

Date of Hearing: April 9, 2025

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Juan Carrillo, Chair

AB 259 (Blanca Rubio) – As Introduced January 16, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Open meetings: local agencies: teleconferences.

**SUMMARY:** Eliminates the sunset date of January 1, 2026, on provisions of law enacted by AB 2449 (Blanca Rubio), Chapter 285, Statutes of 2022, which allowed members of a legislative body of a local agency to use teleconferencing without identifying each teleconference location in the notice and agenda of the meeting, and without making each teleconference location accessible to the public, under specified conditions, thereby extending them indefinitely.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Provides, pursuant to Article I, Section 3 of the California Constitution, the following:
  - a) The people have the right to instruct their representatives, petition government for redress of grievances, and assemble freely to consult for the common good.
  - b) The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny.
  - c) In order to ensure public access to the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies, as specified in b), above, each local agency is required to comply with the California Public Records Act, the Brown Act, and with any subsequent statutory enactment amending either act, enacting a successor act, or amending any successor act that contains findings demonstrating that the statutory enactment furthers the purposes of these constitutional provisions.
- 2) Provides, pursuant to the Brown Act, requirements for local agency meetings. (GOV §§ 54950 – 54963)
- 3) Authorizes the legislative body of a local agency to use teleconferencing, subject to a number of requirements that include posting agendas at all teleconference locations, identifying each teleconference location in the notice and agenda for the meeting or proceeding, making each teleconference location accessible to the public, and requiring at least a quorum of the members of the legislative body to participate from locations within the boundaries of the territory over which the local agency exercises jurisdiction, as specified. [GOV § 54953(b)(3)]
- 4) Defines “teleconference” to mean a meeting of a legislative body, the members of which are in different locations, connected by electronic means, through either audio or video, or both. [GOV § 54953(j)(6)]
- 5) Authorizes, until January 1, 2026, pursuant to provisions of law enacted via AB 2449, a legislative body of a local agency to use teleconferencing without complying with the

requirements of 3), above, subject to multiple conditions and requirements and limited to “just cause” or for emergency circumstances, as specified. [GOV § 54953(f)]

**FISCAL EFFECT:** None

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Background.** The Brown Act was enacted in 1953 and has been amended numerous times since then. The legislative intent of the Brown Act was expressly declared in its original statute, which remains unchanged:

“The Legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and other public agencies in this State exist to aid in the conduct of the people’s business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly. The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.”

The Brown Act generally requires meetings to be noticed in advance, including the posting of an agenda, and generally requires meetings to be open and accessible to the public. The Brown Act also generally requires members of the public to have an opportunity to comment on agenda items, and generally prohibits deliberation or action on items not listed on the agenda.

- 2) **Agencies and Legislative Bodies.** The Brown Act defines “local agency” to mean a county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, town, school district, municipal corporation, district, political subdivision, or any board, commission or agency thereof, or other local public agency.

The Brown Act defines “legislative body” to mean:

- a) The governing body of a local agency or any other local body created by state or federal statute.
- b) A commission, committee, board, or other body of a local agency, whether permanent or temporary, decision-making or advisory, created by charter, ordinance, resolution, or formal action of a legislative body. Advisory committees composed solely of the members of the legislative body that are less than a quorum of the legislative body are not legislative bodies. Standing committees of a legislative body, irrespective of their composition, that have a continuing subject matter jurisdiction or a meeting schedule fixed by charter, ordinance, resolution, or formal action of a legislative body are legislative bodies.
- c) A board, commission, committee, or other multimember body that governs a private corporation, limited liability company, or other entity that either:

