1400 K Street, Suite 400 • Sacramento, California 95814
Phone: 916.658.8200 Fax: 916.658.8240
www.cacities.org

August 26, 2005

Notice of League Annual Meeting and Transmittal of Resolutions Packet

To:
1) Mayors and City Managers
2) Members of the League Board of Directors
3) Members of League Policy Committees
4) Members of the League's General Resolutions Committee

Meeting Notice

The League of California Cities' 2005 Annual Conference will occur on October 6 - 8 at the Moscone Convention Center West, 800 Howard Street, San Francisco, California. **The League's Concluding General Session / General Assembly will meet on Saturday morning at 10:00 a.m., October 8. The estimated start time for the Annual Business Meeting and discussion of resolutions is 10:30 a.m.**

Conference registration information has been previously sent to each city and is available at www.cacities.org/ac.

Packet Distribution

Note to City Managers and City Clerks: Please distribute this packet immediately to the mayor and voting delegate, as well as other city officials planning to attend the conference. If your city needs additional copies, we encourage you to make copies of this packet or print a copy from the League's website (www.cacities.org/resolutions). Only a limited number of additional copies will be available at the conference.

Packet Contents

At the conference, seven policy committees, the General Resolutions Committee and the League's General Assembly (comprised of designated voting delegates from each city) will consider the enclosed eight resolutions. This packet contains information relating to the General Assembly's decision-making processes:

I. Information and Procedures
II. Guidelines for Annual Conference Resolutions
III. Location of Meetings
IV. Membership of General Resolutions Committee
V. History of Resolutions
VI. Annual Conference Resolutions (8)

We look forward to seeing everyone at the conference.

Please Bring This Packet to the Annual Conference
October 5 – 8, San Francisco

I.
INFORMATION AND PROCEDURES

RESOLUTIONS CONTAINED IN THIS PACKET. The League bylaws provide that resolutions shall be referred by the president to an appropriate policy committee for review and recommendation. Resolutions with committee recommendations shall then be referred to the General Resolutions Committee at the Annual Conference.

This year, eight resolutions have been introduced for consideration by the Annual Conference and referred to the League policy committees. Please note that some resolutions have been referred to more than one policy committee for consideration.

POLICY COMMITTEES. Seven policy committees will meet at the Annual Conference. With the exception of the Community Services Policy Committee (which has no resolution assigned to it), all other policy committees will meet on **Thursday, October 6**. The committees that met on Thursdays will meet from 8:30 a.m. – 9:15 a.m. The committees that met on Fridays, will meet from 9:30 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. The sponsors of the resolutions were notified of the time and location of the meeting. Please see page iii for the meeting schedule.

After resolutions are reviewed, recommendations will be made to the General Resolutions Committee.

THE GENERAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE will meet at 1:30 p.m., on Friday, October 7, at the Moscone Convention Center West, San Francisco, to consider the reports of the seven policy committees regarding the eight resolutions. This committee includes one representative from each of the League's regional divisions, functional departments, and standing policy committees, as well as additional city officials appointed by the League president.
THE CONCLUDING GENERAL SESSION / GENERAL ASSEMBLY will convene at 10:00 a.m. on Saturday, October 8, at the Moscone Convention Center West. The estimated start time of the Annual Business Meeting, to consider the report of the General Resolutions Committee, is 10:30 a.m.

Resolutions considered by the General Assembly will retain the numbers assigned to them in this document.

INITIATIVE RESOLUTIONS. For those issues that develop **after** the normal 60-day deadline, a resolution may be introduced with a petition signed by designated voting delegates of 10 percent of all member cities (48 valid signatures required) and presented to the Voting Delegates Desk no later than 24 hours prior to the time set for convening the Annual Business Session of the General Assembly. This year, the **deadline** is **10:30 a.m., Friday, October 7.** If the parliamentarian finds that a petitioned resolution is substantially similar in substance to a resolution already under consideration, the petitioned resolution will be disqualified.

Resolutions can be viewed on the League's website: www.cacities.org/resolutions.

Any questions concerning the resolutions procedure should be directed to Linda Welch Hicks at the League office: lhicks@cacities.org or (916) 658-8224.

Pat Eklund, President
League of California Cities
Council Member, Novato

II.
GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

Policy development is a vital and ongoing process within the League. The principal means for deciding policy on the important issues facing cities and the League is through the standing policy committees and the board of directors. The process allows for timely consideration of issues in a changing environment and assures city officials the opportunity to both initiate and influence policy decisions.

This influence may be exercised directly through participation as a policy committee member or as a city official visiting a committee meeting to advance a position on an issue under the committee's purview. If committee membership or personal attendance is not feasible, city officials may affect policy decisions indirectly through department or division representatives on the policy committees or the board of directors.

Annual conference resolutions constitute an additional process for developing League policies. It is recommended that resolutions adhere to the following criteria.

Guidelines for Annual Conference Resolutions

1. Only issues that have a direct bearing on municipal affairs should be considered or adopted at the Annual Conference.

2. The issue is not of a purely local or regional concern.

3. The recommended policy should not simply restate existing League policy.

4. The resolution should be directed at achieving one of the following objectives:

   (a) Focus public or media attention on an issue of major importance to cities.

   (b) Establish a new direction for League policy by establishing general principals around which more detailed policies may be developed by policy committees and the Board of Directors.

   (c) Consider important issues not adequately addressed by the policy committees and Board of Directors.

   (d) Amend the League bylaws.

III.
LOCATION OF MEETINGS

Policy Committee Meetings

Thursday, October 6, 2005
Moscone Convention Center West
800 Howard Street (4th & Howard St)
San Francisco, California 94103
(415) 974-4000

8:30 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.	9:30 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.
Employee Relations	Administrative Services
Housing, Community & Economic Development	Environmental Quality
Public Safety	Revenue and Taxation
(**Note**: Community Services will not meet as no resolutions were referred to this committee.)	Transportation, Communication & Public Works

General Resolutions Committee

Friday, October 7, 2005, 1:30 p.m.
Moscone Convention Center West
800 Howard Street, San Francisco

General Assembly at the Annual Business Meeting

Saturday, October 8, 2005, 10 a.m.
Concluding General Session begins at 10 a.m.
NOTE: Estimated start time for Business Meeting and discussion of resolutions is 10:30 a.m.
Moscone Convention Center West
800 Howard Street, San Francisco

Partial List

IV.

League of California Cities

2005 GENERAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Annual Conference – Moscone Convention Center West, San Francisco – October 5 – 8, 2005
(Committee Meeting: October 7, 2005, 1:30 p.m.)

