

**UCC Board of Director's Meeting  
 Summary  
 September 25, 2018**

Alameda:  
 Contra Costa: Lara Delaney  
 Fresno: Supervisor Buddy Mendes, Supervisor Nathan Magsig  
 Los Angeles:  
 Orange: Peter DeMarco (Alternate), Nicole Wordelman  
 Riverside: Supervisor Chuck Washington  
 Sacramento: Supervisor Susan Peters, Steve Cruz  
 San Bernardino: Josh Candelaria (Alternate), Nicole Wordelman  
 San Diego: Geoff Patnoe (Alternate)  
 San Francisco:  
 San Joaquin: Supervisor Bob Elliott  
 San Mateo: Supervisor Carole Groom, Connie Juarez-Diroll, Steve Cruz, Devon Anderson  
 Santa Clara: Jim Weston (Alternate), Danielle Christian  
 Ventura: Supervisor Kelly Long, Sue Hughes  
 UCC: Jolena Voorhis, Grace Childs-Ferguson

**I. Call to Order**

UCC Chair, Supervisor Carole Groom convened the meeting and called the members to order.

**II. Roll Call of Counties**

There were 6 Supervisors 4 Alternates and 11 counties represented at this meeting.

**III. Approval of Minutes from the August 27, 2018 UCC Board Meeting – APPROVED**

The August 27<sup>th</sup> minutes were Approved and below is the vote count:

Member	County	Yes	No	Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Groom, Chair	San Mateo	X			
Supervisor Ramos Vice-Chair (Alternate)	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda			X	
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa			X	
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X			

Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett (Alternate)	Orange	X			
Supervisor Washington	Riverside	X			
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X			
Supervisor Horn (Alternate)	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Elliott	San Joaquin				X
Supervisor Yeager (Alternate)	Santa Clara	X			
Supervisor Long	Ventura	X			
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>9</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>

#### IV. Items for Consideration

##### 1) Homeless Funding Update

UCC provided a memo on Homeless Funding.

As part of the Budget package this year, the State has invested \$700 million in various programs to provide to cities and counties. The major programs are as follows:

##### Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) – (\$500 million)

The HEAP program has three separate pots:

- \$250 million to the Continuums of Care (CoC) based on Point-In-Time Count ranges.
- \$100 million to CoCs based on percent of homeless population.
- \$150 million to large cities.

HEAP funds are intended to provide funding to Continuums of Care (COCs) and large cities (LCs) with populations over 330,000, so they may provide immediate emergency assistance to people experiencing homelessness. Eligible uses include, but are not limited to the following: homelessness prevention activities, criminal justice diversion programs for homeless individuals with mental health needs, meeting the needs of homeless youth, and emergency aid.

The Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency has held several workshops on the HEAP program across the state and released guidelines for the program. Applications are being accepted on a rolling basis starting September 5, 2018 through December 31, 2018.

##### California Emergency Solutions and Housing Program (CESH) – (\$53 million)

Under SB 2 (Atkins, 2017), the first year of funds received from the \$75 fee will be provided to homeless funding. As part of the budget, the Legislature split this into two pots (ESG and Housing

---

**Board of Directors:** Chair: Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

for a Healthy California). The CESH program provides funds to the Continuum of Care (CoC) based on the 2017 Point-In-Time count, the number of extremely low-income households in rental housing that pay more than 50 percent of household income on rent, and the number of persons below the federal poverty line.

HCD has released the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for this program and applications are due by October 15, 2018.

#### Housing for a Healthy California – (\$53 million)

This funding is provided under SB 2 (Atkins, 2017) and would provide 50% of the homeless funding in the first year to this program which was created by AB 74 (Chau, 2017). This program provides funding to counties who can use the funding for acquisition, new construction, or reconstruction and rehabilitation; project-based operating assistance, which may include long-term assistance for 5 years or establishing a 15-year capitalized operating reserve.

HCD is required to make it operational by January 2019, but has not begun the guideline process.

#### No Place Like Home (NPLH)

In 2016, the Legislature passed the No Place Like Home Program (AB 1618 and AB 1628) which provided for the creation and implementation of the program which provides \$2 billion in bond funding through the Mental Health Services Act to fund permanent and supportive housing to the homeless.

As part of the budget, the Legislature placed the NPLH program on the November ballot for approval due to the validation action pending in the courts. HCD has released guidelines on the non-competitive portion of the funds (\$200 million) and is expected to release guidelines on the competitive pot sometime in the next month. However, no funds or applications can be received unless the ballot measure is approved by the voters.