- i) Is created by the elected legislative body in order to exercise authority that may lawfully be delegated by the elected governing body to a private corporation, limited liability company, or other entity.
  - ii) Receives funds from a local agency and the membership of whose governing body includes a member of the legislative body of the local agency appointed to that governing body as a full voting member by the legislative body of the local agency.
- 3) **Meetings.** The Brown Act defines a “meeting” as “any congregation of a majority of the member of a legislative body at the same time and location, including teleconference locations, to hear, discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.”
- 4) **Registering.** The Brown Act specifies that a member of the public shall not be required, as a condition of attending a meeting, to register a name, provide other information, complete a questionnaire, or otherwise fulfill any condition precedent to attendance. If an attendance list, register, questionnaire, or other similar document is posted at or near the entrance to the room where the meeting is to be held, or is circulated during the meeting, it must state clearly that signing, registering, or completing the document is voluntary, and that all persons may attend the meeting regardless of whether a person signs, registers, or completes the document.
- 5) **Remedies for Violations.** The Brown Act allows a district attorney or any interested person to seek a judicial determination that an action taken by a local agency’s legislative body violates specified provisions of the Brown Act – including the provisions governing open meeting requirements, teleconferencing, and agendas – and is therefore null and void.
- 6) **Agendas.** The Brown Act requires local agencies to post, at least 72 hours before a regular meeting, an agenda containing a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting, including items to be discussed in closed session. The agenda must specify the time and location of the regular meeting and must be posted in a location that is freely accessible to members of the public and on the local agency website, if the local agency has one. No action or discussion may be undertaken on any item not appearing on the posted agenda, with specified exceptions.

If requested, the agenda must be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), and the federal rules and regulations adopted to implement the ADA. The agenda must include information regarding how, to whom, and when a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting.

- 7) **Comment Periods.** The Brown Act generally requires every agenda for regular meetings to provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public, before or during the legislative body’s consideration of the item, that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body. The legislative body of a local agency may adopt reasonable regulations to ensure that this intent is carried out,

including, but not limited to, regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on particular issues and for each individual speaker.

- 8) **Teleconferencing and the Brown Act.** The Brown Act first allowed meetings to be conducted via video teleconference in 1988. At the time, San Diego County was considering the use of video teleconferencing for meetings and hearings of the board of supervisors due to concerns about the long distances that some of their constituents were having to travel to participate in board meetings. They were especially concerned that these distances were so great that they prohibited some people from attending meetings at all. AB 3191 (Frazee), Chapter 399, Statutes of 1988, responded to these concerns by authorizing the legislative body of a local agency to use video teleconferencing. Since that time, a number of bills have made modifications to this original authorization.

The Brown Act generally allows the legislative body of a local agency to use teleconferencing for the benefit of the public and the legislative body in connection with any meeting or proceeding authorized by law. The teleconferenced meeting or proceeding must comply with all requirements of the Brown Act and all otherwise applicable provisions of law relating to a specific type of meeting or proceeding. Teleconferencing may be used for all purposes in connection with any meeting within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.

If the legislative body of a local agency elects to use teleconferencing, the legislative body must comply with a number of requirements. It must conduct teleconference meetings in a manner that protects the statutory and constitutional rights of the parties or the public appearing before the legislative body of a local agency. The legislative body must give notice of the meeting and post agendas as otherwise required by the Brown Act, and must allow members of the public to access the meeting. The agenda for the meeting must provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body directly pursuant to the Brown Act's provisions governing public comment. All votes taken during a teleconferenced meeting must be taken by roll call.

"Teleconference" is defined as a meeting of a legislative body, the members of which are in different locations, connected by electronic means, through either audio or video, or both. Teleconferencing has never been required. It has always been permissive.

- 9) **The Four Teleconferencing Rules of GOV § 54953(b)(3).** The Brown Act contains four additional specific requirements for teleconferenced meetings in GOV § 54953(b)(3). Specifically, this paragraph requires all of the following:
- a) The legislative body shall post agendas at all teleconference locations.
  - b) Each teleconference location shall be identified in the notice and agenda of the meeting or proceeding.
  - c) Each teleconference location shall be accessible to the public.
  - d) During the teleconference, at least a quorum of the members of the legislative body shall participate from locations within the boundaries of the territory over which the local agency exercises jurisdiction, with specified exceptions.