Chair: Maria Alegria, Council Member, Pinole
Vice Chair: Larry Clark, Mayor, Rancho Palos Verdes
Parliamentarian: Arlen Gregorio, Mediator, San Francisco

Cynthia Adams, Council Member, Aliso Viejo
Harry Armstrong, Council Member, Clovis
Lou Bone, Mayor, Tustin
Bill Brown, Chief of Police, Lompoc
Jim Bruno, Council Member, Westlake Village
John Chlebnik, Council Member, Calimesa
Jeff Clet, Fire Chief, San Jose
JoAnne Cousino, City Clerk, Barstow
Iya Falcone, Council Member, Santa Barbara
Joe Fernekes, Mayor Pro Tem, So. San Francisco
Tony Ferrara, Mayor, Arroyo Grande
Sharon Fierro, Community Dev. Dir., Campbell
Alice Fredericks, Council Member, Tiburon
Lois Gaston, Council Member, Duarte
Curt Hagman, Council Member, Chino Hills
Kathy Hicks, Council Member, Walnut Creek
Joe Kellejian, Mayor, Solano Beach
Jeff Kolin, City Manager, Santa Rosa
Linn Livingston, HR Director, San Bernardino
Robert Locke, Finance & Admin. Svcs. Dir., Mt. View
Robin Lowe, Vice Mayor, Hemet
Paul Luellig, Mayor Pro Tem, Barstow
Marsha McLean, Council Member, Santa Clarita
E. Timothy Parker, Mayor Pro Tem, Newman
Lisa Rapp, Public Works Director, Lakewood
Michael Roush, City Attorney, Pleasanton
Robert Rumfelt, Mayor, Lakeport
Sedalia Sanders, Council Member, El Centro
Arne Simonsen, Council Member, Antioch
Bill Spriggs, Council Member, Merced
Ron Swegles, Vice Mayor, Sunnyvale
Miguel Ucovich, Council Member, Loomis
Lori Van Arsdale, Council Member, Hemet
Ana Ventura-Phares, Mayor, Watsonville
A. Kay Vinson, City Clerk, Murrieta
Benjamin Wong, Mayor Pro Tem, West Covina
Laura Wright, Sr. Administrative Analyst, Pittsburg

V.
HISTORY OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolutions have been grouped by policy committees to which they have been assigned.

KEY TO REVIEWING BODIES

1. Policy Committee
2. General Resolutions Committee
3. General Assembly

Action Footnotes

* Subject matter covered in another resolution

** Existing League policy

*** Local authority presently exists

KEY TO ACTIONS TAKEN

A -	Approve
D -	Disapprove
N -	No Action
R -	Refer to appropriate policy committee for study
a -	Amend
Aa -	Approve as amended
Aaa -	Approve with additional amendment(s)
Ra -	Amend and refer as amended to appropriate policy committee for study
Raa -	Additional amendments and refer
Da -	Amend (for clarity or brevity) and Disapprove
Na -	Amend (for clarity or brevity) and take No Action
W -	Withdrawn by Sponsor

Procedural Note: Resolutions that are approved by the General Resolutions Committee, as well as all qualified petitioned resolutions, are reported to the floor of the General Assembly. In addition, League policy provides the following procedure for resolutions approved by League policy committees but *not* approved by the General Resolutions Committee.

Every resolution initially recommended for approval and adoption by all the League policy committees to which the resolution is assigned, but subsequently recommended for disapproval, referral or no action by the General Resolutions Committee, shall then be placed on a consent agenda for consideration by the General Assembly. The consent agenda shall include a brief description of the bases for the recommendations by both the policy committee(s) and General Resolutions Committee, as well as the recommended action by each. Any voting delegate may make a motion to pull a resolution from the consent agenda in order to request the opportunity to fully debate the resolution. If, upon a majority vote of the General Assembly, the request for debate is approved, the General Assembly shall have the opportunity to debate and subsequently vote on the resolution.

Resolutions have been grouped by policy committees to which they have been assigned. Please note that some resolutions may have been assigned to more than one committee.
These resolutions are noted by this sign (◆).

Number	Key Word Index	Reviewing Body Action		
		1	2	3

1 - Policy Committee Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee
2 - General Resolutions Committee
3 - General Assembly

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
1	Publication of Home Addresses & Telephone Numbers of Elected & Appointed Officials			

COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
Note	No resolutions were assigned to this policy committee.			

EMPLOYEE RELATIONS POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
2	Public Sector Mentoring Program			

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
◆3	Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use			
◆4	Voluntary Statewide Residential Green Building Guidelines			
◆5	Urban Environmental Accords Adopted by United Nations World Environmental Day			

HOUSING, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
◆3	Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use			
◆4	Voluntary Statewide Residential Green Building Guidelines			
◆5	Urban Environmental Accords Adopted by United Nations World Environmental Day			

PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
6	Sexual Predators			
◆7	Proposition 172			

REVENUE AND TAXATION POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
◆7	Proposition 172			

TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC WORKS POLICY COMMITTEE

		1	2	3
◆5	Urban Environmental Accords Adopted bt United Nations World Environmental Day			
8	Broadband Internet Access			

RESOLUTIONS INITIATED BY PETITION

		General Resolutions Committee Recommendation	General Assembly Action

VI
2005 ANNUAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION REFERRED TO ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

1. RESOLUTION RELATING TO PUBLICATION OF HOME ADDRESSES AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS OF ELECTED AND APPOINTED OFFICIALS

Source: City of Tustin
Referred to: Administrative Services Policy Committee
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:

WHEREAS, The Public Safety Officials Home Protection Act of 2002 added provisions to Government Code § 6254.21 that prohibit any person from knowingly posting the home address or telephone number of any elected or appointed official, or the official's residing spouse or child, on the Internet knowing that the person is an elected or appointed official and intending to cause imminent great bodily harm to that individual; and

WHEREAS, elected and appointed officials are not protected in a similar manner from publication of their home address or telephone number in a newspaper or similar periodical; and

WHEREAS, elected and appointed officials, as defined in § 6254.21, do receive threats and have become the target of violence at their homes, and the unauthorized publication of their home addresses or telephone numbers in newspapers or similar periodicals in ads or articles, like publication on the Internet, is a threat to the security of public officials in their homes; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 6254.21 should be amended or other legislation enacted which prohibits the unauthorized publication of the home addresses or telephone numbers of elected and appointed officials in newspapers or similar periodicals or otherwise provides protection to elected and appointed officials from such unauthorized publication; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities, assembled in Annual Conference in San Francisco, October 8, 2005, that the League support legislation to extend or provide protection to elected and appointed officials from the publication of their home addresses or telephone numbers in newspapers or similar periodicals.

>>>>>>>>>>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESOLUTION NO. 1

SOURCE: CITY OF TUSTIN
TITLE: RESOLUTION RELATING TO PUBLICATION OF HOME ADDRESSES AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS OF ELECTED AND APPOINTED OFFICIALS
Background:

The Public Safety Officials Home Protection Act of 2002 amended State law to prohibit the posting of the name, address or telephone number of any elected official, or the official's residing spouse or child, on the Internet knowing that the person is an elected official and intending to cause imminent bodily harm to that individual.

Elected officials are not protected in a similar manner from publication of their home addresses or telephone numbers in a newspaper or similar periodical. Being an elected official carries a responsibility to be accessible to the public. Letters, emails, conducting public hearings, public input at public meetings, voice messages, etc., are means to communicate with elected officials. More than ever, elected officials are subject to public scrutiny and interface with the public through traditional means and with interactive technology.

At the same time, citizen legislators should expect reasonable privacy in their homes and be secure in the feeling that their public official status does not endanger themselves or their families. Unfortunately, carrying out their duties as elected officials can give rise to situations where some persons are dissatisfied to the point of inappropriate conduct towards elected officials. Elected officials do at times make decisions regarding regulatory measures, authorize litigation and affect the lives of individuals through discretionary decision making. Discharging these duties does at times upset some individuals.