## **2) Other Emerging or Continuing Legislative Issues**

### **a) Ballot Initiatives – Action Items**

Staff noted to the board the vote requirements (50% +1) – and that 8 votes are needed to take a position on a ballot initiative.

While Proposition 1 and 2 did not have any formal opposition, Proposition 5 did. Two guest speakers were present and given 5 minutes to provide arguments for proponents and opponents.

### **Proposition 1 – Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond of 2018- NO ACTION**

#### **Summary:**

Proposition 1, the Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018, would authorize the issuance of \$4 billion in bonds for affordable housing.

---

**Board of Directors: Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

## **Background**

Affordable housing continues to be a top priority for the Legislature and there is a significant crisis regarding affordable housing in California with 2.2 million extremely low-income households competing for only 664,000 affordable rental homes.

The last housing bond was Proposition 1C which was passed in 2006 and provided \$2 billion in bonds for affordable housing to various programs at the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), all of which have been expended.

## **Proposed Measure:**

This measure would enact the Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018, and would authorize the issuance of \$4 billion in bonds. The bonds shall be allocated in the following manner:

- \$1.5 billion for the Housing Rehabilitation Loan Fund to be used for the Multifamily Housing Program to assist in the new construction, rehabilitation, and preservation of permanent and transitional rental housing for persons with 60% of the AMI.
- \$150 million for the Transit-Oriented Development Program which provides assistance to cities and counties to encourage higher density projects.
- \$300 million for the Infill Incentive Grant Program.
- \$150 million for the Self-Help Housing Fund at CALHFA.
- \$300 million for the Farmworker Housing Grant Fund.
- \$300 million for the Affordable Housing Innovation Fund to fund competitive grants or loans to local housing trust funds.
- \$300 million for the CalHome Program to provide direct, forgivable loans to assist mortgage assistance programs and for manufactured homes.
- \$1 billion for veteran home loans.

## Fiscal Impact

According to the LAO, this measure would create increased state costs to repay bonds averaging about \$170 million annually over the next 35 years.

## **Pros:**

- Provides additional funding for affordable housing due to the significant affordable housing crisis.
- Provides funding to various entities including counties through a competitive process.
- This could create up to 137,000 jobs and provide \$23.4 billion into California's economy.

---

**Board of Directors:** **Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

**Cons:**

- This measure would increase state costs to repay these bonds.

**Support**

Staff provided a list of supporters on Proposition 1.

**Opposition**

No registered opposition to Proposition 1.

**Staff Recommendation:** The UCC Board voted to support SB 3 (Beall, 2017), which placed this on the ballot. Staff recommends a support position on Proposition 1.

**A Motion was made to Support Proposition 1, and below is the vote count:**

<b>Member</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Not Voting</b>
Supervisor Groom, Chair	San Mateo	X			
Supervisor Ramos Vice-Chair (Alternate)	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda			X	
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa			X	
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno		X		
Supervisor Ridley- Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett (Alternate)	Orange				X
Supervisor Washington	Riverside				X
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X			
Supervisor Horn (Alternate)	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Elliott	San Joaquin				X
Supervisor Yeager (Alternate)	Santa Clara				X
Supervisor Long	Ventura	X			
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

Due to UCC By-Laws requirements, this action did not carry and UCC has no position on this ballot measure.

---

**Board of Directors:** **Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

## **Proposition 2 – No Place Like Home Act of 2018 – NO ACTION**

### **Summary:**

Proposition 2, would place the No Place Like Home statutes before the voters to gain approval to use Mental Health Services Funds (Proposition 63) to provide permanent and supportive housing to the homeless who are seriously mentally ill.

### **Background**

#### No Place Like Home Background

In 2016, the Legislature passed the No Place Like Home Program (AB 1618 and AB 1628) which provided for the creation and implementation of the program which provides \$2 billion in bond funding through the Mental Health Services Act to fund permanent and supportive housing to the homeless.

UCC staff was actively involved in the negotiation on AB 1618 and while we did not have an official position on the bill, due to differing opinions among the urban counties, we worked in conjunction with CSAC, RCRC, and CBHDA to provide comments on the guidelines to HCD throughout 2017. We also created a technical working group to continue to provide feedback on the guidelines.

