



# City of Highland

Penny Lilburn, Member  
District 3

Larry McCallon, Member  
District 5

## **Legislative Subcommittee Special Meeting Agenda**

April 15, 2026 at 10:00 AM  
City Hall Donahue Council Chambers  
27215 Base Line, Highland, CA 92346

### **Teleconference Location:**

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(b)  
Subcommittee Member Penny Lilburn will participate remotely via teleconference  
at the following publicly accessible location:  
9003 Redwater Court  
Spring Hill, TN 37174

### **Staff**

Carlos Zamano, City Manager  
Leticia Nava-Cruz, Director of Administrative Services/City Treasurer  
Lawrence Mainez, Community Development Director  
Maricela Marroquin, City Attorney  
Lissette Nock, Deputy City Clerk

### **Mission Statement**

*Highland is dedicated to the betterment of the individual, the family, the neighborhood and the community. The City Council and the staff of Highland are dedicated to providing the quality of public facilities and services that its citizens are willing to fund and will do so as efficiently as possible.*

---

In compliance with the Brown Act, any writings or documents provided to a majority of the legislative body regarding any item on this agenda, that are not exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act, will be made available for public inspection at City Hall, 27215 Base Line Highland, CA 92346, during normal business hours. Such documents will also be made available on the City's website at [www.highlandca.gov](http://www.highlandca.gov).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if you need special assistance, please contact the City Clerk's office at (909) 864-6861, ext. 226, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting for any requests for reasonable accommodations, including interpreters.

Levine Act: Pursuant to Government Code Section 84308, any party to a City proceeding must disclose on the record any campaign contributions made to a member of the City Council (or commission) in excess of \$500 in the past 12 months. This disclosure requirement includes contributions by the party's agent and aggregated contributions from persons or entities related to the party. Please make the disclosure as soon as possible, but no later than the beginning of the proceeding.

---

## Call to Order

### Public Comment

Limited to items on this agenda only. To address the Legislative Subcommittee, please complete a speaker form located at the entrance prior to the beginning of the meeting. For those wishing to make public comments by email, please submit your comments by 9:00 a.m. on April 15, 2026, to [publiccomment@highlandca.gov](mailto:publiccomment@highlandca.gov). Please identify the agenda item number in the subject line. Emailed comments will be distributed to the Subcommittee and retained as part of the public record; however, submissions will not be read out loud during the meeting.

### Business Items

1. Minutes - April 1, 2026 Legislative Subcommittee Meeting  
Approve the Minutes as submitted.
2. Senate Bill 866 (Blakespear) Housing Element Mandates: Homelessness  
Review and provide direction whether to send an oppose unless amended letter to the Legislature.
3. Senate Bill 1308 (Bogh) Constitutional Course for Legislators and Designated Staff  
Review and provide direction whether to send a letter of support to the Legislature.
4. Assembly Bill 1678 (Harabedian) Claremont-Montclair Authority: Metro A Line Extension Project  
Review and provide direction whether to send an opposition letter to the Assembly Committee on Transportation.
5. Proposition 36 Funding - Support Request for \$400 Million in Funding for Recovery Support Services and Substance Use Treatment  
Review and provide direction whether to send a letter of support to include this funding in the final FY 2026-27 State Budget.

## Adjourn

**Certification**

I, Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk, or my designee, hereby certify that the foregoing agenda was posted on our website at [www.highlandca.gov](http://www.highlandca.gov) and in the following designated areas: Highland Branch Library (7863 Central Avenue), Fire Station No. 1 (26974 Base Line), and City Hall (27215 Base Line) at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting per Government Code Section 54956.



# Staff Report

## to the Legislative Subcommittee

Agenda  
Item  
No.1.

---

**Date:** April 15, 2026  
**From:** Carlos Zamano, City Manager  
**Reviewed By:** Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk  
**Prepared By:** Lissette Nock, Deputy City Clerk  
**Subject:** Minutes - April 1, 2026 Legislative Subcommittee Meeting

---

**Recommendation:**

Approve the Minutes as submitted.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None

**Public Notice:**

The agenda for this item was posted at the three locations per Resolution No. 2011-047 and on the City's website.

**Background:**

The Legislative Subcommittee is required to maintain an official record of its proceedings. Minutes serve as the permanent record of actions taken by the Legislative Subcommittee and provide transparency to the public regarding the business conducted at each meeting. In accordance with standard practice, the draft minutes from the April 1, 2026, Legislative Subcommittee meeting have been prepared and are submitted for the Legislative Subcommittee's review and approval.

**Attachments:**

1. Minutes - April 1, 2026 Legislative Subcommittee Meeting

**Call to Order**

The Legislative Subcommittee special meeting was called to order at 4:31 p.m. in the Upright Conference Room, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

**Roll Call**

Present: Lilburn, McCallon

Absent: None

**Public Comment**

None

**Business Items**

1. Minutes - July 30, 2025 Legislative Subcommittee Meeting  
Approve the Minutes as submitted.
2. Senate Bill 1071 (Bogh) Death Certificates: Amending the Manner of Death  
Reviewed and signed the Letter of Support to the legislature.

**Adjourn**

There being no further business, Member Lilburn adjourned the meeting at 4:33 p.m.

Submitted By:

Approved By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lissette Nock, Deputy City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Subcommittee Member



# Staff Report

## to the Legislative Subcommittee

Agenda  
Item  
No.2.

---

**Date:** April 15, 2026  
**From:** Carlos Zamano, City Manager  
**Reviewed By:** Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk  
**Prepared By:** Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk  
**Subject:** Senate Bill 866 (Blakespear) Housing Element Mandates: Homelessness

---

**Recommendation:**

Review and provide direction whether to send an oppose unless amended letter to the Legislature.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Public Notice:**

The agenda for this item was posted at the three locations per Resolution No. 2011-047 and on the City's website.

**Background:**

Senate Bill 866 (Blakespear) proposes to require most California cities to incorporate expanded homelessness reporting requirements into their Housing Elements. The bill is scheduled to be heard in the California State Senate Housing Committee by April 21, 2026.