Elected officials should not have to unduly fear for their safety or that of their families when discharging their duties.

If this resolution is enacted by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities, the League would support legislation to simply extend protection to elected officials that currently exists for the Internet to newspapers and other periodicals.

////////

RESOLUTION REFERRED TO EMPLOYEE RELATIONS POLICY COMMITTEE

2. RESOLUTION RELATING TO PUBLIC SECTOR MENTORING PROGRAM

Source: Personnel and Employee Relations Department
Referred to: Employee Relations Policy Committee
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:

WHEREAS, many public sector employees will retire from service within the next five to ten years; and

WHEREAS, the impact of these vacancies due to the loss of qualified staff and institutional knowledge will be particularly evident in critical positions such as department heads, managers, and supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the community of public sector employers on whole are faced with serious issues regarding new recruitment and vacancies in critical positions in local government; and

WHEREAS, the community of public sector employers are faced with the absence of a comprehensive, statewide, succession-planning strategy; and

WHEREAS, the lack of succession planning impacts all city departments of local governing agencies from public safety to miscellaneous employees; and

WHEREAS, one of the most efficient strategies to develop internal talent pools to fill critical vacancies within a local government agency is a comprehensive Mentoring Program; and

WHEREAS, the Personnel and Employee Relations Department of the League of California Cities has developed a model Mentoring Program from which public agencies may benefit; and

WHEREAS, all Departments of the League of California Cities will benefit from a Mentoring Program that addresses succession planning and staff development issues; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities assembled in Annual Conference in San Francisco, October 8, 2005, that the League support a statewide Mentoring Program that can be accessed via the League's website ; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the League support all local government succession planning and mentoring efforts, encourage each League Department to actively discuss and encourage such efforts, encourage each public agency to establish succession plans and mentoring programs, and to use the Personnel and Employee Relations Department Mentoring Program as a model.

>>>>>>>>>>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESOLUTION NO. 2

SOURCE: PERSONNEL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS DEPARTMENT
TITLE: RESOLUTION RELATING TO PUBLIC SECTOR MENTORING PROGRAM.
Background:

This resolution is the result of the Personnel and Employee Relations Department's ongoing efforts to establish a comprehensive, statewide mentoring program. The objective of the Mentorship program is to establish a database of qualified Human Resources professionals, and other professionals from all areas of public service, to provide guidance and career counseling for individuals seeking to advance their public sector professions.

The Mentoring Program seeks trained professionals with sufficient qualifications to become *Mentors*, and who are willing to advise others seeking car career advancement in the public sector. The Mentoring Program would also seek to pair the Mentors with individuals needing professional guidance on advancing their careers in the public sector. Qualified individuals would be listed in a database, which would be available through the League of California Cities Website. Individuals seeking to advance and/or develop further as a public sector professional would be linked to qualified Mentors approved by the Employee Relations Department's Executive Board.

The Employee Relations Executive Board Officers are anticipating a large number of public sector professionals to retire in the next 5 to 10 years, and public agencies do not have a sufficiently qualified pool of candidates to fill the expected vacancies. Through a comprehensive Mentoring Program, future professionals in all areas of public service would have a resource to assist in their career development; public agencies would have a resource that assists them in creating future leaders to fill critical and important positions. The expected results of this program are the following:

- A sharing of public institutional knowledge that transcends a variety of fields in public sector.
- Development of the next wave of professionals and managers in the public sector.
- Increase in the quality of professionals in the public sector to address the workforce that will be retiring in the next 5 to 10 years.

The Personnel and Employee Relations Department has sponsored a resolution to call attention to the mentoring program and necessity for succession planning efforts in each public agency in the State. The League has and will continue to fight funding issues on the part of public agencies. The lack of qualified leaders and staff is just as critical. The Employee Relations Department strongly urges the League of California Cities to support the Mentoring Program and to actively encourage each public agency to support and engage in mentoring and succession planning efforts.

////////

RESOLUTION REFERRED TO ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY POLICY COMMITTEE

◆3. RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE AHWAHNEE WATER PRINCIPLES FOR RESOURCE-EFFICIENT LAND USE

Source: Jake Mackenzie, Mayor, Rohnert Park
Referred to: Environmental Quality and Housing, Community & Economic Development Policy Committees
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:
- Environmental Quality Policy Committee:
- Housing, Community & Economic Development Policy Committee:

WHEREAS, cities are facing major challenges with water contamination, storm water runoff, flood damage liability, and concerns about whether there will be enough reliable water for current residents as well as for new development, issues that impact city budgets and taxpayers; and

WHEREAS, land use decisions made at the local level have major impacts on local, regional, and state water resources in terms of quality, quantity, and availability; and

WHEREAS, the Local Government Commission, in partnership with the League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties, sought funding from the State Water Resources Control Board to develop principles related to water-efficiency and land use; and

WHEREAS, the Local Government Commission developed a set of principles known as the *Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use* which address the disconnect between local land use decisions and water resources, and which complement the earlier *Ahwahnee Principles for Resource-Efficient Communities*; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities assembled in Annual Conference in San Francisco, October 8, 2005, that the League encourage its member cities to adopt the *Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use* and to implement the Principles in their future land use decisions.

Attachment: *Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use*

>>>>>>>>>>

The Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use

Preamble

Cities and counties are facing major challenges with water contamination, storm water runoff, flood damage liability, and concerns about whether there will be enough reliable water for current residents as well as for new development. These issues impact city and county budgets and taxpayers. Fortunately there are a number of stewardship actions that cities and counties can take that reduce costs and improve the reliability and quality of our water resources.

The Water Principles below complement the Ahwahnee Principles for Resource-Efficient Communities that were developed in 1991. Many cities and counties are already using them to improve the vitality and prosperity of their communities.

Community Principles

1. Community design should be compact, mixed use, walkable and transit-oriented so that automobile-generated urban runoff pollutants are minimized and the open lands that absorb water are preserved to the maximum extent possible. (See the Ahwahnee Principles for Resource-Efficient Communities)

2. Natural resources such as wetlands, flood plains, recharge zones, riparian areas, open space, and native habitats should be identified, preserved and restored as valued assets for flood protection, water quality improvement, groundwater recharge, habitat, and overall long-term water resource sustainability.

3. Water holding areas such as creek beds, recessed athletic fields, ponds, cisterns, and other features that serve to recharge groundwater, reduce runoff, improve water quality and decrease flooding should be incorporated into the urban landscape.

4. All aspects of landscaping from the selection of plants to soil preparation and the installation of irrigation systems should be designed to reduce water demand, retain runoff, decrease flooding, and recharge groundwater.

5. Permeable surfaces should be used for hardscape. Impervious surfaces such as driveways, streets, and parking lots should be minimized so that land is available to absorb storm water, reduce polluted urban runoff, recharge groundwater and reduce flooding.

6. Dual plumbing that allows grey water from showers, sinks and washers to be reused for landscape irrigation should be included in the infrastructure of new development.

