



# **San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce Alliance**

## **April 2014 Legislative Report**

Prepared by:  
HCF, Jeremy Harris  
[jeremy@harrisfirm.biz](mailto:jeremy@harrisfirm.biz)  
714-264-9289

### **Legislative Report**

- **AB 2604 (Brown – D) Workers Compensation Proceedings and Payment Delay**
- **AB 2723 (Medina – D) Administrative Procedure: Small Businesses**
- **SB 1021 (Wolk – D) School Districts: Parcel Taxes**
- **SB 1132 (Mitchell – D) Oil and Gas Well Stimulation Treatments**

### **Ballot Measures: California Statewide Direct Primary Election – June 3, 2014**

- **Proposition 41: Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention Bond Act of 2014**

### **CalChamber Legislative Briefing & Sacramento Host Breakfast – INFORMATION**

# Legislative Report

---

## AB 2604 (Brown – D) Workers Compensation Proceedings and Payment Delay

### Summary

1. AB 2604 would require that when payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused, either prior to or subsequent to the issuance of an award, the amount of the unreasonably delayed or refused payment be increased.

### Background

2. AB 2604 requires the appeals board to consider the amount of the original award, the reason for and length of the delay, and whether there were prior violations.
3. Current law establishes a workers' compensation system, administered by the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers' Compensation, to compensate an employee for injuries arising out of and in the course of his or her employment.
4. Furthermore, current law requires that certain proceedings, including for the recovery of compensation, or concerning any right or liability arising out of or incidental thereto, be instituted before the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.
5. The appeals board may fix and determine, in its award, the total amount of compensation to be paid and specify the manner of payment, or may fix and determine the weekly disability payment to be made and order payment during the continuance of disability.
6. Lastly, current law requires that when payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused, either prior to or subsequent to the issuance of an award, the amount of the unreasonably delayed or refused payment be increased up to 25% or up to \$10,000, **whichever is less**, and the appeals board is required to use its discretion to accomplish a fair balance and substantial justice between the parties.
7. AB 2604 makes a substantive change: the proposed piece of legislation would instead require that when payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused, either prior to or subsequent to the issuance of an award, the amount of the unreasonably delayed or refused payment be increased up to 25% or up to \$10,000, **whichever is more**.
8. AB 2604 is expected to be heard in the Assembly Insurance Committee.

### Arguments in Support

None on file at this time.

### Arguments in Opposition

None on file at this time.

### Supporting

None on file at this time.

### Opposing

California Chamber of Commerce

**Summary**

1. AB 2723 would define cost impact for administrative purposes to include those direct costs that an entity necessarily incurs in reasonable compliance with certain proposed actions.

**Background**

2. SB 2723 would delete a landscape architect, or a building designer from that list and would require that entity organized as a nonprofit to have more than 100 employees in order to not be considered a small business.
3. Requires the impact of new regulations to consider new businesses creation or the elimination of sole proprietorships and small businesses.
4. Current law requires the notice of proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal of a regulation to include, among other things, a description of all cost impacts, known to the agency at the time the notice of the proposed action is submitted to the Office of Administrative Law, that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.
5. Current law defines "cost impact" as the amount of reasonable range of direct costs, or a description of the type and extent of direct costs, that a representative private person or business necessarily incurs in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.
6. AB 2723 is expected to be heard in the Assembly Accountability and Administrative Review Committee.

**Arguments in Support**

7. The Calchamber states: Small businesses are the job creation engine of the California economy and they may be disproportionately impacted by regulations. AB 2723 takes an important step to better understand those impacts and encourage development of a more favorable regulatory climate.

**Arguments in Opposition**

None at this time.