Since 2019, the State's Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention (HHAP) program has provided direct funding to 14 large cities, all 58 counties, and regional Continuums of Care, while the majority of California cities, including smaller and mid-sized jurisdictions do not receive direct HHAP funding. As a condition of receiving funds, HHAP recipients already report detailed system performance metrics through regional planning processes.

SB 866 would extend similar reporting requirements to cities that do not receive HHAP funding, requiring them to include extensive homelessness data and performance metrics within their Housing Elements. Housing Elements are long-term planning documents, typically updated every eight years, and are not designed to track rapidly changing, real-time homelessness conditions.

The proposed requirements would necessitate data collection and coordination with external partners such as counties, healthcare systems, and law enforcement agencies—information that many cities do not independently collect or have direct access to. As currently drafted, SB 866 places these additional obligations solely on cities without direct state homelessness

funding, creating an imbalance between reporting requirements and available resources.

**Attachments:**

1. SB 866 (Blakespear) Action Alert
2. Sample Oppose Unless Amended Letter

# ATTACHMENT 1



## Cal Cities Action Alert

### Oppose Unless Amended SB 866 (Blakespear) Housing Element Mandates: Homelessness

**Action requested:** Contact your legislator to **oppose SB 866 (Blakespear) unless amended**. SB 866 will be heard in the Senate Housing Committee by April 21, 2026.

**What the bill does:** SB 866 requires all but 14 cities in the state to add extensive and burdensome homelessness reporting requirements to their housing elements. This bill specifically targets cities that do not have direct access to state homelessness funding.

#### **Why SB 866 is bad for cities:**

- SB 866 only applies to cities that do not have access to direct state funding from the Homeless Housing Assistance and Prevention (HHAP) grant program, placing extensive new reporting burdens on those with the **fewest resources**.
- SB 866 mandates reporting on metrics that nearly all cities lack the ability to collect. This information could only be collected through regional collaboration with counties, hospitals, jails, and other partners.
- The reporting required in SB 866 does not belong in a long-term housing planning document that, for most cities, is updated every eight years and would quickly become outdated and unresponsive to the evolving needs of unhoused residents.

**Additional background:** Since 2019, HHAP has provided state funding to the 14 largest cities, all 58 counties, and 44 Continuums of Care — leaving the other **469 cities** in California without direct state support. To receive funding, HHAP recipients must submit regional plans that include system performance metrics. SB 866 applies these same metrics as a new housing element requirement **only** for cities that do not receive HHAP funding.

**What cities need:** Amend SB 866 to instead include all cities in the regional planning process. This will provide transparency into the system metrics that SB 866 includes, but through the same regional process already used by California's largest cities.

**Links and attachments:** Cal Cities' oppose unless amended [letter](#). Sample city oppose unless amended [letter](#).

**Where to send letter:** [cityletters@calcities.org](mailto:cityletters@calcities.org), and [Lvarela@calcities.org](mailto:Lvarela@calcities.org)

**Questions?** Contact, Regional Public Affairs Manager, Laura Varela at [Lvarela@calcities.org](mailto:Lvarela@calcities.org)

# **ATTACHMENT 2**

**DATE**

The Honorable Catherine Blakespear  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Room 7720  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 866 (Blakespear) Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention program:  
housing element.  
Notice of OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED**

Dear Senator Blakespear,

The **City/Town of \_\_\_\_\_** must respectfully **oppose your SB 866 (Blakespear) unless amended**. SB 866 would require all but 14 cities to add extensive homelessness reporting requirements to their housing elements, targeting cities that do not receive state funding to address homelessness.

The state's flagship homelessness grant program, the Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention (HHAP) Grant program, allocates funding to all 58 counties, 44 continuums of care, and cities with populations over 300,000. This means that only 14 cities in California are receiving direct state homelessness funding through HHAP.

To receive HHAP funding, grantees must submit a regionally coordinated homelessness action plan to the Housing and Community Development Department that includes specific system performance measures. SB 866 would **copy** these system performance measures from the HHAP regional plans and impose them as a separate reporting requirement **only** on cities not receiving state funding — forcing them to track these metrics in their housing elements.

Specifically, SB 866 would require all but 14 cities to provide detailed reports on available homelessness resources, actions taken to connect individuals to those resources, and various data points. For example, SB 866 requires cities to share information about the number of people who become homeless after exiting institutional settings, including jails, prisons, and hospitals, and the number of people who become unhoused after moving into permanent housing.

SB 866 also requires cities to describe how they are coordinating services under the Behavioral Health Services Act and identify any available mental and behavioral health funding. Counties, not cities, provide behavioral health services in California and receive all the funding to do so. SB 866 does not currently apply to counties because it only applies to local governments that **do not** receive HHAP. As a result, SB 866 places the burden on cities to report on and plan for services beyond their control, requiring

significant reporting on county-led functions within a city's housing planning document – requirements that cities are not well-positioned to fulfill.

There is a reason these system performance metrics are currently in the HHAP regional planning process – because gathering this data requires collaboration with counties, prisons, hospitals, VAs, and other stakeholders. These requirements create significant administrative burdens for communities that **already** do not receive state financial support to address homelessness. Nearly all cities lack the infrastructure to collect the data required by SB 866, making compliance nearly impossible.

Additionally, while HHAP regional plans are updated each year that funding is available, most communities update their housing elements every eight years. The **City/Town of \_\_\_\_\_** fails to see how collecting this data every eight years, when much of this information is collected annually through Continuums of Care point-in-time counts, would help address the evolving needs of unhoused residents in our community.

The **City/Town of \_\_\_\_\_** understands the goal of increasing transparency around the efforts of smaller cities to address the state's homelessness crisis. Currently, cities that do not receive HHAP funding are encouraged to participate in HHAP regional planning but are not required to do so. The **City/Town of \_\_\_\_\_** is requesting amendments that require smaller cities to have a seat at the table for the regional planning process. This will accomplish the same goal, providing transparency into the same system metrics that SB 866 includes, but through the same regional process already used by California's largest cities.