7. Community design should maximize the use of recycled water for appropriate applications including outdoor irrigation, toilet flushing, and commercial and industrial processes. Purple pipe should be installed in all new construction and remodeled buildings in anticipation of the future availability of recycled water.

8. Urban water conservation technologies such as low-flow toilets, efficient clothes washers, and more efficient water-using industrial equipment should be incorporated in all new construction and retrofitted in remodeled buildings.

9. Ground water treatment and brackish water desalination should be pursued when necessary to maximize locally available, drought-proof water supplies.

Implementation Principles

1. Water supply agencies should be consulted early in the land use decision-making process regarding technology, demographics and growth projections.

2. City and county officials, the watershed council, LAFCO, special districts and other stakeholders sharing watersheds should collaborate to take advantage of the benefits and synergies of water resource planning at a watershed level.

3. The best, multi-benefit and integrated strategies and projects should be identified and implemented before less integrated proposals, unless urgency demands otherwise.

4. From start to finish, projects and programs should involve the public, build relationships, and increase the sharing of and access to information.

5. Plans, programs, projects and policies should be monitored and evaluated to determine if the expected results are achieved and to improve future practices.

Authors:	Celeste Cantu	Martha Davis	Jennifer Hosterman
	Susan Lien Longville	Jake Mackenzie	Jonas Minton
	Mary Nichols	Virginia Porter	Al Wanger
	Robert Wilkinson	Kevin Wolf	

Editor: Judy Corbett

For more information, contact the LGC Center for
Livable Communities: 916-448-1198, ext 321

© Copyright 2005, Local Government Commission, Sacramento CA 95814

======

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESOLUTION NO. 3

SOURCE: JAKE MACKENZIE, MAYOR, ROHNERT PARK
TITLE: RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE AHWAHNEE WATER PRINCIPLES FOR RESOURCE-EFFICIENT LAND USE

Background:

The Local Government Commission, in partnership with the League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties, sought funding from the State Water Resources Control Board to develop principles related to water-efficiency and land use. The Local Government Commission developed a set of principles known as the *Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use* which address the disconnect between local land use decisions and water resources, and which complement the earlier Ahwahnee Principles for Resource-Efficient Communities The Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use provide cities with a framework to reduce the impact that their growth decisions can have on the quality and quantity of their water resources.

Maintaining adequate water supplies and water quality, and protecting the beneficial uses of water, depends largely on land use decisions made by local government. Land use choices either cause or avoid physical impacts to aquatic, wetland, riparian habitat and habitat connectivity, construction and post-construction urban pollution, and alteration of flow regimes and groundwater recharge. The distribution of impervious surfaces and design of storm drain collector systems also have both immediate and long-term impacts on aquatic resources

watershed-wide.

All in all, the current disconnect between water supplies and quality and land-use regulation has resulted in chronic permitting conflicts, costly regulatory delays, and inadequate resource protection. After-the-fact regulatory control is at best a partial substitute for resource-sensitive planning that assures the efficient use of water and avoids environmental degradation.

To make matters worse, political jurisdictions rarely correspond to physical watersheds, and cross-jurisdictional coordination and cooperation is rare or nonexistent. The relationship between land use and water will become increasingly critical given California's projected population growth and urbanization. The Local Government Commission believes that it is extremely important to inform local elected officials about their critical role in addressing future water supplies and the protection of other beneficial uses.

For these reasons, we encourage the League of California Cities to adopt this resolution endorsing the Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use, and support adoption of the Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource-Efficient Land Use by its member cities, and implementation of the Principles in their future land use decisions.

In 2003, local elected officials from throughout the state indicated interest in the principles and support for the proposal to the SWRCB, including:

Aliso Viejo Councilmember Karl Warkomski
Buena Park Councilmember Art Brown
Buenaventura Councilmember Neil Andrews
Carlsbad Mayor Ramona Finnila
Cloverdale Councilmember Robert Jehn
Davis Councilmember Michael Harrington
Imperial Beach Councilmember Patricia McCoy
Irvine Councilmember Beth Krom
Loomis Councilmember Walt Scherer
Los Angeles Councilmember Ruth Galanter
Modesto Mayor Carmen Sabatino
Monterey County Supervisor Edith Johnsen
Napa County Supervisor Diane Dillon
Pinole Councilmember Maria Alegria
Placer County Supervisor Harriet White
Pleasanton Councilmember Jennifer Hosterman
Redwood City Mayor Richard Claire
Richmond Vice Mayor Tom Butt
Rolling Hills Estates Councilmember John Addleman
Rohnert Park Councilmember Jake Mackenzie
St. Helena Mayor Ken Slavens
San Bernardino Councilmember Susan Lien Longville
San Jose Councilmember Linda LeZotte
San Luis Obispo Councilmember Christine Mulholland
San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Shirley Bianchi
Santa Clara Councilmember John McLemore
Santa Monica Mayor Richard Bloom
Santa Rosa Vice Mayor Jane Bender
Sonoma Councilmember Larry Barnett
South Gate Mayor Hector De La Torre
Stanislaus County Supervisor Pat Paul
Tehama County Supervisor Barbara McIver
Ukiah Councilmember Mari Rodin
Ventura County Supervisor Kathy Long
Watsonville Mayor Richard de la Paz
Woodside Councilmember David Tanner
Visalia Mayor Jesus Gamboa
Metropolitan Water District Boardmember Judy Abdo

////////

◆4. RESOLUTION RELATING TO VOLUNTARY STATEWIDE RESIDENTIAL GREEN BUILDING GUIDELINES

Source: Easy Bay Division
Referred to: Environmental Quality Policy Committee and Housing, Community and Economic Development Policy Committees
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:
- Environmental Quality Policy Committee:
- Housing, Community and Economic Development Policy Committee:

WHEREAS, California cities strive to preserve and improve the natural and built environment of communities in California, protecting the health of their residents and visitors while fostering their economy; and

WHEREAS, the "green building" concept is a whole systems approach to the design, construction and operation of buildings that employs materials and methods that promote natural resource conservation, energy and water efficiency and good indoor air quality; and

WHEREAS, green buildings benefit building industry professionals, residents and communities by improving construction quality, increasing building durability, reducing utility, maintenance, water and energy costs, creating healthier homes and enhancing comfort and livability; and

WHEREAS, in recent years, green building design, construction, and operational techniques have become increasingly widespread in California and the nation, with many homeowners, businesses, and building professionals voluntarily seeking to incorporate green building techniques into their projects; and

WHEREAS, the Alameda County Waste Management Authority had developed a series of voluntary Green Building Guidelines designed specifically for the residential building industry (*New Home Construction, Home Remodeling, Multifamily*; and

WHEREAS, the practices contained in these residential Green Building Guidelines were selected for their viability in today's market and their ability to promote sustainable buildings and communities; and

WHEREAS, a number of cities and counties throughout California have used these guidelines and;

WHEREAS, to provide regional and statewide consistency, the State Green Residential Environmental Action Team (GREAT) under the leadership of the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) is developing voluntary, statewide Residential Green Building Guidelines based on Alameda County's guidelines; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities assembled in Annual Conference in San Francisco, October 8, 2005, that the League support the voluntary inclusion of green building design and strategies in residential public and private development projects; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the League endorse voluntary, statewide Residential Green Building

Guidelines as developed by GREAT and CIWMB; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the League encourage cities to adopt the statewide residential guidelines as a reference guide and explore incentives to encourage their use by private developers of residential construction projects.