- 10) **Executive Order N-29-20.** In March of 2020, responding to the global COVID-19 pandemic, the Governor issued Executive Order N-29-20, which stated that, “Notwithstanding any other provision of state or local law (including, but not limited to, the Bagley-Keene Act or the Brown Act), and subject to the notice and accessibility requirements set forth below, a local legislative body or state body is authorized to hold public meetings via teleconferencing and to make public meetings accessible telephonically or otherwise electronically to all members of the public seeking to observe and to address the local legislative body or state body. All requirements in both the Bagley-Keene Act and the Brown Act expressly or impliedly requiring the physical presence of members, the clerk or other personnel of the body, or of the public as a condition of participation in or quorum for a public meeting are hereby waived.”

“All of the foregoing provisions concerning the conduct of public meetings shall apply only during the period in which state or local public health officials have imposed or recommended social distancing measures.”

- 11) **AB 361 of 2021.** Despite the Governor’s executive order, both local and state governing bodies were concerned about their ongoing ability to teleconference without having to disclose the locations of teleconferencing members or make those locations accessible to the public. In response, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 361 (Robert Rivas) Chapter 165, Statutes of 2021. In addition to provisions affecting state governing bodies, AB 361 allowed exemptions to the Brown Act’s teleconferencing requirements during a proclaimed state of emergency.

Specifically, AB 361 authorized a local agency’s legislative body to use teleconferencing for a public meeting without having to post agendas at each teleconference location, identify each teleconference location in the notice and agenda, make each teleconference location accessible to the public, and require at least a quorum of the legislative body to participate from within the local agency’s jurisdiction [the requirements of GOV § 54953(b)(3)]. This flexibility was limited to the following circumstances:

- a) A legislative body holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency, and state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing.
- b) A legislative body holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency for purposes of determining, by majority vote, whether as a result of the emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees.
- c) A legislative body holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency and has determined by majority vote pursuant to b), above, that, as a result of the emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

AB 361 required a legislative body that chooses to use its provisions to meet the following requirements:

- a) **Notice and Agenda.** A legislative body must give notice of the meeting and post agendas as otherwise required by the Brown Act.

- b) **Public Access.** A legislative body must allow members of the public to access the meeting, and the agenda must provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body directly. The legislative body must give notice of the means by which members of the public may access the meeting and offer public comment. The agenda must identify and include an opportunity for all persons to attend via call-in option or an internet-based service option. The legislative body need not provide a physical location from which the public may attend or comment.
- c) **Meeting Disruptions.** In the event of a disruption that prevents the agency from broadcasting the meeting to the public using the call-in or internet-based service options, or in the event of a disruption within the local agency's control that prevents the public from offering public comments using the call-in or internet-based service options, the legislative body must take no further action until public access is restored. Actions taken on agenda items during a disruption may be challenged as provided in the Brown Act.
- d) **Public Comment.** The legislative body may not require public comments to be submitted in advance, and it must provide an opportunity for the public to address the legislative body and offer comment in real time. The legislative body may use an online third-party system for individuals to provide public comment that requires registration with the system before providing comment. If a legislative body provides a timed public comment period, it may not close the comment period or the time to register until the timed period has elapsed. If the legislative body does not provide a time-limited comment period, it must allow a reasonable time for the public to comment on each agenda item and to register as necessary.

If a state of emergency remains active, or state or local officials have imposed measures to promote social distancing, the legislative body was required to make specified findings every 30 days in order to continue using the exemptions provided by AB 361. As an urgency measure, AB 361 went into effect on September 16, 2021. It originally contained a sunset date of January 1, 2024. Subsequent legislation [AB 557 (Hart) Chapter 534, Statutes of 2023] eliminated the sunset date, changed the required findings to be made every 45 days, and eliminated the ability of local agencies to continue to hold meetings pursuant to its provisions if a state of emergency ends, but state or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

12) **AB 2449 of 2022.** Responding to calls from local governments to provide even further flexibility to use teleconferencing, AB 2449 (Blanca Rubio), Chapter 285, Statutes of 2022, again relieved a legislative body of a local agency from the requirements of GOV § 54953(b)(3) while teleconferencing, but this time outside of a declared state of emergency. In order to enjoy this flexibility, AB 2449 requires at least a quorum of the legislative body to participate in person from a singular physical location. This location must be:

- a) Clearly identified on the agenda.
- b) Open to the public.
- c) Situated within the boundaries of the local agency's jurisdiction.