The final guidelines on NPLH were released in July 2017. However, because NPLH is using MHSA funds under Proposition 63, the use of those funds needs to be validated by the court. This has resulted in significant delay in NPLH and only technical assistance funds have been provided to counties. The first court date was set for July 23, 2018, but HCD has indicated that this process could take another year.

#### NPLH – Funding Allocations

Under NPLH there are three funding allocation:

- Competitive Program (\$1.8 billion). This program uses county tiers so that urban counties compete against urban counties, rural counties against rural counties.
- Non-Competitive Program (\$200 million). This will allow HCD to distribute two hundred million from the fund on an over-the-counter basis to finance the construction, rehabilitation, or preservation of permanent and supportive housing for individuals in the target population.
- Alternative Process (\$1.8 billion). This program provides for an alternative process for allocating funds as grants directly to counties with at least five percent of the state's homeless population. Under the guidelines released there are four counties with this level of homeless: Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, and Santa Clara.

### **Proposed Measure:**

- This measure provides that the Mental Services Act Funds can be used for NPLH and is consistent with and in furtherance of Proposition 63.

---

**Board of Directors:** **Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

- Provides that no more than \$140 million of MHSA could be used for NPLH in any year. Also provides that the Controller shall make transfer no later than 90 days after the effective date of the appropriation by the Legislature.
- Provides that in any month that MHSA funds are insufficient to fully transfer to the subaccount the shortfall shall carry over to the next month.
- Allows the California Health Facilities Financing Authority to sell up to \$2 billion in bonds to pay for NPLH.

**Fiscal Impact**

According to the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO), this measure would allow the state to use up to \$140 million per year of county mental health funds to repay up to \$2 billion in bonds.

**Pros:**

- Allows the No Place Like Home Program to be utilized instead of waiting for court validation.
- Provides significant investment to address the homeless and housing crisis.
- Provides funds in both non-competitive and competitive pots to allow for all counties to have access and to build these projects.

**Cons:**

- Would divert county MHSA funds to repay the bonds that these funds would have otherwise been allocated by the county.
- Requires counties to compete for funds that otherwise would have been directly allocated to counties.

**Support**

Staff provided a list of supporters.

**Opposition**

NAMI Contra Costa (Opposed to SB 3).

**Staff Recommendation:** Support. The UCC Board voted to support SB 1206 (De Leon), which had the same provisions regarding approval by the voters of NPLH.

**A motion was made to Support Proposition 2 and below is the vote count:**

Member	County	Yes	No		Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Groom, Chair	San Mateo	X				
Supervisor Ramos Vice-Chair (Alternate)	San Bernardino	X				
Supervisor Carson	Alameda				X	
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa				X	

**Board of Directors:** **Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X				
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles				X	
Supervisor Bartlett (Alternate)	Orange					X
Supervisor Washington	Riverside					X
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X				
Supervisor Horn (Alternate)	San Diego	X				
Vacant	San Francisco				X	
Supervisor Elliott	San Joaquin					X
Supervisor Yeager (Alternate)	Santa Clara					X
Supervisor Long	Ventura	X				
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>6</b>			<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

Due to UCC By-Laws requirements, this action did not carry and UCC has no position on this ballot measure.

### **Proposition 5 – Property Transfer Tax Initiative – NO ACTION**

Staff provided a brief summary and then allowed the proponents and opponents 5 minutes each to present. After the presentations, staff opened it up for questions to the guest speakers.

#### **Summary:**

This measure would change the process for base year value transfers by allowing unlimited transfer opportunities for seniors and those with disabilities.

#### **Background**

Under existing law, base year transfers allow a homeowner to continue paying property taxes at the amount of their previous home and prevent the reassessment of their newly purchased or constructed home to full market value. Under Proposition 13 (1978), homeowners are able to use their prior homes protected assessed value when purchasing a home of equal or lesser value. This is provided to homeowners 55 years of age or older and also to those homeowners with a severe, permanent disability, as long as certain conditions are met.

Generally, a home's value is established when it is purchased, constructed, or undergoes a change in ownership under Proposition 13. Proposition 13 also offers that the property's full cash value as adjusted for inflation or 2% per year, whichever is lower. As a result, a homeowner who holds onto his or her home for a long period of time has a much lower property tax bill than someone who just recently purchased or built their home, even if the fair market value is similar.