>>>>>>>>>>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESOLUTION NO. 4

SOURCE: EAST BAY DIVISION
TITLE: RESOLUTION RELATING TO VOLUNTARY STATEWIDE RESIDENTIAL GREEN BUILDING GUIDELINES
Background:

In order to meet expected California population growth, approximately 220,000 housing units will need to be added annually until 2020. According to the State of California this growth and housing development will have significant impacts in terms of energy consumption, waste generation, water use, transportation, and other quality of life factors. An effective way to reduce these impacts is by incorporating green building in projects.

Green building is one of the fastest growing trends in the building industry, according to *Better Homes & Gardens* magazine. Interest in green building spans the public, private and nonprofit sectors. Local governments in California, such as City of Santa Monica and the Alameda County Waste Management Authority, have developed green building guidelines and educational programs. The California Building Industry Association created the California Green Builder program, and the National Association of Homebuilders released guidelines this year. The U.S. Green Building Council developed the LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) rating system, which is being used for institutional and commercial buildings nationally.

The State of California is leading by example by requiring all State buildings to be constructed to a LEED Silver standard (Governor's Executive Order #S-20-04) and by promoting the Collaborative for High Performance Schools.

What is green building? In a nutshell, green building means taking steps to create buildings that are safe and healthy for people and that protect our environment. For example, proper orientation of homes on a site can significantly reduce the heating and cooling energy that is required year after year. Recycled-content decking, reclaimed lumber and other products put waste to good use, while providing quality and durability that often exceed conventional materials. Advanced framing techniques can substantially reduce lumber requirements without compromising structural integrity. Using low-emitting interior finishes and designing for sufficient ventilation will contribute to better indoor air quality. While specific methods and products may vary from project to project, the basic principles of green building apply to all types of new construction and renovation, from remodeling a kitchen to constructing a courthouse.

What are the benefits of green building? Green building promotes a whole-systems approach to the planning, design, construction and operation of buildings. This comprehensive approach benefits communities, residents and businesses by:

- Improving construction quality and increasing building longevity
- Reducing utility, maintenance and infrastructure costs

- Protecting the health of workers and residents
- Enhancing quality of life in our communities
- Supporting manufacturers and suppliers of resource-efficient building products

What are Residential Green Building Guidelines? Residential Green Building Guidelines educate builders, homeowners and municipalities about cost-effective green building practices that are applicable to home construction methods in California. The Guidelines were first developed through a collaborative partnership among builders, green building experts and government staff in Alameda County.

The New Home Construction Guidelines are being revised to be applicable throughout California and compatible with all available third party verification programs. An interagency state task force led by the California Integrated Waste Management Board, including the California Air Resources Board, California Energy Commission, and Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is providing technical guidance. Numerous local governments have also contributed to its development.

Why the need for Residential Guidelines? Residential Guidelines will facilitate sustainable home construction practices by:

- Providing local governments with a ready-to-use educational tool
- Offering a range of green homebuilding practices from simple to sophisticated
- Encouraging statewide consistency to increase predictability for builders
- Providing a way for builders to differentiate themselves in the marketplace

EAST BAY DIVISION ACTION
At their Board of Directors meeting on June 16, 2005, the East Bay Division unanimously approved the attached Resolution supporting the Voluntary Statewide Residential Green Building Guidelines

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Environmental Quality Policy Committee recommend to the General Resolutions Committee adoption of the Voluntary Statewide Residential Green Building Guidelines Resolution:

- Supporting the inclusion of green building design and strategies in public and private development projects
- Encouraging the California Integrated Waste Management Board to take a leadership role in providing model statewide residential guidelines
- Encouraging cities in California to adopt voluntary residential guidelines, evaluate available third party verification programs, and explore incentives to encourage green building by private developers of residential construction projects

////////

◆5. RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL ACCORDS ADOPTED AT UNITED NATIONS WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

Source: Gavin Newsom, Mayor, San Francisco
Referred to: Environmental Quality; Housing, Community and Economic Development; and Transportation, Communication and Public Works Policy Committees
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:
- Environmental Quality Policy Committee:
- Housing, Community and Economic Development Policy Committee:
- Transportation, Communication and Public Works Policy Committee:

WHEREAS, for the first time in history, the majority of the planet's population now live in cities and that continued urbanization will result in one million people moving to cities each week, thus creating a new set of environmental challenges and opportunities; and

WHEREAS, mayors of cities around the globe have a unique opportunity to provide leadership to develop truly sustainable urban centers based on culturally and economically appropriate local actions; and

WHEREAS, the Urban Environmental Accords, which were developed as part of United Nations World Environment Day 2005 and signed in San Francisco on June 5, 2005, comprise 21 actions to provide first steps toward urban environmental sustainability, in topic areas of energy, waste reduction, urban design, urban nature, transportation, environmental health, and water; and

WHEREAS, in the spirit of the 1972 Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment, the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the 1996 Istanbul Conference on Human Settlements, the 2000 Millennium Development Goals, and the 2002 Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development, the Urban Environmental Accords build on the synergistic extension of efforts to advance sustainability, foster vibrant economies, promote social equity, and protect the planet's natural systems; and

WHEREAS, over seventy cities from six continents have already adopted the Urban Environmental Accords, coming together to write a new chapter in the history of global cooperation to promote this collective platform and to build an ecologically sustainable, economically dynamic, and socially equitable future for our urban cities; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities, assembled in Annual Conference in San Francisco, October 8, 2005, that the League calls to action all California mayors to sign the Urban Environmental Accords and collaborate with us to implement the Accords; and be it further

RESOLVED, that by signing the Urban Environmental Accords we commit to encourage our city governments to adopt these Accords and commit our best efforts to achieve the Actions stated within; and be it further

RESOLVED, that by implementing the Urban Environmental Accords, we aim to realize the right to a clean, healthy, and safe environment for all members of our society.

Attachment: Urban Environmental Accords

>>>>>>>>>>

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL ACCORDS

Signed on the occasion of United Nations Environmental Programme World Environmental Day June 5, 2005, in San Francisco, California

Green Cities Declaration

Recognizing that for the first time in history, the majority of the planet's population now lives in cities and that continued urbanization will result in one million people moving to cities each week, thus creating a new set of environmental challenges and opportunities; and

Believing that as Mayors of cities around the globe, we have a unique opportunity to provide leadership to develop truly sustainable urban centers based on culturally and economically appropriate local actions; and

Recalling that in 1945 the leaders of 50 nations gathered in San Francisco to develop and sign the Charter of the United Nations; and

Acknowledging the importance of the obligations and spirit of the 1972 Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment, the 1992 Rio Earth Summit (UNCED), the 1996 Istanbul Conference on Human Settlements, the 2000 Millennium Summit, and the 2002 Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development, we see the Urban Environmental Accords described below as a synergistic extension of the efforts to advance sustainability, foster vibrant economies, promote social equity, and protect the planet's natural systems;

Therefore, be it resolved, today on World Environment Day 2005 in San Francisco, we the signatory Mayors have come together to write a new chapter in the history of global cooperation. We commit to promote this collaborative platform and to build an ecologically sustainable, economically dynamic, and socially equitable future for our urban citizens; and

Be it further resolved that we call to action our fellow Mayors around the world to sign the Urban Environmental Accords and collaborate with us to implement the Accords; and

Be it further resolved that by signing these Urban Environmental Accords, we commit to encourage our City governments to adopt these Accords and commit our best efforts to achieve the Actions stated within. By implementing the Urban Environmental Accords, we aim to realize the right to a clean, healthy, and safe environment for all members of our society.