The legislative body must provide one of the following so that the public can hear and visually observe the meeting, and remotely address the legislative body:

- a) A two-way audiovisual platform.
- b) A two-way telephonic service and a live webcasting of the meeting.

The legislative body must give notice of the means by which members of the public may access the meeting and offer public comment, and the agenda must allow all persons to attend and address the legislative body directly via a call-in option, an internet-based service option, and at the in-person location of the meeting. AB 2449 contained identical provisions as AB 361 concerning meeting disruptions and public comment.

AB 2449 allows members of a legislative body to use these alternative teleconferencing rules in two distinct situations: for “just cause” and for emergency circumstances.

- a) **Just Cause.** Under the “just cause” circumstance, a member must notify the legislative body as early as possible of their need to participate remotely for just cause. A just cause circumstance cannot be used by any member of the legislative body for more than two meetings per calendar year. “Just cause” means any of the following:
  - i) Childcare or a caregiving need that requires them to participate remotely.
  - ii) A contagious illness that prevents a member from attending in person.
  - iii) A need related to a physical or mental disability not otherwise accommodated.
  - iv) Travel while on official business of the legislative body or another state or local agency.
- b) **Emergency Circumstances.** Under emergency circumstances, a member requests the legislative body to allow them to participate in the meeting remotely due to emergency circumstances and the legislative body takes action to approve the request. “Emergency circumstances” means a physical or family medical emergency that prevents a member from attending in person. The legislative body must request a general description of the emergency circumstances, which shall not require the member to disclose any medical diagnosis or disability or any personal medical information. For the purposes of emergency circumstances, the following requirements apply:
  - i) A member shall make a request to participate remotely as soon as possible, and shall make a separate request for each meeting in which they seek to participate remotely.
  - ii) The legislative body may take action on a request to participate remotely at the earliest opportunity. If the request does not allow sufficient time to place proposed action on such a request on the agenda for the meeting for which the request is made, the legislative body may take action at the beginning of the meeting, in accordance with specified provisions of the Brown Act.

iii) The member who is participating remotely must publicly disclose at the meeting before any action is taken whether any other individuals 18 years of age or older are present in the room at the remote location with the member, and the general nature of the member's relationship with any such individuals.

iv) The member must participate through both audio and visual technology.

A member of a legislative body is limited to using the provisions of AB 2449 as follows:

- a) Two meetings per year, if the legislative body regularly meets once per month or less.
- b) Five meetings per year, if the legislative body regularly meets twice per month.
- c) Seven meetings per year, if the legislative body regularly meets three or more times per month.

AB 2449 remains in effect until January 1, 2026.

- 13) **Bill Summary and Author's Statement.** This bill removes the sunset date on AB 2449. This bill is sponsored by the California Special Districts Association and the Three Valleys Municipal Water District.

According to the author, "Several special districts and other local agencies have utilized the procedures established by AB 2449, successfully facilitating remote participation for legislative policymakers that would otherwise (have) been encumbered by illness, official travel, or medical emergency.

"Though the terms of AB 2449 have been amended since their passage, the sunset date associated with its terms has not been changed; the alternative Brown Act meeting procedures established by the bill expire at the end of 2025. By removing the sunset, AB 259 preserves the additional flexibility for individual board members of local agencies looking to meet remotely to continue providing the public with essential services."

- 14) **Policy Consideration and Committee Amendment.** There are several bills this year seeking to extend or eliminate sunset dates on alternative teleconferencing for various bodies. These existing sunset dates were relatively short when they were enacted. In the case of AB 2449, the bill was chaptered in 2022 and has, therefore, been in effect for less than three years. Rather than eliminating these dates, the Committee may wish to consider extending them with a uniform sunset date of January 1, 2030, to maintain consistency and provide more time to evaluate their effects before authorizing them indefinitely.