**PLEASE CITE SPECIFIC REASONS OF HOW YOUR CITY WILL BE AFFECTED BY THIS BILL.**

Each year, the Legislature introduces bills that change the rules mid-stream, significantly complicating cities' efforts to secure housing element certification. These multiyear planning efforts are already complex, time-consuming, and expensive. SB 866 would add yet another layer of reporting requirements — through a non-reimbursable state mandate — placing a disproportionate burden on smaller cities. For many, the challenge of collecting and reporting this data could further jeopardize their ability to achieve a compliant housing element.

The **City/Town of \_\_\_\_\_** urges amendments to SB 866 that ensure consistency with the existing HHAP regional planning process and do not unfairly target California's small cities, which continue to be left out of direct state homelessness funding.

For these reasons, the **City/Town of \_\_\_\_\_** respectfully **oppose your SB 866 (Blakespear) unless amended.**

Sincerely,

**NAME**

**TITLE**

**CITY/TOWN of \_\_\_\_\_**

cc. Your Senator & Assembly Member  
Your League Regional Public Affairs Manager (via email)  
League of California Cities, [cityletters@cacities.org](mailto:cityletters@cacities.org)



# Staff Report

## to the Legislative Subcommittee

Agenda  
Item  
No.3.

---

**Date:** April 15, 2026  
**From:** Carlos Zamano, City Manager  
**Reviewed By:** Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk  
**Prepared By:** Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk  
**Subject:** Senate Bill 1308 (Bogh) Constitutional Course for Legislators and Designated Staff

---

**Recommendation:**

Review and provide direction whether to send a letter of support to the Legislature.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Public Notice:**

The agenda for this item was posted at the three locations per Resolution No. 2011-047 and on the City's website.

**Background:**

SB 1308 requires legislators and legislative staff, within six months of the convening of a regular legislative session, to complete a course covering the U.S. Constitution, the California Constitution, and key principles including federalism, preemption, civil rights, and the separation of powers.

Under existing law, members and employees of the Legislature are required to complete mandatory training related to ethics, harassment and discrimination prevention, and workplace violence prevention. SB 1308 builds on that model by adding structured constitutional instruction to ensure lawmakers and staff share a clear understanding of the legal foundations that shape the legislative process.

**Attachments:**

1. Senate Bill 1308 Draft
2. SB 1308 (Bogh) Sample Letter of Support

# Attachment 1

**Introduced by Senator Ochoa Bogh**February 20, 2026

---

---

An act to add Section 9025.5 to the Government Code, relating to the Legislature.

## LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1308, as introduced, Ochoa Bogh. Legislature: constitutional course.

Existing law provides for the administration of the constitutional oath of office and seating of Members of the Legislature at the beginning of any regular session of the Legislature. Existing law requires each Member of the Legislature and each designated employee of the Legislature to attend certain orientation courses conducted by the appropriate legislative ethics committees at least once in each biennial session.

This bill would require Members and designated employees of the Legislature to attend an orientation course regarding the United States Constitution and the California Constitution, as specified. The bill would require the Legislative Counsel Bureau, in consultation with the Joint Rules Committee, to develop and conduct the course, as specified. The bill would authorize Members and designated employees of the legislature to opt out of the course if they are able to demonstrate proficient knowledge of specified topics or if they are licensed to practice law in California.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.  
State-mandated local program: no.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

1 SECTION 1. Section 9025.5 is added to the Government Code,  
2 to read:

3 9025.5. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), all Members  
4 and designated employees of the Legislature shall, in conjunction  
5 with ethics training as specified in Section 8956, attend an  
6 orientation course regarding the United States Constitution and  
7 the California Constitution.

8 (b) (1) If a Member of the Legislature assumes their seat after  
9 a regular session is convened, the Member shall attend the course  
10 within six months of assuming their seat.

11 (2) If a designated employee of the Legislature is hired after a  
12 regular session is convened, the employee shall attend the course  
13 within six months of their date of hire.

14 (c) The Legislative Counsel Bureau, in consultation with the  
15 Joint Rules Committee, shall develop and conduct the course  
16 described in subdivision (a). The course shall provide an orientation  
17 to relevant statutes and regulations, and address at a minimum the  
18 following topics: federalism, preemption, separation of powers,  
19 civil rights, the Bill of Rights, state constitutional rights and  
20 freedoms, and the roles and responsibilities of the three branches  
21 of government at the state and federal levels.

22 (d) Members and designated employees of the Legislature may  
23 opt out of the course described in subdivision (a) if either of the  
24 following requirements are met:

25 (1) The Member or employee demonstrates proficient knowledge  
26 of the topics described in subdivision (c) through an evaluation  
27 that is developed by the Legislative Counsel Bureau, in consultation  
28 with the Joint Rules Committee.

29 (2) The Member or employee is licensed to practice law in the  
30 State of California.

O

# **ATTACHMENT 2**

**[ORGANIZATION'S LETTERHEAD]**

March XX, 2026

The Honorable Thomas Umberg, Chair  
Senate Judiciary Committee  
1021 O Street, Room 3240  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 1308 – LEGISLATOR CONSTITUTIONAL COURSE • SUPPORT •**

Dear Senator Umberg,

[Organization] is pleased to support Senate Bill 1308 (Ochoa Bogh), which would require Legislators and legislative staff, to take a minimum two-hour course on the provisions of the U.S. and California Constitutions.

A mandatory course regarding the Constitutions of both the United States and the State of California would serve to inform legislative members and employees of the protections and policies that these documents outline for each branch of government, specifically related to the role and jurisdiction of the Legislature.

Ensuring that proposed legislation is in alignment with the framework of the U.S. and California Constitutions is essential to protecting the integrity of the legislative process and preserving the separation of powers that defines our democracy. To fully uphold the responsibilities described in the Oath of Office, all members and employees of the Legislature should be fully informed of the provisions of both Constitutions that they have sworn to abide by within their legislative duties.