Implementation & Recognition

The 21 Actions that comprise the Urban Environmental Accords are proven first steps toward environmental sustainability. However, to achieve long-term sustainability, cities will have to progressively improve performance in all thematic areas.

Implementing the Urban Environmental Accords will require an open, transparent, and participatory dialogue between government, community groups, businesses, academic institutions, and other key partners. Accords implementation will benefit where decisions are made on the basis of a careful assessment of available alternatives using the best available science.

The call to action set forth in the Accords will most often result in cost savings as a result of diminished resource consumption and improvements in the health and general well-being of city residents. Implementation of the Accords can leverage each city's purchasing power to promote and even require responsible environmental, labor and human rights practices from vendors.

Between now and the World Environment Day 2012, cities shall work to implement as many of the 21 Actions as possible. The ability of cities to enact local environmental laws and policies differs greatly. However, the success of the Accords will ultimately be judged on the basis of actions taken. Therefore, the Accords can be implemented though programs and activities even where cities lack the requisite legislative authority to adopt laws.

The goal is for cities to pick three actions to adopt each year. In order to recognize the progress of cities to implement the Accords a City Green Star Program shall be created. At the end of the seven years a city that has implemented:

19 - 21 Actions shall be recognized as a ✶✶✶✶ City
15 - 18 Actions shall be recognized as a ✶✶✶ City
12 - 17 Actions shall be recognized as a ✶✶ City
8 - 11 Actions shall be recognized as a ✶ City

Energy
Renewable Energy · Energy Efficiency · Climate Change
Waste Reduction
Zero Waste · Manufacturer Responsibility · Consumer Responsibility
Urban Design
Green Building · Urban Planning · Slums
Urban Nature
Parks · Habitat Restoration · Wildlife
Transportation
Public Transportation · Clean Vehicles · Reducing Congestion
Environmental Health
Toxics Reduction · Healthy Food Systems · Clean Air
Water
Water Access and Efficiency · Source Water Protection · Waste Water Reduction

Energy

Action 1 Adopt and implement a policy to increase the use of renewable energy to meet ten per cent of the city's peak electric load within seven years.

Action 2 Adopt and implement a policy to reduce the city's peak electric load by ten per cent within seven years through energy efficiency, shifting the timing of energy demands, and conservation measures.

Action 3 Adopt a citywide greenhouse gas reduction plan that reduces the jurisdiction's emissions by twenty-five per cent by 2030, and which includes a system for accounting and auditing greenhouse gas emissions.

Waste Reduction

Action 4 Establish a policy to achieve zero waste going to landfills and incinerators by 2040.

Action 5 Adopt a citywide program that reduces the use of a disposable, toxic, or non-renewable product category by at least fifty per cent in seven years.

Action 6 Implement "user-friendly" recycling and composting programs, with the goal of reducing by twenty per cent per capita solid waste disposal to landfill and incineration in seven years.

Urban Design

Action 7 Adopt a policy that mandates a green building rating system standard that applies to all new municipal buildings.

Action 8 Adopt urban planning principles and practices that advance higher density, mixed use, walkable, bikeable, and disabled-accessible neighborhoods which coordinate land use and transportation with open space systems for recreation and ecological restoration.

Action 9 Adopt a policy or implement a program that creates environmentally beneficial jobs in slums and/or low-income neighborhoods.

Urban Nature

Action 10 Ensure that there is an accessible public park or recreational open space within half-a-kilometer of every city resident by 2015.

Action 11 Conduct an inventory of existing canopy coverage in the city and then establish a goal based on ecological and community considerations to plant or maintain canopy coverage in not less than 50 per cent of all available sidewalk planting sites.

Action 12 Pass legislation that protects critical habitat corridors and other key habitat characteristics (e.g. water features, food-bearing plants, shelter for wildlife, use of native species, etc.) from unsustainable development.

Transportation

Action 13 Develop and implement a policy which expands affordable public transportation coverage to within half-a-kilometer of all city residents in ten years.

Action 14 Pass a law or implement a program that eliminates leaded gasoline (where it is still used); phases down sulfur levels in diesel and gasoline fuels, concurrent with using advanced emission controls on all buses, taxis, and public fleets to reduce particulate matter and smog-forming emissions from those fleets by 50 per cent in seven years.

Action 15 Implement a policy to reduce the percentage of commuter trips by single occupancy vehicles by ten per cent in seven years.

Environmental Health

Action 16 Every year, identify one product, chemical, or compound that is used within the city that represents the greatest risk to human health and adopt a law and provide incentives to reduce or eliminate its use by the municipal government.

Action 17 Promote the public health and environmental benefits of supporting locally grown organic foods. Ensure that twenty per cent of all city facilities (including schools) serve locally grown and organic food within seven years.

Action 18 Establish an Air Quality Index (AQI) to measure the level of air pollution and set the goal of reducing by 10 per cent in seven years the number of days categorized in the AQI range as "unhealthy" or "hazardous."

Water

Action 19 Develop policies to increase adequate access to safe drinking water, aiming at access for all by 2015. For cities with potable water consumption greater than 100 liters per capita per day, adopt and implement policies to reduce consumption by 10 per cent by 2015.

Action 20 Protect the ecological integrity of the city's primary drinking water sources (i.e., aquifers, rivers, lakes, wetlands and associated ecosystems).

Action 21 Adopt municipal wastewater management guidelines and reduce the volume of untreated wastewater discharges by ten per cent in seven years through the expanded use of recycled water and the implementation of a sustainable urban watershed planning process that includes participants of all affected communities and is based on sound economic, social, and environmental principles.