- 15) **Chaptering Conflict.** Provisions of this bill conflict with provisions in SB 707 (Durazo), which makes a number of changes to Brown Act teleconferencing requirements. The author may wish to amend the bill later in the legislative process to avoid any chaptering out issues that could occur because of this conflict.

- 16) **Related Legislation.** AB 409 (Arambula) eliminates the sunset date of January 1, 2026, on provisions of law enacted by AB 1855 (Arambula), Chapter 232, Statutes of 2024, which allowed a community college student body association or any other student-run community



college organization to teleconference without meeting all of the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act. AB 409 is pending in this committee.

AB 467 (Fong) extends, until January 1, 2031, the sunset date of January 1, 2026, on provisions of law enacted by SB 411 (Portantino), Chapter 605, Statutes of 2023, which allowed a neighborhood council in the City of Los Angeles to teleconference without meeting all of the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act. AB 467 is pending in this committee.

SB 239 (Arreguín) allows subsidiary bodies of a local agency to teleconference meetings without having to notice and make publicly accessible each teleconference location. SB 239 is pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

SB 707 (Durazo) makes various changes to the rules for local agencies to hold public meetings pursuant to the Brown Act. SB 707 is pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

- 17) **Previous Legislation.** AB 817 (Pacheco) of 2024 would have allowed subsidiary bodies of a local agency to teleconference meetings without having to notice and make publicly accessible each teleconference location, or have at least a quorum participate from locations within the boundaries of the agency. AB 817 failed passage in the Senate Local Government Committee.

AB 1855 (Arambula), Chapter 232, Statutes of 2024, allowed a community college student body association or any other student-run community college organization to teleconference without meeting all of the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act

AB 557 (Hart), Chapter 534, Statutes of 2023, eliminated the January 1, 2024, sunset date on AB 361; changed the requirement for a legislative body, in order to continue using AB 361 teleconferencing provisions, to make specified findings every 45 days instead of every 30 days; and, eliminated the ability of local agencies to continue to hold meetings pursuant to AB 361 if a state of emergency ends, but state or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

AB 1275 (Arambula) of 2023 would have expanded teleconferencing flexibility under the Brown Act for community college student organizations. AB 1275 was subsequently amended to address a different subject matter.

AB 1379 (Papan) of 2023 would have eliminated the Brown Act's teleconferencing requirements to post agendas at all teleconferencing locations, identify each teleconference location in the notice and agenda, make each teleconference location accessible to the public, and require a quorum of the legislative body to participate from locations within the local agency's jurisdiction, and allowed legislative bodies to participate remotely from any location for all but two meetings per year. AB 1379 is pending in this Committee.

SB 411 (Portantino), Chapter 605, Statutes of 2023, allowed a neighborhood council in the City of Los Angeles to teleconference without meeting all of the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act.

SB 537 (Becker) of 2023 would have allowed multi-jurisdictional, cross-county local agencies with appointed members to teleconference without meeting all of the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act. SB 537 was subsequently amended to address a different subject matter.

AB 1944 (Lee) of 2022 would have allowed, until January 1, 2030, members of a legislative body of a local agency to use teleconferencing without identifying each teleconference location in the notice and agenda of the meeting, and without making each teleconference location accessible to the public, under specified conditions. AB 1944 was held in the Senate Governance and Finance Committee.

AB 2449 (Blanca Rubio), Chapter 285, Statutes of 2022, allowed, until January 1, 2026, members of a legislative body of a local agency to use teleconferencing without identifying each teleconference location in the notice and agenda of the meeting, and without making each teleconference location accessible to the public, under specified conditions.

AB 339 (Lee) of 2021 would have required, until December 31, 2023, city councils and boards of supervisors in jurisdictions over 250,000 residents provide both in-person and teleconference options for the public to attend their meetings. This bill was vetoed with the following message:

“While I appreciate the author's intent to increase transparency and public participation in certain local government meetings, this bill would set a precedent of tying public access requirements to the population of jurisdictions. This patchwork approach may lead to public confusion. Further, AB 339 limits flexibility and increases costs for the affected local jurisdictions trying to manage their meetings.