[OPTIONAL: Add a paragraph about why your organization supports SB 1308.]

SB 1308 is an important step to strengthen the integrity of the legislative process, and we urge your AYE vote when SB 1308 is heard in your committee

Sincerely,

Signature

[NAME]

[TITLE]

[ORGANIZATION]



# Staff Report

## to the Legislative Subcommittee

Agenda  
Item  
No.4.

---

**Date:** April 15, 2026  
**From:** Carlos Zamano, City Manager  
**Reviewed By:** Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk  
**Prepared By:** Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk  
**Subject:** Assembly Bill 1678 (Harabedian) Claremont-Montclair Authority: Metro A Line Extension Project

---

**Recommendation:**

Review and provide direction whether to send an opposition letter to the Assembly Committee on Transportation.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Public Notice:**

The agenda for this item was posted at the three locations per Resolution No. 2011-047 and on the City's website.

**Background:**

Existing law establishes the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority to award and oversee all design and construction contracts for a light rail project extending from Union Station in Los Angeles to Sierra Madre Villa Boulevard in Pasadena, as well as any planned mass transit guideway along the rail right-of-way extending to the City of Montclair in San Bernardino County.

This bill would revise that authority's responsibilities by limiting the project's scope to a planned extension only as far as the City of Claremont in Los Angeles County. The bill would also create the Claremont-Montclair Construction Authority to oversee and award all design and construction contracts for the portion of the project extending from the rail tracks east of the future Claremont station to the Montclair Transit Center in the City of Montclair, San Bernardino County.

On April 1, 2026, the SBCTA Board of Directors unanimously voted to oppose the bill. Their argument being, the bill would essentially override the Board of Directors' decision to pursue enhanced Metrolink service frequency, from the Pomona North station to the Rancho Cucamonga station, remove any decision making or approval authority from SBCTA for the project to Montclair, as well as put significant agency assets and resources at risk in perpetuity.

Cal Cities has not taken a position on the bill.

**Attachments:**

1. AB1678 Draft Language
2. AB 1678 Oppose Letter Template

# Attachment 1

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 19, 2026

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE— 2025–2026 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

NO. 1678

Introduced by Assembly Member Harabedian

February 02, 2026

~~An act to amend Section 701 of the Public Utilities Code, relating to public utilities. An act to amend Sections 132400, 132410, 132415, and 132450 of, and to add Chapter 6.5 (commencing with Section 132500) to Division 12.7 of, the Public Utilities Code, relating to transportation.~~

## LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1678, as amended, Harabedian. ~~Public utilities. Claremontclair Authority: Metro A Line Extension project.~~

~~Existing law creates the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority for purposes of awarding and overseeing all design and construction contracts for completion of a light rail project extending from Union Station in the City of Los Angeles to Sierra Madre Villa Boulevard in the City of Pasadena and any mass transit guideway that may be planned along the rail right-of-way extending to the City of Montclair in the County of San Bernardino, as provided.~~

~~This bill would reduce the scope of the light rail project overseen by the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority by instead providing that the project extends to any mass transit guideway that may be planned along the rail right-of-way to the City of Claremont in the County of Los Angeles.~~

~~This bill would instead require the Claremontclair Authority (authority), which the bill would create, to award and oversee all design and construction contracts for completion of a light rail project extending from and including the rail tracks located to the east of the Claremont light rail station to be constructed by the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority and continuing to the Montclair Transit Center in the City of Montclair in the County of San Bernardino. The bill would grant the authority all the powers necessary for completion of the project, as provided. The bill would require the authority to conduct financial studies and planning and engineering necessary for completion of the project and to make reasonable progress in the design and construction of the project. The bill would require the authority to be dissolved upon completion of project construction. The bill would also make conforming changes.~~

~~This bill would require the authority to be governed by a board of 5 voting members and one nonvoting member, with the city councils of the Cities of Claremont and Montclair, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), the president of the board of directors of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), and the County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors each appointing one voting member and the Governor appointing the nonvoting member. The bill would authorize the board to appoint an executive director and authorize the executive director to appoint staff or retain consultants as necessary to carry out the duties of the authority.~~

~~This bill would require LACMTA and SBCTA to enter into an agreement with the authority to grant to the authority or hold in trust with the authority all real property and real property rights, and other assets, as necessary for the completion of the project. The bill would also require LACMTA and the authority to enter into a memorandum of understanding that specifically addresses the ability of LACMTA to review any significant changes in the scope of the design or construction, or both the design and construction, of the project. The bill would require LACMTA to assume responsibility for operating all completed phases of the project, with operation of certain portions of the project being contingent upon LACMTA entering into an operations and maintenance agreement with SBCTA, as provided.~~

~~By imposing new duties on local agencies, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.~~

~~The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.~~

~~This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to the statutory provisions noted above.~~

~~Existing law authorizes the Public Utilities Commission to supervise and regulate every public utility in the state, as specified.~~

~~This bill would make nonsubstantive changes to that authorization.~~

## Digest Key

Vote: majority Appropriation: no Fiscal Committee: ~~no~~yes Local Program: ~~no~~yes

## Bill Text

### THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

**SECTION 1.** ~~Section 132400 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:~~

132400. For purposes of this chapter, the following ~~terms have the following meanings: definitions apply:~~

(a) ~~The "authority" is "Authority"~~ means the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority created under this chapter, formerly known as the Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority.

(b) ~~The "board" is "Board"~~ means the governing board of the authority.

(c) ~~The "commission" is "Commission"~~ means the California Transportation Commission.

(d) ~~"Extension cities"~~ means the Cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, and Claremont.

~~(d) The "LACMTA" is~~

(e) "LACMTA" means the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

~~(e) The "project" is~~

(f) *"Project" means* the Los Angeles-Pasadena Foothill Extension Gold Line light rail project, formerly known as the Los Angeles-Pasadena Metro Blue Line, extending from Union Station in the City of Los Angeles to Sierra Madre Villa Boulevard in the City of Pasadena and any mass transit guideway that may be planned east of Sierra Madre Villa Boulevard along the rail right-of-way extending to the City of ~~Montclair~~. *Claremont*.