**Supporting**

California Manufacturers & Technology Assoc.  
California Chamber of Commerce  
Air Conditioning Trade Association  
American Institute of Architects, California Council  
Associated Builders and Contractors of California  
Associated Builders and Contractors - San Diego Chapter  
Building Owners & Managers Association of California  
California Association of Boutique & Breakfast Inns  
California Business Properties Association  
California Business Roundtable  
California Construction and Industrial Materials Association  
California Grocers Association  
California Hotel & Lodging Association

Commercial Real Estate Development Association, NAIOP of California  
Family Business Association  
Industrial Environmental Association  
International Council of Shopping Centers  
Los Angeles County Economic Development Corp.  
National Federation of Independent Business  
Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors Association of California  
State of California Auto Dismantler's Assoc.  
United Contractors  
Western Electrical Contractors Association

**Opposing**

None on file at this time.

**Summary**

1. SB 1021 amends existing law that authorizes any school district to impose qualified special taxes. SB 1021 provides that special taxes that apply uniformly include any special tax imposed on a per parcel basis, according to the square footage of a parcel or the square footage of improvement on a parcel, according to the classification of a parcel, and at a lower rate on unimproved property

**Background**

2. The California Constitution requires 2/3 voter approval when a local agency wants to impose or increase a special tax (Proposition 13, 1978).
3. However, the Legislature must authorize school or special districts to impose taxes because these agencies have no plenary taxing powers.
4. Responding to Proposition 13's reduction in local revenue, the Legislature generally authorized all local agencies to impose special taxes with 2/3 voter approval (SB 785, Foran, 1979), but voters subsequently approved an initiative requiring the Legislature to grant specific taxing power to local agencies to impose taxes (Proposition 62, 1986).
5. Prior to Proposition 62, school districts imposed parcel taxes to fund education; however, the initiative prompted school districts to seek specific legislative authorization to ratify the existing taxes and clarify the authority to impose new ones.
6. The Legislature allowed school and community college districts to impose qualified special taxes that applied uniformly to all taxpayers or real property within the district, and allowed districts to exempt persons over the age of 65 from the tax (AB 1440, Hannigan, 1988).
7. In 1991, the Legislature additionally allowed 15 types of local agencies to impose similar taxes; however, the measure allowed local agencies to tax unimproved property at a lower rate than improved property, and contained no other exemptions. (SB 158, Committee on Local Government, 1991).
8. Parcel taxes are not ad valorem, or assessed based on the value of a property like property taxes; instead they are a flat rate assessed per parcel or per square foot, regardless of its size, meaning they are basically a flat tax on property ownership.
9. Districts can use revenues in almost any way that serves local needs, such as ongoing expenses, programs, or buildings. Counties collect parcel taxes with property taxes, and then remit funds to the school district imposing the tax. Property tax law generally guides parcel tax collection.
10. Between 1983 and November 2012, voters approved 322 parcel taxes in 584 elections. At least eight school districts have passed variable rate parcel tax measures that utilize separate rates, based on square footage or other property improvements, according to the California School Boards Association.
11. For example, the Mountain View-Whisman School District's parcel tax contains six rates that increase according to the size of the parcel; other districts structure their taxes to account for multifamily and mixed-use housing by imposing the tax on those uses per dwelling unit, while imposing a different rate for single-family residential and other uses.
12. In 2013, George Borikas successfully challenged Alameda Unified School District's Measure H, which imposed a variable rate parcel tax, at rates of:
  - a. \$120 per parcel per year for residential parcels, and commercial and industrial parcels under 2,000 square feet, and
  - b. 15 cents per square foot for commercial and industrial property above 2,000 square feet, not to exceed \$9,500 per year.
13. The Court determined that because the school district statute didn't also contain the language in SB 158 allowing for a lower rate on unimproved property, districts couldn't differentiate property by classification and assign different tax rates to each class. (Borikas v. Alameda Unified School District, 214 Cal. App. 4th 135).
14. The Court pointed specifically to the differences between the two statutes in its decision:

- a. "Section 50079.1 (the Community College District Statute) does not include exemptions for senior or disabled taxpayers. It does, however, provide that "unimproved property may be taxed at a lower rate than improved property." The inclusion of this additional language - expressly allowing community colleges to classify and differentially tax real property - makes manifest that the definitional language alone does not allow [school] districts to establish rational classifications and impose different tax rates. "
15. In *Borikas*, the Court eliminated school districts' ability to apply different rates to property based on its classification, or based on whether the property has improvements. School districts want to restore flexibility they thought they had before the Court's decision.
16. SB 1021 responds to the *Borikas* case by defining "special taxes that apply uniformly" to include one or more taxes imposed:
  - a. On a per parcel basis, according to the square footage of the parcel or its improvements, according to the residential, multifamily residential, industrial, or commercial classification of a parcel, so long as the same rate of tax is levied on all properties of the same classification, at a lower rate on unimproved property.
17. The measure also allows districts to combine multiple parcels into one when they're commonly owned and constitute one economic unit.
18. SB 1021 applies only to school district parcel taxes imposed in the future; the measure contains "no inference" language that directs courts to adjudicate cases similar to *Borikas* under the law in place at the time the district imposed the tax.
19. SB 1021 is expected to be heard in the Senate Governance and Finance Committee.
20. The California Chamber of Commerce has labeled SB 1021 as a "job killer" piece of legislation.

### **Arguments in Support**

21. According to the author, "Under the recent court decision, school districts can no longer apply higher or lower rates to parcels based on commercial, industrial, or residential classification of the parcel. Districts can't even tax an empty property at a lower rate than an oil refinery or a research and development campus.
22. SB 1021 restores this needed local control by allowing school district boards to structure its tax according to local values and priorities. Because these taxes must be approved by 2/3 vote of local voters, school district boards must forge a communitywide consensus to ensure voters approve the tax, evident by the high approval rates in parcel tax elections.
23. The bill simply returns local control to its state before the court case, and conforms the school district law to 15 other laws that allow local agencies to impose parcel taxes. The bill doesn't grant any additional powers to districts they didn't have before the case. The choice SB 1021 presents is clear: the Legislature can decide who should and shouldn't pay local taxes, or local voters can choose at the ballot box whether the tax placed on the ballot by the locally elected school board after a full, public process is worth it."

### **Arguments in Opposition**

24. Opponents may argue that SB 1021 fall into the category of an old piece of tax policy wisdom attributed to Louisiana Governor Russell Long states that, "Don't tax you, don't tax me, tax the man behind the tree."
25. Landowners who own property in the school district imposing a parcel tax must pay it regardless of where they live, but resident non-landowners, like renters, can vote in the election, but don't pay it, except to the extent that property owners can pass through the taxes in rents.
26. In addition, districts may exempt taxpayers 65 years or older or who receive SSI income, creating another class of voters who do not bear the incidence of the tax. The *Borikas* case didn't eliminate parcel taxes, but it did ensure that owners of commercial and industrial property won't pay parcel tax rates for their parcels that exceed rates applied to residential ones, who are more likely to have children who attend schools in the district imposing the tax, thereby creating a demand for services.
27. SB 1021 would restore the ability of districts to assign more of the tax burden to those who can pay more by virtue of owning commercial and industrial property, but aren't as likely as residential property owners to consume the goods and services the tax pays for.

## **Supporting**

Alameda Unified School District  
California Association of School Business Officials  
California Labor Federation  
California School Boards Association  
California School Employees Association  
California Teachers Association  
Davis Joint Unified School District  
Larkspur-Corte Madera School District  
San Diego Unified School District  
San Francisco Unified School District  
Wiseburn School District