“Additionally, this bill requires in-person participation during a declared state of emergency unless there is a law prohibiting in-person meetings in those situations. This could put the health and safety of the public and employees at risk depending on the nature of the declared emergency.

“I recently signed urgency legislation that provides the authority and procedures for local entities to meet remotely during a declared state of emergency. I remain open to revisions to the Brown Act to modernize and increase public access, while protecting public health and safety. Unfortunately, the approach in this bill may have unintended consequences.”

AB 361 (Robert Rivas) Chapter 165, Statutes of 2021, allowed local agencies to use teleconferencing without complying with specified Brown Act restrictions in certain state emergencies, and provided similar authorizations for state agencies subject to the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act and legislative bodies subject to the Gloria Romero Open Meetings Act of 2000.

AB 703 (Rubio) of 2021 would have allowed teleconferencing with only a quorum of the members of a local legislative body participating from a singular location that is clearly identified on an agenda, open to the public, and situated within the boundaries of the local agency. AB 703 was held in this Committee.

18) **Arguments in Support.** A coalition of supporters, including this bill’s sponsors, write, “Recognizing the evolving landscape of public meetings and the demonstrated value of remote participation options when members of governing bodies are unable to attend a physical gathering, the Legislature passed Assembly Bill 2449 in 2022, which amended the Ralph M. Brown Act. Beginning in 2023, special districts and other local agencies began using the procedures established by AB 2449, successfully facilitating remote participation for officials that would otherwise been encumbered by illness, official travel, or medical emergency. The provisions of that bill, having been negotiated by civil society groups and local government stakeholders, contained numerous requirements, including the presence of an in-person quorum at the official meeting location.

“While the provisions added by AB 2449 were modified slightly by technical amendments made by subsequent legislation, the January 1, 2026 sunset included in the original bill remains. To preserve the flexibility provided by AB 2449, Assembly Bill 259 would eliminate this sunset date, thereby preserving indefinitely the remote meeting procedures added by the earlier legislation. AB 259 would not otherwise change any other elements of the remote meeting provisions.”

19) **Arguments in Opposition.** None on file.

## **REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

### **Support**

California Special Districts Association [CO-SPONSOR]  
 Three Valleys Municipal Water District [CO-SPONSOR]  
 Alameda County Mosquito Abatement District  
 Alzheimer's Greater Los Angeles  
 Alzheimer's Orange County  
 Alzheimer's San Diego  
 Amador Resource Conservation District  
 Antelope Valley Fire Protection District  
 Antelope Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District  
 Arbuckle Parks and Recreation District  
 Association of California Healthcare Districts  
 Association of California Water Agencies  
 Association of Regional Center Agencies  
 Bear Valley Water District  
 Big Lagoon Community Services District  
 Brooktrails Township Community Services District  
 Calaveras County Water District  
 California Association of Licensed Investigators  
 California Association of Public Authorities for Ihss  
 California Association of Recreation & Park Districts  
 California Broadcasters Association  
 California Clerk of The Board of Supervisors Association  
 California Commission on Aging  
 California Municipal Utilities Association  
 California News Publishers Association

California State Association of Counties  
California Travel Association (CALTRAVEL)  
Calleguas Municipal Water District  
Castro Valley Sanitary District  
Chico Area Recreation and Park District  
City Clerks Association of California  
City of Monterey Park  
City/county Association of Governments of San Mateo County  
Coachella Valley Public Cemetery District  
Coachella Valley Water District  
Coast Life Support District  
Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District  
Cordova Recreation and Park District  
Corning Cemetery District  
Cortina Community Services District  
Costa Mesa Sanitary District  
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors  
Crestline Village Water District  
Delta Diablo  
Desert Healthcare District  
Desert Water Agency  
Donner Summit Public Utility District  
East Valley Water District  
Eastern Municipal Water District  
Eden Township Healthcare District  
El Dorado County Fire Protection District  
El Dorado Irrigation District  
Elk Grove Water District  
Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District  
Fall River Resource Conservation District  
Fern Valley Water District  
Fresno Irrigation District  
Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District  
Gold Mountain Community Services District  
Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District  
Golden Valley Municipal Water District  
Goleta Sanitary District  
Goleta; City of  
Groveland Community Services District  
Hayward Area Recreation and Park District  
Helix Water District  
Heritage Ranch Community Services District  
Hidden Valley Lake Community Services District  
Hilmar County Water District  
Humboldt Community Services District  
Humboldt County Resource Conservation District  
Independent Special Districts of Orange County  
Inland Empire Utilities Agency  
Inverness Public Utility District