~~(f) The "extension cities" are the Cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair.~~

**SEC. 2. Section 132410 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:**

132410. (a) The authority has all of the powers necessary for planning, acquiring, leasing, developing, jointly developing, owning, controlling, using, jointly using, disposing of, designing, procuring, and building the project, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

- (1) Acceptance of grants, fees, allocations, and transfers of funds from federal, state, and local ~~agencies, as well as~~ *agencies and from* private entities.
- (2) Acquiring, through purchase or through eminent domain proceedings, any property necessary for, incidental to, or convenient for, the exercise of the powers of the authority.
- (3) Incurring indebtedness, secured by pledges of revenue available for project completion.
- (4) Contracting with public and private entities for the planning, design, and construction of the project. These contracts may be assigned separately or may be combined to include any or all tasks necessary for completion of the project.
- (5) Entering into cooperative or joint development agreements with local governments or private entities. These agreements may be entered into for the purpose of sharing costs, selling or leasing land, air, or development rights, providing for the transferring of passengers, making pooling arrangements, or for any other purpose that is necessary for, incidental to, or convenient for the full exercise of the powers granted the authority. For purposes of this paragraph, "joint development" includes, but is not limited to, an agreement with any person, firm, corporation, association, or organization for the operation of facilities or development of projects adjacent to, or physically or functionally related to, the project.
- (6) Relocation of utilities, as necessary for completion of the project.

(b) The duties of the authority include, but are not limited to, all of the following:

- (1) Conducting the financial studies and the planning and engineering necessary for completion of the project.
- (2) (A) Adoption of an administrative code, not later than 60 days after establishment of the authority, for administration of the authority in accordance with any applicable laws, including, but not limited to, the Ralph M. Brown Act (Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 54950) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code), ~~the provisions of~~ this chapter, laws generally applicable to local agency procurements and contracts, laws relating to contracting goals for minority and women business participation, and the Political Reform Act of 1974 (Title 9 (commencing with Section 81000) of the Government Code).
  - (B) (i) The administrative code adopted under subparagraph (A) shall include a code of conduct for employees and board members that is consistent with Sections 84308 and 87103 of the Government Code and prohibits board members and staff from accepting gifts valued at ten dollars (\$10) or more from contractors, potential contractors, or their subcontractors.
  - (ii) The code shall require the disclosure, on the record, of the proceedings by the officer of the agency who receives a contribution within the preceding 24 months in an amount of more than two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) from a party or participant to a proceeding, and the disclosure by the party or participant.
  - (iii) The code shall provide that no officer of the agency shall make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use ~~his or her~~ *their* official position to influence the decision in a proceeding, as described in Section 84308 of the Government Code, if the officer has willfully or knowingly received a contribution in the amount of more than two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) within the preceding 24 months from a party or ~~his or her~~ *the party's* agent, or from any participant or ~~his or her~~ *participant's* agent if the participant has a financial interest in the decision.
  - (iv) Any officer deemed ineligible to participate in a proceeding due to the ~~provisions of this~~ code of conduct may be replaced for the purposes of that proceeding by an appointee chosen by the appropriate appointing authority.
  - (v) Under the code of conduct, board members shall be deemed to have a financial interest in a decision within the meaning of Section 87100 of the Government Code if the decision involves the donor of, or intermediary or agent for a donor of, a gift or gifts aggregating ten dollars (\$10) or more in value within the 12 months ~~prior to~~ *before* the time the decision was made.
  - (vi) Board members and alternate members shall not be considered financially interested, under or for the purposes of Section 1090 of the Government Code, solely by virtue of their holding office with the authority and, concurrently, holding office with an entity set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 132415, an extension city, ~~or both such an entity and such a city~~, *the board of the Claremontclair Authority created pursuant to Chapter 6.5 (commencing with Section 132500), or any combination thereof*, and they may participate in decisions and agreements regarding the authority, any of the entities set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 132415, ~~and any of the extension cities~~. *cities, and the board of the Claremontclair Authority created pursuant to Chapter 6.5 (commencing with Section 132500)*. The participation described in this clause shall not constitute a conflict of interest under or for ~~the~~ purposes of Section 1090 of the Government Code, or an incompatible employment, activity, or enterprise under or for ~~the~~ purposes of Section 1126 of the Government Code.

(c) The authority shall make reasonable progress, as determined by the commission, in the design and construction of the project within the timetable imposed under the 1998 State Transportation Improvement Program.

**SEC. 3. Section 132415 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:**

132415. (a) The authority shall be governed by a board consisting of five voting members and four nonvoting members who shall be appointed as follows:

- (1) Three members shall be appointed by the City Councils of the Cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, and South Pasadena, with each city council appointing one member by a majority vote of the membership of that city council.
- (2) One member shall be appointed by the President of the Governing Board of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, subject to confirmation by that board.
- (3) One member shall be appointed by the LACMTA.
- (4) One nonvoting member shall be appointed by the Governor.
- (5) Two nonvoting members shall be appointed by the City Councils of the Cities of Pasadena and South Pasadena, with each city appointing one nonvoting member.
- (6) One nonvoting member shall be appointed by the president of the board of directors of the San Bernardino ~~Associated Governments~~, *County Transportation Authority*, subject to confirmation by that board.

(b) All members shall serve a term of not more than four years, with no limit on the number of terms that may be served by any person.

(c) Each appointing authority shall also appoint an alternate member to serve in a member's absence. If the position of a voting member becomes vacant, the alternate member shall serve until the position is filled as required pursuant to subdivision (a).