## **Opposing**

Air Logistics Corporation  
Apartment Association, California Southern Cities  
Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles  
Associated General Contractors of California  
Building Owners and Managers Association of California  
California Apartment Association  
California Association of Realtors  
California Attractions and Parks Association  
California Bankers Association  
California Building Industry Association  
California Business Properties Association  
California Chamber of Commerce  
California Grocers Association  
California Healthcare Institute  
California Hotel and Lodging Association  
California Independent Petroleum Association  
California Manufacturers and Technology Association  
California Mortgage Bankers Association  
California Railroad Industry  
California Restaurant Association  
California Retailers Association  
California Tank Lines, Inc.  
California Taxpayers Association  
California Chemical Transfer Company, Inc.  
Council of State Taxation  
East Bay Rental Housing Association  
Family Business Association  
Family Winemakers of California  
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association  
International Council of Shopping Centers  
NAIOP of California, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association  
National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts  
National Federation of Independent Businesses  
Nor Cal Rental Property Association  
Orange County Business Council  
Orange County Taxpayers Association  
San Diego County Apartment Association  
Santa Barbara Rental Property Association  
Silicon Valley Leadership Group  
Superior Tank Wash, Inc.  
TechAmerica  
Tenet Health Care Corporation  
West Coast Leasing, LLC  
West Coast Lumber and Building Material Association

**Summary**

1. SB 1132 requires a specified scientific study to consider additional elements and evaluate potential direct, indirect and cumulative health and environmental effects of onshore and offshore well stimulation and well stimulation treatment-related activities.

**Background**

2. SB 1132 would impose a moratorium of indefinite length on well stimulation treatments in the state until:
  - a. A scientific study is conducted and completed with public participation, a committee of executive agency members certifies, as specified and with public participation, that the study is final and that well stimulation poses no risk to, or impairment of, the public health and welfare or the environmental and economic sustainability of the state, the Governor reviews the certified study and makes further specific findings that well stimulation poses no risk or impairment, 90 days have passed from the Governor's determination or a judicial decision affirming the Governor's decision that is final and non-appealable has occurred.
  - b. Should the above criteria not be entirely met, the moratorium on well stimulation would stay in effect.
3. The Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (division) located in the Department of Conservation is the state oil and gas regulator. The Oil and Gas Supervisor has existing broad authority to regulate the oil and gas industry "to prevent, as far as possible, damage to life, health, property, and natural resources," among other factors (Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 3106).
4. California is a major oil and gas producing state. It is the third largest oil producing state and in the top 15 for natural gas. Oil and gas development and production occurs statewide, although it is concentrated in Kern County and surrounding areas in the Central Valley. There are also important producing fields in coastal areas including Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara and other counties, and offshore, where allowed. There are approximately 50,000 active producing oil and gas wells.
5. Lately, the practice of hydraulic fracturing of oil and gas wells to facilitate the production of oil and gas has received considerable attention and scrutiny, and has become increasingly controversial. Proponents argue that it promotes energy independence, provides good jobs and is a long-standing industry practice that is entirely safe. Opponents argue that fracking contaminates the air, water and soil resulting in adverse impacts to public, environmental and occupational health and welfare, and climate change.
6. Hydraulic fracturing ("fracking") injects a fluid, typically composed of water and added chemicals, into an underground geologic formation at pressures sufficiently high to create or enhance fractures. This process increases the permeability of the formation to the trapped hydrocarbons which then can flow through the formation to the wellbore and be produced. Fracking is one form of a well stimulation treatment and others include acid-based treatments. Well stimulation treatments are continuously evolving as technology changes and are specifically tailored to each particular location.
7. In California, recent projections suggest that the "unconventional" oil reserves in the Monterey Shale formation are the largest in the country. (The Monterey Shale is an existing source of conventional hydrocarbon reserves.) Well stimulation treatments, particularly acidization, may be a key factor in developing these unconventional reserves and, if successful, could result in an economic boom and substantial increases in oil production.
8. As recently as February 2011, the division could not provide any information about hydraulic fracturing in a response to an inquiry from Senator Pavley, despite its acknowledged authority to take regulatory action.
9. Over the last few years there have been numerous legislative attempts to require the division to specifically regulate or ban well stimulation.
10. Governor Brown signed SB 4 (Pavley, c. 313, Statutes of 2013) into law in September. SB 4 provides a comprehensive regulatory framework for well stimulation treatments and has repeatedly been characterized as the most comprehensive and stringent in the country. Emergency interim well stimulation regulations governing well stimulation went into effect on January 1, 2014.
11. SB 4:

- a. applies to all wells, both onshore and offshore in state waters, in California,
- b. requires that an independent scientific study of all aspects of well stimulation be completed by January 1, 2015,
- c. requires that the division completes permanent well stimulation regulations by January 1, 2015,
- d. requires that the division consult with and reach agreements with other regulators with jurisdiction over aspects of well stimulation by January 1, 2015,
- e. requires that the division conduct a well stimulation Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and certify it by July 1, 2015, and provides the division with the authority to impose site-specific mitigation for well stimulation treatments conducted during the interim period,
- f. requires groundwater monitoring, as specified, for wells subject to well stimulation treatments,
- g. requires pre- and post-stimulation public reporting of the chemicals and water used in the well stimulation treatment, the disposition of the chemicals and water used, advance neighbor notification prior to well stimulation, and baseline and follow-up water quality testing for the neighbors, among other provisions,
- h. requires that the production fee paid by industry per barrel of oil (or equivalent amount of natural gas) be used to pay for the expenses of the new regulatory program.

12. The California Chamber of Commerce has labeled SB 1132 a “job killer” piece of legislation.

13. SB 1132 is expected to be heard in the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee.

### **Arguments in Support**

14. According to the author, "Today's fracking techniques are new and may pose new dangers. Technological changes have facilitated an explosion of drilling in areas where, even a decade ago, companies couldn't recover oil and gas profitably. It's important that the implications for health and environmental safety are fully understood before fracking is allowed to continue in [California]."
15. SB 1132 imposes a moratorium on all well stimulation including fracking and acidizing, on-shore and off-shore, until a comprehensive report is completed and submitted to the Governor and the Legislature and a recommendation is made as to if, how and where fracking activity can resume. Further, it lays out how the report is to be conducted in a way that ensures fairness and reliability in the data collected."

### **Arguments in Opposition**

16. A joint oil and gas industry letter states, "SB 1132 appears to establish a study, comment and findings process designed to ensure that well stimulation treatments are prohibited in California in perpetuity."
17. The letter continues, "the Governor's finding shall be considered final only when all pending legal challenges are resolved and [the] Governor's findings are affirmed based on "clear and convincing evidence." Should this standard be set for all future state scientific studies, economic studies and regulations? [...] Oil and gas production in California is a \$34 billion annual industry, employing more than 25,000 workers with an annual payroll in excess of \$1.5 billion" and point out that the economic investments in hydraulic fracturing and other well stimulation techniques that may make development of California's deep shale reserves economically viable require certainty.
18. According to a joint letter signed by the California Chamber of Commerce, among others, SB 1132 is a "job killer." They continue, "...the regulatory process for SB 4 implementation, including the scientific study, is now underway and should be given adequate time to proceed without abrupt and substantial modifications such as those imposed by SB 1132."

### **Supporting**

350.org  
 350 Bay Area  
 American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists  
 Asian Pacific Environmental Network  
 Breast Cancer Action  
 California Nurses Association  
 Carpinteria Valley Association  
 Center for Biological Diversity  
 Center for Environmental Health  
 Center on Race, Poverty, & the Environment  
 Clean Water Action



Citizen's Coalition For a Safe Community  
City of Culver City  
Clean Water Action  
CREDO Action  
Earthworks  
Environment California  
Environmental Defense Center  
Environmental Working Group  
Food & Water Watch  
Frack-Free Butte County  
Friends Committee on Legislation of California  
International Longshore & Warehouse Union - Southern California District Council  
Mainstreet Moms Organize or Bust  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
Oil Change International  
Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco Bay Area Chapter  
Planning and Conservation League  
Santa Barbara County Action Network  
Sierra Club California  
Sierra Club - Los Padres Chapter  
Surfrider Foundation

### **Opposing**

American Chemistry Council  
Associated Builders and Contractors of California  
California Chamber of Commerce  
California Construction and Industrial Materials Association  
California Independent Petroleum Association  
California Manufacturers and Technology Association  
California Metals Coalition  
Chemical Industry Council of California  
Independent Oil Producers' Association  
National Federation of Independent Business  
Western States Petroleum Association