---

**Board of Directors:** **Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County



### Existing Law:

- Both properties must be located within the same county unless the county where the homeowner seeks to purchase their new residence has adopted an ordinance allowing intercounty transfers. Currently 11 counties allow intercounty transfers (Alameda, El Dorado, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Tuolumne and Ventura).
- A homeowner can transfer their assessed value only once in their lifetime.

### **Proposed Measure:**

This measure would expand the base year value transfers for homeowners 55 years and older and/or severely disabled by providing no value limit on replacement properties, unlimited transfer opportunities, and allow transfers anywhere in the state.

### Fiscal Impact

According to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), schools and local governments would lose over \$100 million in annual property taxes growing to about \$1 billion per year. There will be similar state costs to backfill school property losses.

### **Pros:**

- Would allow seniors who are on a fixed income to be able to afford a new home.
- Reduces property taxes for seniors and those with disabilities.

### **Cons:**

- Would result in significant property tax losses to counties due to the lower property taxes.
- Would increase the duties of the county assessors.

### **Support**

California Association of Realtors (Sponsor), California Chamber of Commerce, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

### **Opposition**

California Teachers Association, California School Boards Association, California State Association of Counties.

**Staff Recommendation:** Oppose due to fiscal impact on counties.

### **Proponents:**

The California Realtors noted in support of Proposition 5, that people are moving out of 3, 4 and 5 bedroom homes after 20 plus years allowing the younger generation in. Proposition 5 allows transfers anywhere in the state. This measure should avoid moving penalty. The issue is funding. The LAO did a static analysis and the California Realtors did an economic report which they said they would be happy to share. It showed a 43,000 bump.

---

**Board of Directors:** **Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

**Opponents:**

Dorothy Johnson from the California State Association of Counties presented the opposition arguments and noted \$1 billion per year would be lost affecting local government and schools. This might be a wash but they are not looking at permanent erosion of county taxes. This is a detriment to first time homebuyers. Noted that the San Francisco Chronicle said this measure should go down in flames. Local control is at stake and 11 counties are ending the program. She concluded by noting that it would be half a million annual loss from the program.

Supervisor Washington from Riverside county said their county has a program in place to accept transfers into their county. They are adamantly opposed to this measure.

**A motion was made to Oppose Proposition 5 and below is the vote count:**

<b>Member</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Absent</b>	<b>Not Voting</b>
Supervisor Groom, Chair	San Mateo	X				
Supervisor Ramos Vice-Chair (Alternate)	San Bernardino					X
Supervisor Carson	Alameda				X	
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa				X	
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X				
Supervisor Ridley- Thomas	Los Angeles				X	
Supervisor Bartlett (Alternate)	Orange					X
Supervisor Washington	Riverside	X				
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X				
Supervisor Horn (Alternate)	San Diego					X
Vacant	San Francisco				X	
Supervisor Elliott	San Joaquin					X
Supervisor Yeager (Alternate)	Santa Clara					X
Supervisor Long	Ventura	X				
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>5</b>			<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

Due to UCC By-Laws requirements, this action did not carry and UCC has no position on this ballot measure.

Some Board members expressed concerns that UCC would not be able to take a position due to the vote threshold for ballot measures (50%+1). San Diego County suggested that UCC should take a look at changing the Bylaws related to supporting propositions that mirror state legislation that UCC supports.

---

**Board of Directors: Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

## **b) Legislative Update**

Staff provided a handout of the list of bills UCC has positions on. Governor had 5 days left to take action on the remaining bills. Staff reported some really good news – The Governor signed AB 1804 (Berman), which provides counties with a similar exemption to CEQA for infill projects that are residential and mixed use.

The Governor also signed the Conference Committee Report on the Wildfires (SB 901).

### FCC Action on Wireless

Staff noted to the Board that they may have seen this in various updates last week or in UCC's e-news, that the FCC is proposing a new rule on permitting small cell facilities similar to SB 649. Staff sent a letter of opposition to the proposal but it is unclear if this will stop the FCC from adopting the final order.

## **Informational Items**

### **a) WorkPlan 2018**

Staff provided a handout outlining the WorkPlan for 2018.

## **V. Proposals for Next Month's Meeting Agenda**

- 1) State Budget
- 2) Legislative Update
- 3) Ballot Initiatives

## **VI. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

## **VII. Adjourn until **Wednesday, November 28, 2018** at **5:00PM**. This meeting will be an in-person meeting held in conjunction with the CSAC Annual Conference in San Diego.**

**\*Note:** no conference line will be available.