Irvine Ranch Water District  
Keyes Community Services District  
Lake Arrowhead Community Services District  
Lake County Vector Control District  
Lake Oroville Area Public Utility District  
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District  
Leadingage California  
League of California Cities  
Leucadia Wastewater District  
Livermore Area Recreation and Park District  
Local Agency Formation Commission for The County of Los Angeles  
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts  
Los Angeles Lafco  
Mammoth Community Water District  
Mckinleyville Community Service District  
Mckinleyville Community Services District  
Mendocino County Waterworks District #2  
Mesa Water District  
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
Mi Wuk Sugar Pine Fire Protection District  
Mid-peninsula Water District  
Middletown Cemetery District  
Midway City Sanitary District  
Monte Vista Water District  
Mosquito & Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County  
Mt. View Sanitary District  
Municipal Water District of Orange County  
Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District  
Nevada Irrigation District  
Nevada Sierra Connecting Point Public Authority  
North County Fire Protection District  
North Sonoma Coast Fire Protection District  
Northstar Community Services District  
Nossaman Llp  
Olivenhain Municipal Water District  
Orange County Cemetery District  
Orange County Mosquito and Vector Control District  
Orange County Water District  
Orchard Dale Water District  
Orland Cemetery District  
Oro Loma Sanitary District  
Oxnard Harbor District/port of Hueneme  
Padre Dam Municipal Water District  
Palmdale Water District  
Pine Grove Community Services District  
Plumas County Board of Supervisors  
Ponderosa Community Services District  
Potter Valley Cemetery District  
Puente Basin Water Agency

Rancho California Water District  
Regional Government Services  
Resort Improvement District No.1  
Rim of The World Recreation and Park District  
Rossmoor Community Services District  
Rowland Water District  
Rural County Representatives of California  
San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District  
San Bernardino Municipal Water Department  
San Diego Lafco  
San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority  
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership  
San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District  
San Gabriel Valley Water Association  
San Mateo County Harbor District  
San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District  
Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority  
Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency  
Santa Ynez Community Services District  
Saratoga Fire Protection District  
Sausalito-marin City Sanitary District  
Scott Valley Fire Protection District  
Serrano Water District  
Shasta Mosquito and Vector Control District  
Shasta Valley Cemetery District  
Sierraville Public Utility District  
Solano County Water Agency  
South Bay Cities Council of Governments  
Southern California Water Coalition  
Stockton East Water District  
Sweetwater Authority  
Tahoe City Public Utility District  
Town of Discovery Bay Community Services District  
Town of Hillsborough  
Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC)  
Transportation Authority of Marin  
Truckee Sanitary District  
Tulare; City of  
Tuolumne City Sanitary District  
Tuolumne Utilities District  
Twain Harte Community Services District  
Union Public Utility District  
Union Sanitary District  
United Water Conservation District  
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District  
Urban Counties of California (UCC)  
Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA)  
Valley Sanitary District  
Valley-wide Recreation and Park District

Vista Irrigation District  
Walnut Valley Water District  
Water Replenishment District  
Weaverville-douglas City Parks and Recreation District  
West Kern Water District  
West Valley Water District  
Western Municipal Water District  
Western Shasta Resource Conservation District  
Willow Creek Community Services District  
Woodside Fire Protection District

**Opposition**

None on file

**Analysis Prepared by:** Angela Mapp / L. GOV. / (916) 319-3958