Note: A copy of the original document is available online at: http://www.wed2005.org/3.1.php

=====

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESOLUTION NO. 5
Not Provided by Sponsor

////////

RESOLUTIONS REFERRED TO HOUSING, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

◆3. RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE AHWAHNEE WATER PRINCIPLES FOR RESOURCE-EFFICIENT LAND USE

Source: Jake Mackenzie, Mayor, Rohnert Park
Referred to: Environmental Quality and Housing, Community & Economic Development Policy Committees
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:
- Environmental Quality Policy Committee:
- Housing, Community & Economic Development Policy Committee:

***NOTE**: To see the resolution text and background, please refer to the Environmental Quality section.*

>>>>>>>>>>

◆4. RESOLUTION RELATING TO VOLUNTARY STATEWIDE RESIDENTIAL GREEN BUILDING GUIDELINES

Source: Easy Bay Division
Referred to: Environmental Quality Policy Committee and Housing, Community and Economic Development Policy Committees
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:
- Environmental Quality Policy Committee:
- Housing, Community and Economic Development Policy Committee:

***NOTE**: To see the resolution text and background, please refer to the Environmental Quality section.*

◆5. RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL ACCORDS ADOPTED AT UNITED NATIONS WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

Source: Gavin Newsom, Mayor, San Francisco
Referred to: Environmental Quality; Housing, Community and Economic Development; and Transportation, Communication and Public Works Policy Committees
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:
- Environmental Quality Policy Committee:

- Housing, Community and Economic Development Policy Committee:
- Transportation, Communication and Public Works Policy Committee:

***NOTE**: To see the resolution text, please refer to the Environmental Quality section.*

>>>>>>>>>>

RESOLUTIONS REFERRED TO PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE

6. RESOLUTION RELATING TO SEXUAL PREDATORS

Source: City of La Mesa
Referred to: Public Safety Policy Committee
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:

WHEREAS, existing law provides that: (1) minors adjudged wards of the juvenile court may be placed in community care facilities; and (2) an inmate released on parole for commission of lewd or lascivious acts or continuous sexual abuse of a child shall not be placed or reside (for the duration of the period of parole) within 1/4 mile of a school; and

WHEREAS, Senator Hollingsworth introduced SB 1051 with the support of Assemblyman Jay La Suer which would: (1) prohibit a licensed community care facility receiving state funds and located within one mile of any school from accepting juveniles undergoing treatment, therapy, or counseling for sexual disorders, deviancy, or sexual misbehavior of any kind; and (2) expand the 1/4 mile distance restriction to one mile; and

WHEREAS, the said exclusion of juveniles from specified licensed community care facilities and the expansion of the distance requirement to one mile is necessary and appropriate to maximize the protection of our communities' youth against potential attacks by sexual predators; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities, assembled in Annual Conference in San Francisco, October 8, 2005, that the League support SB 1051 for purposes of maximizing the protection of our communities' youth against potential attacks by sexual predators.

>>>>>>>>>>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESOLUTION NO. 6
Not Provided by Sponsor

////////

◆7. RESOLUTION RELATING TO PROPOSITION 172

Source: San Diego County Division
Referred to: Public Safety and Revenue and Taxation Policy Committees
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:
- Public Safety Policy Committee:
- Revenue and Taxation Policy Committee:

WHEREAS, on November 2, 1993, California voters approved Proposition 172, the Local Public Safety Protection and Improvement Act of 1993 which established a permanent statewide half-cent sales tax for the support of local public safety activities in cities and counties; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 172 was placed on the ballot by the Legislature and the Governor to partially replace the $2.6 billion in property taxes shifted from local agencies to local school district's "educational revenue augmentation funds" (ERAF); and

WHEREAS, the proceeds of the funds, pursuant to Proposition 172, were to be used by cities and counties to provide necessary funds to "public safety services" including but not limited to sheriffs, police, fire protection, county district attorneys and county corrections; and

WHEREAS, cities in San Diego County contribute a disproportionate share of ERAF, and in 1996 Senator Steve Peace introduced SB 8 which caps receipts of Proposition 172 revenues to cities at 5.56%, while the County of San Diego continues to draw 94.35% of these funds even though they do not have a fire agency nor significantly assist other local fire agencies in the unincorporated portions of the county with financial assistance; and

WHEREAS, the San Diego County Division of the League of California Cities unanimously endorses an appropriate modification of the distributions of Proposition 172 revenues; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities assembled in Annual Conference in San Francisco, October 8, 2005, that the League endorse and support the San Diego County Division's efforts to amend the distribution formula to reflect an equitable distribution of Proposition 172 public safety revenues.

>>>>>>>>>>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESOLUTION NO. 7

SOURCE: SAN DIEGO COUNTY DIVISION
TITLE: RESOLUTION RELATING TO PROPOSITION 172
Background:

On November 2, 1993, California voters approved Proposition 172, the Local Public Safety Protection and Improvement Act of 1993, which established a permanent statewide half-cent sale tax for support of local public safety activities in cities and counties. Proposition 172 was placed on the ballot by the Legislature and the governor to partially replace the $2.6 billion in property taxes shifted from local agencies to local school district's "educational revenue augmentation funds" (ERAF).

Relative to the use of Proposition 172 revenues, Section 30052(b)(1) of the California Government Code defines "public safety services" as including, but not limited to, sheriffs, police, fire protection, county district attorneys and county corrections. Section 30052(b)(1) further states that public safety services do not include courts.

To further protect the intended use of Proposition 172 taxes and to avoid the perception that law enforcement and the legislative communities, local jurisdictions, would use these public safety funds to supplant local revenues that would otherwise accrue to public safety functions. AB2788 was enacted during the 1994 legislative session. It requires that a “Maintenance of Effort” threshold be met in order to utilize Proposition 172 funds. The bill established the 1992-93 approved budget as the base year as the minimum funding level in order to receive full allocation of Proposition 172 revenues.

Local Allocation of Proposition 172 Funds

State voters were led to believe that a “yes” vote for Proposition 172 would mean more funds for all “public safety services.” Cities contribute 14% of ERAF funds, counties 77% and special districts 7% annually, but Proposition 172 allocations do not mirror ERAF property tax shifts; further local agencies vary in degree to which Proposition 172 compensates for ERAF property tax loss.

While counties contribute significantly higher percentages of property taxes than city governments, in 1996 Senator Steve Peace (D-San Diego) introduced Senate Bill 8 which changed the allocation in San Diego County directing 94.35% of the funds to the county with the remaining 5.65% to the 18 cities in the county.

Proposition 172 generates $200 million annually for the region with annual growth in the range of $6 million. Statewide, revenues approach $2.5 billion with counties receiving $2.15 billion (94%) and cities receiving $350 million (6%). (See attached spreadsheet.)

Keeping Faith with the Voters

The language of Proposition 172 promised the voters “an ironclad guarantee statewide that this money, estimated at approximately 1.4 billion dollars a year, would go to where it was needed the most: police, fire protection, district attorneys and jails.” While all polls showed that the initiative was headed for resounding defeat, an unfortunate turn of events convinced the voters that such tax support was needed as viewers statewide witnessed the huge wildfire storms in Laguna Beach and Malibu and the heroic efforts of firefighters to protect life and property.

San Diego County has similar, yet a more extensive history of major wildfire including the following examples:

FIRE NAME	DATE	ACRES BURNED	STRUCTURES LOST	STRUCTURES DAMAGES	DEATHS
Conejos Fire	July 1950	62,000	Not Available	Not Available	0
Laguna Fire	Oct. 1970	190,000	382	Not Available	5
Harmony Fire (Carlsbad Elfin Forest, San	Oct. 1996	8,600	122	142	1

Marcos)					
La Jolla Fire (Palomar Mountain)	Sept. 1999	7,800	2	2	1
Viejas Fire	Jan. 2001	10,353	23	6	0
Gavilan Fire (Fallbrook)	Feb. 2002	6,000	43	13	0
Pines Fire (Julian, Ranchita)	July 2002	61,690	45	121	0
Cedar	Oct. 2003	273,246	4,847	380	15

While several of these fires predate Proposition 172, San Diego County divested themselves of any public safety responsibilities in the area of fire protection in 1974, by terminating their contract with the California Department of Forestry to provide fire protection in the unincorporated portions of the county. San Diego County continues to be without a consolidated fire department to provide fire protection to its constituents, yet continues to collect hundreds of millions of dollars annually in Proposition 172 monies.

