

# South Bay Cities Council of Governments

July 23, 2020

TO: SBCCOG Board of Directors

FROM: Jacki Bacharach, SBCCOG Executive Director

RE: Time Critical Legislation – Recommendation for Action – AB 570, AB 2122,  
proposed county charter amendment

## Adherence to Strategic Plan:

Goal B: Regional Advocacy. Advocate for the interests of the South Bay

Basically, all bills must be disposed of by the legislature by August 31 so this is the last meeting that we can really address legislation as the full Board. If there is something extremely important that warrants action after this meeting, the Steering Committee will be able to address it on August 10 but the next Board meeting isn't until August 27 which is really too late.

These bills are further explained on the legislative matrix but this memo seeks to explain why action on these measures is warranted.

### **1. AB 570**

Assemblyman Muratsuchi was considering proposing a bond ballot measure for additional funding for broadband. In working with his colleagues, he agreed that it would be more expeditious to support AB 570 and drop the proposed bond measure.

Assemblyman Muratsuchi explained that this legislation would leverage existing broadband revenues in the California Advanced Services Fund by bonding up to \$1 billion so that the money would be available earlier. There would be no need for this to go to the voters and it would be part of the broader package of COVID economic recovery bills. The SBCCOG Board supported the proposed bond ballot measure.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Support AB 570

### **2. AB 2122**

Penalties for illegal cannabis operations. When Prop 64 passed there wasn't this penalty against unlicensed operators. Last year the Governor included penalties in his trailer bill to give the Bureau of Cannabis Control the authority to charge these penalties. However, that penalty was only to the unlicensed entity's which are usually hidden as to who the actual owner is and often difficult to prosecute. With this legislation, this same tool now can be applied to the property owners that aid and abet this unlicensed activities. And it gives the authority to prosecute and

charge these civil penalties to all local jurisdictions which in turn can retain any collected funds from it.

Redondo Beach is a good example of this. They have enforced multiple times against the illegal cannabis shop only for them to pop up and now become a Church, then a CBD shop, and now a CBD church, because they keep claiming it's a new owner of the business entity each time and thus have it to reset the process for enforcement which is exhausting and very costly for Police and City attorney to do so.

This bill creates an authorized tool for use by the City attorney. It would now allow for local jurisdictions to hold the property owner accountable by making them aware of the unlicensed activities. After being made aware of it, should they not choose to remove the businesses from the property, they can be held accountable with a \$30,000/day penalty. More often than not this results in the property owner removing the business from the location and the enforcement issue being resolved expeditiously and cost effectively.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Support AB 2122

**3. Proposed County Charter Amendment to Allocate 10% funding for Community Investment (board motion attached)**

This proposal will be coming to the Board of Supervisors on Tuesday, July 28 for their decision as to whether to put it on the November ballot. This measure dedicates funding for community investment programs and specifically prohibits use of any earmarked funds for law enforcement agencies including the Sheriff, District Attorney, Los Angeles Superior Courts and Probation Departments.

Without getting into the merits of where county general funds should go, this is a proposed charter amendment that would restrict the discretion of the Board of Supervisors to allocate funds as needed. It removes flexibility from their decision making and priority setting. This restriction does not belong in the charter.

Should the SBCCOG oppose this amendment, it must be clear that this is not opposition to re-prioritizing county spending which should be decided on its own, but is opposition to putting it in the charter. Unfortunately, the Supervisors in favor of this proposal have said that they want to let the voters decide, but the message in the vote may not be that clear. Defeat could reflect the desire for good governance and not restricting an elected body's options.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Oppose proposed county charter amendment