- (d) Members of the board are subject to the Political Reform Act of 1974 (Title 9 (commencing with Section 81000) of the Government Code).
- (e) Three members of the board shall constitute a quorum.
- (f) The board shall elect a chairperson and vice chairperson from among the membership of the board.
- (g) Each member of the board may be compensated at a rate of not more than one hundred fifty dollars (\$150) per day spent attending to the business of the authority. Compensation, if paid, shall not exceed six hundred dollars (\$600) per month, plus expenses directly related to the performance of duties imposed by the authority, including, but not limited to, travel and personal expenses.
- (h) Members appointed to the board may include members of the entities set forth in subdivision (a), ~~and~~ members of the city councils or other elected officials of the extension cities, ~~or both~~ members of the board of the Claremontclair Authority created pursuant to Chapter 6.5 (commencing with Section 132500), or any combination thereof. The simultaneous membership described in this subdivision shall not constitute a violation of Section 1099 or 1126 of the Government Code.

**SEC. 4. Section 132450 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:**

132450. (a) (1) The LACMTA shall assume responsibility for operating all completed phases of the project.

~~(2) Subject to subparagraph (A), the LACMTA shall have the authority to operate the portion of the project located in the County of San Bernardino, which extends approximately one half mile from the Los Angeles and San Bernardino County line to the Montclair Transit Center.~~

~~(A) With respect to the portion of the project on the right-of-way owned by the San Bernardino Associated Governments, the LACMTA's authority to operate the project shall be contingent upon the approval of the board of directors of the San Bernardino Associated Governments, acting as the county transportation commission, through approval of an operations and maintenance agreement with the LACMTA.~~

~~(B) The operations and maintenance agreement shall provide that the San Bernardino Associated Governments reimburse the LACMTA for the costs of operating that portion of the line located in the County of San Bernardino.~~

~~(C) Prior to the commencement of construction of the portion of the project in the County of San Bernardino, the authority shall enter into a construction agreement with the San Bernardino Associated Governments, acting as the county transportation commission.~~

~~(3)~~

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the LACMTA to allocate funds to the project beyond funds that have been allocated as of January 1, 2012.

(b) The authority shall be dissolved when project construction has been completed.

**SEC. 5. Chapter 6.5 (commencing with Section 132500) is added to Division 12.7 of the Public Utilities Code, to read:**

**CHAPTER 6.5. Claremontclair Authority**

132500. For purposes of this chapter, the following definitions apply:

(a) "Authority" means the Claremontclair Authority created under this chapter.

(b) "Board" means the governing board of the authority.

(c) "Commission" means the California Transportation Commission.

(d) "Extension cities" has the same meaning as that term is defined in Section 132400.

(e) "LACMTA" means the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

(f) "Project" means the Metro A Line Extension project, formerly a component of the Los Angeles-Pasadena Foothill Extension Gold Line light rail project described in Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 132400), extending from and including the rail tracks located to the east of the Claremont light rail station to be constructed by the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority created pursuant to Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 132400) and continuing to the Montclair Transit Center in the City of Montclair.

(g) "SBCTA" means the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority.

132501. The Claremontclair Authority is hereby created for the purpose of awarding and overseeing all design and construction contracts for completion of the project.

132502. (a) The authority has all of the powers necessary for planning, acquiring, leasing, developing, jointly developing, owning, controlling, using, jointly using, disposing of, designing, procuring, and building the project, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(1) Acceptance of grants, fees, allocations, and transfers of funds from federal, state, and local agencies and from private entities.

(2) Acquiring, through purchase or through eminent domain proceedings, any property necessary for, incidental to, or convenient for the exercise of the powers of the authority.

(3) Incurring indebtedness, secured by pledges of revenue available for project completion.

(4) Contracting with public and private entities for the planning, design, and construction of the project. These contracts may be assigned separately or may be combined to include any or all tasks necessary for completion of the project.

(5) Entering into cooperative or joint development agreements with local governments or private entities. These agreements may be entered into for the purpose of sharing costs, selling or leasing land, air, or development rights, providing for the transferring of passengers, making pooling arrangements, or for any other purpose that is necessary for, incidental to, or convenient for the full exercise of the powers granted the authority. For purposes of this paragraph, "joint development" includes, but is not limited to, an agreement with any person, firm, corporation, association, or organization for the operation of facilities or development of projects adjacent to, or physically or functionally related to, the project.

(6) Relocation of utilities, as necessary for completion of the project.

(b) The duties of the authority include, but are not limited to, all of the following:

(1) Conducting the financial studies and the planning and engineering necessary for completion of the project.

(2) (A) Adoption of an administrative code, not later than 60 days after establishment of the authority, for administration of the authority in accordance with any applicable laws, including, but not limited to, the Ralph M. Brown Act (Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 54950) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code), this chapter, laws generally applicable to local agency procurements and contracts, laws relating to contracting goals for minority and women business participation, and the Political Reform Act of 1974 (Title 9 (commencing with Section 81000) of the Government Code).

(B) (i) The administrative code adopted under subparagraph (A) shall include a code of conduct for employees and board members that is consistent with Sections 84308 and 87103 of the Government Code and prohibits board members and staff from accepting gifts valued at ten dollars (\$10) or more from contractors, potential contractors, or their subcontractors.

(ii) The code shall require the disclosure, on the record, of the proceedings by the officer of the agency who receives a contribution within the preceding 24 months in an amount of more than two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) from a party or participant to a proceeding, and the disclosure by the party or participant.

(iii) The code shall provide that no officer of the agency shall make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use the officer's official position to influence the decision in a proceeding, as described in Section 84308 of the Government Code, if the officer has willfully or knowingly received a contribution in the amount of more than two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) within the preceding 24 months from a party or the party's agent, or from any participant or the participant's agent if the participant has a financial interest in the decision.

(iv) Any officer deemed ineligible to participate in a proceeding due to the code of conduct may be replaced for the purposes of that proceeding by an appointee chosen by the appropriate appointing authority.

(v) Under the code of conduct, board members shall be deemed to have a financial interest in a decision within the meaning of Section 87100 of the Government Code if the decision involves the donor of, or intermediary or agent for a donor of, a gift or gifts aggregating ten dollars (\$10) or more in value within the 12 months before the time the decision was made.