# **Ballot Measures: California Statewide Direct Primary Election – June 3, 2014**

## **Proposition 41: Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention Bond Act of 2014**

### **Summary**

1. A **YES** vote on this measure means: The state would sell \$600 million in general obligation bonds to fund affordable multifamily housing for low-income and homeless veterans.
2. A **NO** vote on this measure means: The state would not sell \$600 million in general obligation bonds to fund affordable multifamily housing for low-income and homeless veteran

### **Background**

3. According to the Legislative Analyst's Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact: Proposition 41, if passed, would increase the state bond repayment costs averaging about \$50 million annually over 15 years.

#### **State Housing Programs.**

4. In most years, about 150,000 houses and apartments are built in California. Most of these housing units are built entirely with private dollars. Some, however, receive financial help from federal, state, or local governments.
5. For example, the state provides local governments, nonprofits, and private developers with low-cost loans to fund a portion of the housing units' construction costs. Typically, housing built with these funds must be sold or rented to Californians with low incomes.
6. A portion of housing units built with state funds is set aside for homeless Californians. These include homeless shelters, short-term housing, and supportive housing. Supportive housing combines housing with certain services, including mental and physical health care, drug and alcohol abuse counseling, and job training programs. A January 2013 federal government survey identified 137,000 homeless Californians, including about 15,000 veterans.
7. California veterans are more than twice as likely to be homeless than non-veterans.

#### **Veterans' Home Loan Program.**

8. The state and federal governments provide home loan assistance to some of the 1.9 million veterans living in California. Under the *state* program, the state sells general obligation bonds to investors and uses the funds to buy homes on behalf of eligible veterans.
9. Each participating veteran then makes monthly payments to the state, which allows the state to repay the investors. These payments have always covered the amount owed on the bonds, meaning the program has operated at no direct cost to taxpayers.
10. Since 2000, the number of veterans receiving new home loans under this program each year has declined significantly. Many factors have contributed to this decline, including: (1) historically low mortgage interest rates, (2) the availability of federal home loan assistance, and (3) the recent housing crisis.
11. When the Legislature placed this measure on the ballot, it also reduced the amount of bonds that could be used for the veterans' home loan program by \$600 million. As a result, about \$500 million of state bonds remain available for veterans home loans.

### **Proposition 41**

#### **New General Obligation Bonds for Veterans' Housing.**

12. This measure allows the state to sell \$600 million in new general obligation bonds to fund affordable multifamily housing for low-income veterans. The general obligation bonds authorized by this measure would be repaid using state tax revenue, meaning that taxpayers would pay for the new program.

#### **Housing for Low-Income Veterans.**

13. This measure funds construction, renovation, and acquisition of affordable multifamily housing, such as apartment complexes. The state would do this by providing local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private developers with

financial assistance, such as low-interest loans, to fund part of a project's costs. Housing built with these funds would be rented to low-income veterans (and their families)—that is, those who earn less than 80 percent of average family income, as adjusted by family size and county.

14. For example, the average statewide amount for a single person to be considered low-income for this program is about \$38,000. State law requires these units to be affordable, meaning rent payments made by veterans cannot exceed 30 percent of the income limit for the program.

#### **Housing for Homeless Veterans.**

15. State law gives funding priority in this program to projects that would house homeless veterans and veterans who are at risk of becoming homeless. In particular, at least one-half of the funds would be used to construct housing for extremely low-income veterans.
16. These veterans earn less than 30 percent of the amount earned by the average family in the county where they live. (The average statewide amount for a single person to be considered extremely low-income is about \$14,000.) A portion of the funding for extremely low-income veterans would be used to build supportive housing for homeless veterans.
17. Other Provisions: Under this measure, the Legislature could make changes in the future to improve the program and the state could use up to \$30 million of the bond funds to cover the costs of administering the program.
18. In addition, the state would be required to publish an annual evaluation of the program.

