to resolving those problems.

In order to encourage and facilitate compliance with new transparency and ethics requirements, State laws should be internally consistent, avoid redundancy and be mindful of the practical challenges associated with implementation.

State officials and agencies should aspire to conform to the same level of transparency and ethical behavior as is imposed on local officials and agencies.

Comments:
Staff Comments:
The California Police Chiefs Association is asking for several amendments.

1. For instances of dishonesty and sexual assault, the bill specifies that there needs to be a “sustained finding” in order to release information. The California Police Chiefs Association would like to see this standard of “sustained finding” extended to specified use of force incidents.

2. They would also like to narrow the definition of what is released and exclude the names of those involved in the incident if they have been found through a thorough review process that there was no wrongdoing by the officer. Their intent is to prevent unwarranted public attacks against innocent officers and focus the measure towards the most serious cases.
Support-Opposition: (as of 05/025/2018)

**Support:**
- A New Path
- A New Way of Life Re-entry Project
- Advancement Project
- AF3IRM Los Angeles
- AFSCME Local 329
- Alliance for Boys and Men of Color
- Alliance San Diego
- American Civil Liberties Union of California
- American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
- American Friends Service Committee
- Anaheim Community Coalition
- Anti Police – Terror Project
- Anti-Recidivism Coalition
- Arab American Civic Council
- Asian Americans Advancing Justice
- Asian Law Alliance
- Bend the Arc
- Black American Political Association of California
- Black and Pink, Inc.
- Black Lives Matter – California
- Cage-Free Repair
- California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice
- California Broadcasters Association
- California Church IMPACT
- California Courage Campaign
- California Faculty Association
- California Federation of Teachers
- California Immigrant Policy Center
- California Immigrant Youth Justice Alliance
- California Latinas for Reproductive Justice
- California News Publishers Association
- California Nurses Association
- California Public Defenders Association
- Californians Aware
- Californians for Justice
- Californians United for Responsible Budget
- Catholic Worker Community
- CDTech
- Center for Juvenile and Criminal Justice
- Chican@’s Unidos
- Children’s Defense Fund
- Chispa
- Church in Ocean Park
- City of Berkeley
- Climate Action Campaign
- Coalition for Justice and Accountability
- Committee for Racial Justice
- Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice
- Community Coalition
- Conference of California Bar Associations
- Council on American-Islamic Relations
- Critical Resistance
- CTT
- Davis People Power
- Dignity and Power No
- Drain the NRA
- Earl B. Gilliam Bar Association
- East Bay Community Law Center
- Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
- Equal Justice Society
- Equity for Santa Barbara
- Fannie Lou Hamer Institute
- First Amendment Coalition
- Friends Committee on Legislation of California
- Greater Long Beach
- Homeboy Industries
- Immigrant Legal Resource Center
- Indivisible CA: StateStrong
- InnerCity Struggle
- Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity
- Interfaith Worker Justice San Diego
- IUCC Advocates for Peace and Justice
- Jack and Jill America of America, Incorporated, San Diego Chapter
- Jewish Action
- Journey House
- Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance
- LA Voice
- LAANE
- Law Enforcement Accountability Network
- Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, San Francisco Bay Area
- Legal Services for Prisoners with Children
- March and Rally Los Angeles
- Media Alliance
Mexican Legal Defense and Education Fund
Mid-City CAN
Motivating Individual Leadership for Public Advancement
National Juvenile Justice Network
National Lawyers Guild, Los Angeles Bay Area
Oak View ComUNIDAD
Oakland Privacy
Orange County Communities Organized for Responsible Development
Orange County Equality Coalition
Pacific Media Workers Guild
PACT: People Acting in Community Together
Partnership for the Advancement of New Americans
PICO California
PolicyLink
Press4WordPrevention Institute
Public Health Justice Collective
R Street Institute
Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press
Resilience Orange County
Richard Barrera, Trustee, Board of Education
Riverside Coalition for Police Accountability
Riverside Temple Beth El
Root and Rebound
San Diego LGBT Community Center
San Diego Organizing Project
San Diego Unified School District
San Francisco District Attorney’s Office
San Francisco Public Defender
San Gabriel Valley Immigrant Youth Coalition
Santa Ana Building Healthy Communities
Santa Ana Unidos
Service Employees International Union Local 1000
Showing Up for Racial Justice, Bay Area
Showing Up for Racial Justice, Long Beach
Showing Up for Racial Justice, Marin

Showing Up for Racial Justice, Rural-NorCal
Showing Up for Racial Justice, Sacramento
Showing Up for Racial Justice, Santa Barbara
Silicon Valley De-Bug
Social Justice Learning Institute
Stop LAPD Spying Coalition
Street Level Health Project
The Black Jewish Justice Alliance
The Education Trust-West
The W. Haywood Burns Institute
Think Dignity
Transgender Law Center
UAW 2865, UC Student-Workers Union
Union of the Alameda County Public Defender’s Office
UNITE HERE Local 11
Urban Peace Institute
Urban Peace Movement
Village Connect
White People for Black Lives/AWARE LA
Women For: Orange County
Women Foundation of California
Young Women’s Freedom Center
Youth Alive
Youth Justice Coalition
8 individuals

Opposition:
Association of Deputy District Attorneys
Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs
California Association of Highway Patrolmen
California Narcotic Officers’ Association
California Peace Officers Association
California State Sheriffs’ Association
Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association
Los Angeles Deputy Probation Officers, AFSCME Local 685
Los Angeles Police Protective League
Peace Officers Research Association of California
San Bernardino Sheriff-Coroner’s Office

California Police Chiefs Association (May 29, 2018)
Staff Recommendation:

Note: This measure will also be presented to the League’s Government, Transparency, and Labor Relations committee for a recommendation.

Committee Recommendation:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>League Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 924</td>
<td>Bonta  D</td>
<td>Indian tribes: commercial cannabis activity.</td>
<td>7/10/2017-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>7/6/2017-S. B., P. &amp; E.D.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1968</td>
<td>Low    D</td>
<td>Mental health: firearms.</td>
<td>5/30/2018-In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.</td>
<td>5/30/2018-S. RLS.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2020</td>
<td>Quirk  D</td>
<td>Cannabis: local jurisdiction licensees: temporary event license.</td>
<td>5/30/2018-In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.</td>
<td>5/30/2018-S. RLS.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2164</td>
<td>Cooley  D</td>
<td>Local ordinances: fines and penalties: cannabis.</td>
<td>5/31/2018-Action From THIRD READING: Read third time. Passed Assembly to SENATE.</td>
<td>5/31/2018-S. SENATE</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2717</td>
<td>Lackey  R</td>
<td>Cannabis: local control: city responsibility for county regulatory function.</td>
<td>5/30/2018-Referred to Com. on GOV. &amp; F.</td>
<td>5/30/2018-S. GOV. &amp; F.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 3157</td>
<td>Lackey  R</td>
<td>Taxation: cannabis.</td>
<td>5/25/2018-In committee: Held under submission.</td>
<td>5/16/2018-A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 3173</td>
<td>Irwin  D</td>
<td>Unmanned aerial vehicles.</td>
<td>5/30/2018-Referred to Com. on PUB. S.</td>
<td>5/30/2018-S. PUB. S.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Action Details</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Measures: 21