**Legislative Committee Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, May 10, 2023, 3:00 - 4:00 pm

Via Zoom

**Committee Present**: Chair Jennifer Perez, Co-Chair Dr. John Erickson, Dr. Julian Gold, Dana Reed, Cathy Marucci, Oscar Flores, Gustavo Camacho, Sandra Armenta, Beatriz Dieringer, Chris Barajas, Bill Uphoff

**Member Cities Present**: Norwalk, Beverly Hills, West Hollywood, Rosemead, Glendora, Santa Fe Springs, Pico Rivera, Rolling Hills, Lomita, Cerritos, Lawndale, Downey, Beaumont, Hermosa Beach, Lakewood

**Others Present:** Marcel Rodarte, Frank Rodarte, Jorge Morales, Frank Zerunyan Ray Jackson, Mike Flad, Rene Trevino, Hernan Molina, Alonso Ramirez, Jesse Garcia, Masis Hagobian, Salpy Kabaklian, Kristen Nelson, Rhonda Hofmann Gorman, Thaddeus McCormack

1. **Call to Order: 3:04 pm**
2. **Approval of Minutes**

John Erickson motioned approval of the April 26, 2023, meeting minutes. Motion seconded by Bill Uphoff. No abstentions motion passed unanimously.

1. **LEGISLATIVE UPDATES**
2. **Announcements**

Jorge Morales encouraged the Legislative Committee to invite any newly elected officials to the Newly Elected Breakfast at AMS.

Chair Jennifer Perez wished all the moms a happy Mother’s Day and expressed her excitement to see everyone at AMS.

1. **The Scoop**

Jorge Morales gave the scoop and identified that it is a busy season in Sacramento and last week was the last week to get a bill out of the house of origin (not appropriations). If the bills don’t get out by next week they die. All of June is going to be floor hearings.

Morales informed the Committee that it is going to be very busy and to be on the lookout for letters of support or opposition. He encouraged the Committee to share with their city staff to gain more support on bills of interest.

* 1. **Metro Project**

Herman Molina gave an update on the project and said he is working with L.A. County Supervisors to support it. Waiting for bill number and might have it after June 3 and will notify the Committee.

1. **Bills of Interest**
	1. **AB 914 -** **Friedman, Laura - Electrical infrastructure: California Environmental Quality Act –**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of an environmental impact report on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment.

This bill would require a state agency, acting as the lead agency, to complete its environmental review for an electrical infrastructure project and to approve or deny the project within 2 years of the submission and acceptance of an a complete application for the issuance of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use for electrical infrastructure to the state agency. If the state agency fails to meet this time period, the bill would require the state agency to submit to the Legislature a report setting forth the reasons for why the review could not be completed within the time period and identifying potential impacts to the electrical system that could result from the delay.

Beatriz Dieringer suggested to consider a friendly amendment that we do provide some conditions for people in the community that are affected by the work that the utility company is doing. To have an extended time. Provision to do that if it is needed. The bill does not include the consequences. There needs to be something in the bill to have some kind of process by which if the process if there is a compelling need to extend the process. Then it’s not just up to the applicant but something built it to address during the project and by means in which in can be fairly adjudicated. The various interests can be balanced equitably. Approval if amended to include some type of process. Need to show what concerns we want to arbitrate.

Two recommendations are if an extension is needed to the public, they will grant that somehow and find a process to arbitrate.

Dana Reed motioned to support. Bill Uphoff seconded the motion. No opposition. No abstentions. Motion passed unanimously.

* 1. **AB 33 - Bains, Jasmeet - Fentanyl Addiction and Overdose Prevention Task Force.**

Existing law, the California Uniform Controlled Substances Act, classifies controlled substances into 5 schedules and places the greatest restrictions and penalties on the use of those substances placed in Schedule I. The act classifies the drug fentanyl in Schedule II. Existing law prohibits a person from possessing for sale or purchasing for purposes of sale, specified controlled substances, including fentanyl, and provides for imprisonment in a county jail for 2, 3, or 4 years for a violation of this provision. This bill would establish the Fentanyl Addiction and Overdose Prevention Task Force to undertake various duties relating to fentanyl abuse, including, among others, collecting and organizing data on the nature and extent of fentanyl abuse in California and evaluating approaches to increase public awareness of fentanyl abuse. The bill would require the task force to be cochaired by the Attorney General and the Surgeon General, or their designees, and would specify the membership of the task force. The bill would require the first meeting of the task force to take place no later than March 1, 2024, and would require the task force to meet at least once every 2 months. The bill would require the task force to submit an interim report to the Governor and the Legislature by January 1, 2025, and would require the task force to report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature by July 1, 2025. The bill would repeal these provisions on January 1, 2026.

Bill Uphoff motioned to **SUPPORT** the bill. Beatriz Dieringer seconded the motion. No opposition. No abstentions. Motion passed unanimously.

* 1. **AB 701 - Villapudua, Carlos - Controlled substances: fentanyl.**

Existing law classifies controlled substances into 5 schedules and places the greatest restrictions and penalties on the use of those substances placed in Schedule I. Existing law classifies the drug fentanyl in Schedule II. Existing law prohibits a person from possessing for sale or purchasing for purposes of sale specified controlled substances, including fentanyl, and provides for imprisonment in a county jail for 2, 3, or 4 years for a violation of this provision. Existing law also imposes an additional term, and authorizes a trial court to impose a specified fine, upon a person who is convicted of a violation of, or of a conspiracy to violate, specified provisions of law with respect to a substance containing heroin, cocaine base, and cocaine, if the substance exceeds a specified weight. This bill would impose that additional term upon, and authorize a fine against, a defendant who violates those laws with respect to a substance containing fentanyl. By increasing the penalty for a crime, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

Jennifer Perez motioned to **SUPPORT** the bill. Beatriz Dieringer seconded the motion. No opposition. No abstentions. Motion passed unanimously.

* 1. **SB 43 - Eggman, Susan – Behavioral Health**

Existing law, the Lanterman-Petris-Short Act, provides for the involuntary commitment and treatment of a person who is a danger to themselves or others or who is gravely disabled. Existing law, for purposes of involuntary commitment, defines “gravely disabled” as either a condition in which a person, as a result of a mental health disorder, is unable to provide for their basic personal needs for food, clothing, or shelter or has been found mentally incompetent, as specified.

This bill expands the definition of “gravely disabled” to also include a condition in which a person, due to a mental health disorder or a substance use disorder, or both, is at substantial risk of serious harm, or is currently experiencing serious harm to their physical or mental health. The bill defines “serious harm” for purposes of these provisions to mean significant deterioration, debilitation, or illness due to a person’s failure to meet certain conditions, including, among other things, attend to needed personal or medical care and attend to self-protection or personal safety. The bill specifies circumstances under which substantial risk of serious harm may be evidenced, as specified. The bill would make conforming changes. To the extent that this change increases the level of service required of county mental health departments, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

John Erickson motioned to **SUPPORT** the bill. Chris Barajas seconded the motion. No opposition. No abstentions. Motion passed unanimously.

**Adjournment: May 10, 2023, at 3:35pm**