#### **Arguments in Support**

19. Proponents of Proposition 41 state: the Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention Act of 2014, redirects \$600 million of previously approved, unspent bond funds to construct and rehabilitate housing for California's large population of homeless veterans. This Act will construct affordable, supportive, and transitional housing for homeless and near homeless veterans without raising taxes.

#### **Arguments in Opposition**

20. Opponents of Proposition 41 state: Proposition 41 would authorize the State to borrow (by selling bonds) \$600 million out of \$900 million in bonds previously approved by voters in 2008 for use by the CalVet Home and Farm Loan Program. The issue is whether such a diversion of funds is wise.

#### **Supporting**

*(partial list)*

American Legion  
AMVETS  
California Association of Veteran Service Agencies  
California Coalition for Rural Housing  
California Department of the Military Order of the Purple Heart  
California Housing Partnership Corporation  
California State Sheriffs' Association  
Corporation for Supportive Housing  
County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators' Association of California  
First Place for Youth  
Housing California  
Kings County Veterans Services  
Los Angeles Times

Military Officers Association of America  
Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California  
Reserve Officer's Association  
Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing (SCANPH)  
St. Anthony Foundation  
Swords to Plowshares  
The McClatchy Company (Fresno Bee and The Sacramento Bee)  
U.S. Vets  
Urban Counties Caucus  
Veteran Resource Centers of America  
Veterans of Foreign Wars  
Veterans Village of San Diego  
Vietnam Veterans of California

#### **Opposing**

None at this time.

## CalChamber Legislative Briefing & Sacramento Host Breakfast – INFORMATION



### May 20-21, 2014 2014 CalChamber Legislative Briefing & Host Breakfast

Tuesday, May 20, 2014 10:30 AM - Wednesday, May 21, 2014 9:00 AM (Pacific Time)

Sheraton Grand  
1230 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95814  
United States

 [Map and Directions](#)

**Because local chamber grassroots is more important than ever, the CalChamber has decided to cover the cost of your registration for the Sacramento Host Reception and Breakfast! The registration fee is only \$50 to attend all three events! Space is limited, register today to secure your attendance.**

#### CalChamber Legislative Briefing (\$50 per person)

May 20, 10:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

*Location: Sheraton Grand Hotel, Sacramento*

New district boundaries and the top-two primary system have changed California political dynamics. Gain insights on how the largest freshman Assembly class in recent history is handling the challenges of developing state policies and what this could mean for your community. Hear the latest on CalChamber "job killer" and job creator bills, ballot initiatives and hot legislative races. Featured speakers include CalChamber President/CEO Allan Zaremberg and longtime members of the Capitol Press Corps.

Lunch included.

#### Sacramento Host Reception (\$0 per person)

May 20, 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

*Location: Sutter Club, Sacramento*

The Sacramento Host Reception is a networking opportunity for business leaders from all industries in California to discuss key issues facing our great state. This event is a wonderful precursor to the following morning's Host Breakfast.

#### Sacramento Host Breakfast (\$0 per person)

May 21, 7:30 – 9:00 a.m.

*Location: Sacramento Convention Center, 3rd Floor Ballroom*

The Sacramento Host Breakfast provides a venue at which California's top industry and government leaders can meet, socialize and discuss the contemporary issues facing businesses, the economy and government.

This event helps to develop an atmosphere of good will and understanding around a common table. Your presence will provide an important voice to the dialogues that shape our state.

Traditionally, the Governor of California and the Chairman of the CalChamber Board of Directors speak on the current issues facing employers in California. Leaders from business, agriculture, the administration, education, the military and legislators from throughout the state are invited to join the discussion of matters that concern you most.

The Sacramento Host Committee and CalChamber invite you to participate in this event.

---

**REGISTRATION OPTIONS:**

**Option 1: Legislative Briefing/Reception/Host Breakfast: \$50**

**Option 2: Host Reception/Breakfast: \$0**

**Option 3: Host Breakfast Only: \$0**

***Registration Deadline: Friday, May 9, 2014***

**Registration Information:** <https://www.regonline.com/builder/site/default.aspx?EventID=1507760>

---