The responsibility for providing fire protection to these areas now falls on some 28 local fire agencies in these unincorporated areas. The incorporated areas either have their own fire departments or contract with several local fire agencies.

Recommendation

The disproportionate share of Proposition 172 funds in San Diego, and other urban counties, needs serious review and adjustment of the current formula.

At its July 21, 2005 business meeting, the San Diego County Division of the League of California Cities unanimously approved to sponsor a statewide resolution at the League's October 8, 2005 State Convention. The request is to seek the endorsement and support of the delegates regarding the San Diego Division's efforts to amend the existing distribution formula including, but not limited to, a countywide initiative to change the current distribution formula of Proposition 172 to one based on the growth of population and sales tax increase.

At its August 8, 2005 regular business meeting, the San Diego County Division again unanimously reaffirmed their July 21, 2005 action, to seek via resolution, the League's Delegates endorsement for proposed actions in the modification to the current formula used in the distribution of Proposition 172 revenues in San Diego County.

Prop. 172 Funds Collected and Distributed in San Diego Region													
AGENCY	**FY 1993-94**	**FY 1994-95**	**FY 1995-96**	**FY 1996-97**	**FY 1997-98**	**FY 1998-99**	**FY 1999-00**	**FY 2000-01**	**FY 2001-02**	**FY 2002-03**	**FY 2003-04**	**FY 2004-05**	**TOTAL (EST)**
County of SD	105,340,565	113,271,735	120,270,144	125,678,854	132,797,550	143,051,268	165,574,869	178,908,422	173,002,041	181,150,998	197,670,393	195,358,507	**1,832,075,346**
Carlsbad	275,351	359,445	382,056	400,351	499,576	531,521	628,700	741,804	656,913	687,856	750,583	741,804	**6,655,960**
Chula Vista	254,670	332,447	353,270	370,281	435,991	463,871	548,700	647,390	573,304	600,308	655,051	647,390	**5,882,673**
Coronado	93,858	122,524	130,231	136,467	168,125	178,876	211,600	249,644	221,075	231,489	252,598	249,644	**2,246,131**
Del Mar	20,572	26,854	28,544	29,910	37,200	39,579	46,800	55,238	48,916	51,220	55,891	55,238	**495,962**
El Cajon	123,848	161,672	168,347	180,071	206,345	219,540	259,700	306,395	271,332	284,112	310,021	306,395	**2,797,778**
Encinitas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Escondido	230,822	301,316	320,271	335,607	400,806	426,436	504,400	595,144	527,037	551,862	602,187	595,144	**5,391,032**
Imperial Beach	44,616	58,240	61,825	64,868	75,779	80,625	95,400	112,522	99,645	104,339	113,853	112,522	**1,024,234**
LA MESA	85,721	111,901	117,764	124,636	144,345	153,575	178,044	196,285	189,805	198,745	216,869	214,333	**1,932,023**
Lemon Grove	15,217	19,865	17,226	22,125	21,114	22,464	26,600	31,351	27,763	29,071	31,722	31,351	**295,869**
National City	51,793	67,612	64,771	75,306	79,391	84,467	99,900	117,884	104,394	109,311	119,280	117,884	**1,091,993**
Oceanside	536,553	700,417	744,478	780,127	969,815	1,031,830	1,220,500	1,440,048	1,275,251	1,335,320	1,457,089	1,440,048	**12,931,476**
Poway	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
San Diego	2,537,690	3,312,703	3,521,095	3,689,700	4,438,578	4,722,402	5,585,800	6,590,700	5,836,473	6,111,390	6,668,695	6,590,700	**59,605,926**
San Marcos	50,395	65,785	66,567	73,272	81,591	86,809	102,700	121,152	107,288	112,342	122,586	121,152	**1,111,639**
Santee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Solana Beach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Vista	180,065	235,056	249,843	261,806	316,472	336,709	398,300	469,919	416,143	435,744	475,480	469,919	**4,245,456**
TOTAL	109,841,736	119,147,572	126,496,432	132,223,381	140,672,678	151,429,972	175,482,013	190,583,898	183,357,380	191,994,107	209,502,298	207,052,031	**1,937,783,498**

RESOLUTION REFERRED TO REVENUE AND TAXATION POLICY COMMITTEE

◆7. RESOLUTION RELATING TO PROPOSITION 172

Source: San Diego County Division
Referred to: Public Safety and Revenue and Taxation Policy Committees
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:
- Public Safety Policy Committee:
- Revenue and Taxation Policy Committee:

***NOTE**: To see the resolution text and background, please refer to the Public Safety section.*

>>>>>>>>>>

RESOLUTIONS REFERRED TO TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC WORKS POLICY COMMITTEE

◆5. RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL ACCORDS ADOPTED AT UNITED NATIONS WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

Source: Gavin Newsom, Mayor, San Francisco
Referred to: Environmental Quality; Housing, Community and Economic Development; and Transportation, Communication and Public Works Policy Committees
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:
- Environmental Quality Policy Committee:
- Housing, Community and Economic Development Policy Committee:
- Transportation, Communication and Public Works Policy Committee:

***NOTE**: To see the resolution text, please refer to the Environmental Quality section.*

>>>>>>>>>>

8. RESOLUTION RELATING TO BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS

Source: Gavin Newsom, Mayor, San Francisco
Referred to: Transportation, Communication and Public Works Policy Committee
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:

WHEREAS, the United States ranks behind 15 other industrialized countries in the percentage of residents using broadband Internet connections; and

WHEREAS, the availability of broadband service is critical to attracting, growing, and retaining businesses in the highly competitive global marketplace; and

WHEREAS, broadband service is proving valuable to the economic transitioning and growth of distressed urban and rural communities; and

WHEREAS, broadband service to access information and resources is pivotal to eliminating the digital divide and promoting the economic and personal self-sufficiency of low-income individuals; and

WHEREAS, local governments are seeking to meet the needs of their communities for broadband service where such service is unavailable, inadequate, or prohibitively expensive; and

WHEREAS, local government can play an important role in achieving President Bush's goal of universal broadband deployment by 2007; and

WHEREAS, local governments are beginning to establish wireless municipal broadband networks for underserved residents, either directly or in partnership with others; and

WHEREAS, for example, there has been a ten-fold increase in the number of public power companies offering broadband service over the past decade; and

WHEREAS, the permissibility of and conditions under which local governments can offer broadband service will be considered in the upcoming rewrite of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities, assembled in Annual Conference in San Francisco, October 8, 2005, that the League support state and federal legislation to ensure the continued ability of local governments to offer broadband Internet service access to citizens; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the League of California Cities request the National League of Cities to support federal legislation to ensure the continued ability of local governments to offer broadband Internet service access to citizens.

>>>>>>>>>>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESOLUTION NO. 8
Not Provided by Sponsor

////////

[Note: No resolutions were assigned to the Community Services Policy Committee.]

##########