(vi) Board members and alternate members shall not be considered financially interested, under or for the purposes of Section 1090 of the Government Code, solely by virtue of their holding office with the authority and, concurrently, holding office with an entity set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 132503, an extension city, the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority created pursuant to Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 132400), or any combination thereof, and they may participate in decisions and agreements regarding the authority, any of the entities set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 132503, any of the extension cities, and the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority created pursuant to Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 132400). The participation described in this clause shall not constitute a conflict of interest under or for purposes of Section 1090 of the Government Code, or an incompatible employment, activity, or enterprise under or for purposes of Section 1126 of the Government Code.

(c) The authority shall make reasonable progress, as determined by the commission, in the design and construction of the project.

132503. (a) The authority shall be governed by a board consisting of five voting members and one nonvoting member who shall be appointed as follows:

(1) Two members shall be appointed by the city councils of the Cities of Claremont and Montclair, with each city council appointing one member by a majority vote of the membership of that city council.

(2) One member shall be appointed by the LACMTA.

(3) One member shall be appointed by the president of the board of directors of the SBCTA, subject to confirmation by that board.

(4) One member shall be the member of the County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors whose district includes the City of Montclair.

(5) One nonvoting member shall be appointed by the Governor.

(b) All members shall serve a term of not more than four years, with no limit on the number of terms that may be served by any person.

(c) Each appointing authority shall also appoint an alternate member to serve in a member's absence. If the position of a voting member becomes vacant, the alternate member shall serve until the position is filled as required pursuant to subdivision (a).

(d) Members of the board are subject to the Political Reform Act of 1974 (Title 9 (commencing with Section 81000) of the Government Code).

(e) Three members of the board shall constitute a quorum.

(f) The board shall elect a chairperson and vice chairperson from among the membership of the board.

(g) Each member of the board may be compensated at a rate of not more than one hundred fifty dollars (\$150) per day spent attending to the business of the authority. Compensation, if paid, shall not exceed six hundred dollars (\$600) per month, plus expenses directly related to the performance of duties imposed by the authority, including, but not limited to, travel and personal expenses.

(h) Members appointed to the board may include members of the entities set forth in subdivision (a), members of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority created pursuant to Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 132400), members of the city councils or other elected officials of the extension cities, or any combination thereof. The simultaneous membership described in this subdivision shall not constitute a violation of Section 1099 or 1126 of the Government Code.

132504. (a) The board may appoint an executive director to serve at the pleasure of the authority.

(b) The executive director is exempt from all civil service provisions and shall be paid a salary established by the board.

(c) The executive director may appoint staff or retain consultants as necessary to carry out the duties of the authority.

(d) All contracts approved and awarded by the executive director shall be awarded in accordance with state laws generally applicable to local agency procurements and contracts, subject to this chapter. Awards shall be based on price or competitive negotiation, or on both of those things.

132505. The LACMTA and the SBCTA shall identify and expeditiously enter into an agreement with the authority to grant to the authority, or hold in trust with the authority, all real property and all real property rights currently owned or held by the LACMTA or the SBCTA, respectively, that are necessary for the project, as determined by the authority, until project completion, without reservation of rights, or the imposition of requirements, including, but not limited to, reviews or approvals, and any other assets accumulated in the planning, design, and construction of the project, including, but not limited to, rights-of-way, temporary construction easements, documents, third-party agreements, contracts, and design documents, as necessary for completion of the project.

132506. The authority shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the LACMTA that shall specifically address the ability of the LACMTA to review any significant changes in the scope of the design or construction, or both the design and construction, of the project. For purposes of this section, the term "significant change" means any change of mode or technology, or any other substantive change that affects the connectivity and operation of the project as part of the overall transit system operated by the LACMTA, or any combination of those things. Design and construction of a light rail project that is consistent with the current scope of the project shall not be deemed to be a significant change in the scope of the project and shall not require concurrence by the LACMTA.

132507. The authority shall not encumber any future farebox revenue anticipated from the operation of the project.

132508. The authority shall not encumber the project with any obligation that is transferable to the LACMTA upon completion of the design and construction of the project unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the LACMTA. The design and construction to be administered by the authority shall not include rolling stock, which is a component of the operation of the project and shall be administered by the LACMTA. This section does not apply to any joint development agreements, as authorized under paragraph (5) of subdivision (a) of Section 132502, that may be used to contribute to the financing of project design and construction.

132509. (a) The LACMTA shall assume responsibility for operating all completed phases of the project.

(b) Subject to paragraph (1), the LACMTA shall have the authority to operate the portion of the project located in the County of San Bernardino, which extends approximately one-half of a mile from the Los Angeles and San Bernardino county lines to the Montclair Transit Center.

*(1) With respect to the portion of the project on the right-of-way owned by the SBCTA, the LACMTA's authority to operate the project shall be contingent upon the approval of the board of directors of the SBCTA, acting as the county transportation commission, through approval of an operations and maintenance agreement with the LACMTA.*

*(2) The operations and maintenance agreement shall require the SBCTA to reimburse the LACMTA for the costs of operating that portion of the line located in the County of San Bernardino.*

*(3) The operations and maintenance agreement shall be negotiated and entered into only after the start of project construction and before the start of project operations.*

*132510. The authority shall be dissolved when project construction has been completed.*

**SEC. 6.** *If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.*

~~SECTION 1. Section 701 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:~~

~~701. The commission may supervise and regulate every public utility in the state and may do all things, whether specifically designated in this part or in addition to this part, that are necessary and convenient in the exercise of that power and jurisdiction.~~

## **Attachment 2**

DATE

The Honorable Lori D. Wilson  
Chair, Assembly Committee on Transportation  
California State Assembly  
1020 N Street, Suite 112  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: AB 1678 (Harabedian) – OPPOSE**

Dear Chair Wilson,

On behalf of **[Organization Name]**, I am writing to express our opposition to Assembly Bill (AB) 1678 by Assemblymember John Harabedian.

AB 1678 would remove the existing Metro Foothill Gold Line Construction Authority's responsibility for extending the A Line (formerly the Gold Line) beyond Claremont and create a new authority – the Claremontclair Authority (CMA) – to deliver the extension from Claremont to Montclair. While the City of [City Name] supports expanding high-quality transit service in our region, this bill raises significant legal, financial, and governance concerns and sets a troubling precedent for the State to mandate that local agencies build, fund, and operate specific projects regardless of locally adopted priorities or funding capacity.

Most concerning, AB 1678 exposes local agencies to substantial risk while limiting their authority. The bill would require the transfer of assets at the discretion of the CMA without adequate protections for local agency interests, including right-of-way protections and risk mitigation. It also grants the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) – but not affected local agencies – the authority to review significant project changes, effectively excluding local jurisdictions from meaningful oversight of a project within their own communities.

Additionally, the bill creates significant and ongoing financial exposure. Local agencies could be precluded from negotiating operations and maintenance agreements until after construction begins, effectively pre-committing them to fund operations without defined terms. This structure risks obligating local jurisdictions to cover ongoing operating costs without meaningful oversight or cost control.

These concerns are particularly significant given the history of the project, which has experienced ongoing cost escalation, repeated delays, and uncertainty regarding delivery. In response, local and regional agencies have begun advancing alternative transit

strategies that better reflect current conditions, prioritize fiscal responsibility, and deliver more reliable mobility outcomes.

AB 1678 would override these locally adopted policy directions, undermining the authority of local elected officials to determine which transportation projects are advanced and funded in their communities. It raises broader concerns regarding accountability and the responsible stewardship of limited transportation resources.

For these reasons, [Organization Name] respectfully opposes AB 1678. The bill exposes local taxpayers to significant financial risk, weakens local control, and sets a precedent that could have far-reaching implications for other regions across the state.

We remain committed to working collaboratively on transportation solutions that are fiscally responsible, locally supported, and deliver meaningful mobility improvements for the communities we serve.

If you have any questions, please contact **[Name, Title]** at **[phone/email]**.

Sincerely,

**[Name]**

**[Title]**

**[Organization Name]**

Cc: San Bernardino County Legislative Delegation  
Assembly Transportation Committee



# Staff Report

## to the Legislative Subcommittee

Agenda  
Item  
No.5.

---

**Date:** April 15, 2026  
**From:** Carlos Zamano, City Manager  
**Reviewed By:** Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk  
**Prepared By:** Alondra Muñoz, City Clerk  
**Subject:** Proposition 36 Funding - Support Request for \$400 Million in Funding for Recovery Support Services and Substance Use Treatment

---

**Recommendation:**

Review and provide direction whether to send a letter of support to include this funding in the final FY 2026-27 State Budget.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Public Notice:**

The agenda for this item was posted at the three locations per Resolution No. 2011-047 and on the City's website.

**Background:**

In 2024, California voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition 36, the Homelessness, Drug Addiction, and Theft Reduction Act, to address rising concerns related to retail theft, substance use, and repeat offenses. The measure established a new treatment-mandated felony framework intended to prioritize both accountability and access to rehabilitation services for offenders.

Following its passage, the State allocated approximately \$100 million to initiate implementation efforts. However, no funding was designated for probation services, which play a critical role in supervising offenders, ensuring compliance with court-ordered treatment, and supporting long-term behavioral change.

The current \$400 million budget request seeks to address these gaps by expanding treatment capacity, including in-custody services, and strengthening individualized assessment, supervision, and monitoring. These investments are essential for cities, which are often on the front lines of addressing public safety and quality-of-life impacts associated with homelessness, substance abuse, and retail theft.

In support of these efforts, League of California Cities (Cal Cities) is advocating for approval of the \$400 million request led by Stephanie Nguyen and Catherine Blakespear, and has formally testified in favor of the funding before an Assembly Budget Subcommittee.

**Attachments:**

1. Sample Letter Prop-36 Funding Request

**\*\*\*CITY LETTERHEAD\*\*\***

**DATE**

The Honorable James Ramos  
Chair, Senate Budget Sub #5  
1021 O Street, Suite 7340  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Laura Richardson  
Chair, Assembly Budget Sub #6  
1021 O Street, Suite 8310  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Proposition 36 Funding – Support Request for \$400 Million in Funding for Recovery Support Services and Substance Use Treatment**

Dear Honorable Members,

The **City/Town of \_\_\_\_\_** writes in strong support of the budget requests signed by Assembly Member Stephanie Nguyen and Senator Catherine Blakespear for additional funding in the amount of \$400 million for probation and other services that are critical in the implementation of Proposition 36.

As you know, California voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 36 (2024), the Homelessness, Drug Addiction, and Theft Reduction Act. This important measure made changes to drug and property theft crimes and created a new Treatment-Mandated Felony to address the surge in retail theft and shoplifting.

Funding to fully implement Proposition 36 is a top priority for our city. We are appreciative of the \$115 million that was provided last year for the courts and behavioral health. However, more funding is needed to actualize the will of the voters.

Specifically, we support the request for \$400 million to address the services needed to help ensure that treatment, when accompanied by supervision can increase the chances of successful rehabilitation. These investments are necessary to expand service capacity, secure in-custody treatment, and allow for individualized planning and monitoring for those in our communities. Absent real consequences and accountability, local governments cannot maximize treatment success.

**INSERT CITY SPECIFIC REASONS FOR THIS PROP 36 FUNDING REQUEST**

For these reasons, the **City/Town of \_\_\_\_\_** urges the Legislature to include this important funding in the final FY 2026-27 State Budget and continue the progress being made in addressing retail theft, shoplifting and other crime in our communities.

Sincerely,

**NAME**

**TITLE**

**CITY/TOWN of \_\_\_\_\_**

cc. Your Senator & Assembly Member  
Your League Regional Public Affairs Manager (via email)  
League of California Cities, [cityletters@cacities.org](mailto:cityletters@cacities.org)