Meeting of the Gateway Cities Planning Directors

PLEASE ARRIVE AT 7:45 AM FOR CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

Wednesday, June 12, 2019 8:00AM

Gateway Cities COG Offices
16401 Paramount Boulevard, Paramount
2nd Floor Conference Room

AGENDA

I. Self-Introductions

II. AB 1356 (Cannabis) Informational Presentation
   Jonatan Cvetko
   Angeles Emeralds

III. CalEPA Brownfields Funding Opportunities
    Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi
    Department of Toxic Substances Control

IV. SCAG RTP/SCS Update – Scenario Outreach and Envisioning
    Ma’Ayn Johnson, AICP
    Housing and Land Use Planner
    SCAG

V. Climate Planning Update
   Stephanie Cadena
   Assistant Planner
   Gateway Cities COG

VI. Regional Planning Update
    Stephanie Cadena
    Assistant Planner
    Gateway Cities COG

VII. Discussion of Future Agenda Items

VIII. Adjourn
GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

LOCAL CONTROL OVER LEGAL & ILLEGAL CANNABIS OPERATORS
EDUCATIONAL CANNABIS OPERATOR TOURS

Retail Tours
Manufacturing & Lab Testing Tours
Cultivation Tours

AngelesEmeralds.org
LA County
Cannabis Policy Seminar

since 64
SBCCOG Responsible Cannabis Policy Workshops

ANGELES EMERALDS CAN Help
How To Regulate
You can’t ban cannabis.
You can only ban legal cannabis.
Maybe.
OVERVIEW OF LICENSED MARKET IN LA COUNTY/STATE
LA County Prop 64 Voting Results

- Voted Yes: 71
- Voted No: 18

AngelesEmeralds.org
Gateway Cities

Prop 64 Voting Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gateway City</th>
<th>Voted Yes</th>
<th>Voted No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Habra Heights</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierson</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated LA</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated LA</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated LA</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated LA</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voted Yes: 25
Voted No: 4
LA County Cannabis Licensing Status

Voted Yes: 71
Voted No: 18
Licensed: 17
Non-Licensed: 72
Total Storefront Retail: 7
Total Non-Storefront Retail: 6

* FIGURES BASED ON STATE ISSUED LICENSES
CALIFORNIA License Status 2019

- **CULTIVATION**: 9,445 licenses
- **MANUFACTURING**: 1,233 licenses
- **DISTRIBUTION**: 1,219 licenses
- **RETAIL**: 632 licenses

14.94 : 1.95 : 1.92 : 1
[ESTIMATES]

6000+ CA RETAILERS LISTED ON WEEDMAPS

1200+ ILLEGAL RETAILERS IN CITY OF LA ALONE

632 LICENSED RETAILERS IN ALL OF CALIFORNIA

ILLEGAL Retailers in LA County
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CALIFORNIA License Status 2019

637 licenses Vs 6000+ CA RETAILERS LISTED ON WEEDMAPS = Legal Retail Bottle Neck

AngelesEmeralds.org
RECOMMENDATION

The Gateway Cities Council Of Governments should establish a regional working group to address state legislation and regional implementation of Cannabis Regulations.
TEMPLE CITY VS EL MONTE

Temple City to sue El Monte over controversial marijuana growing facility
The business is planned next to the cities’ border, near Temple City homes.
Chris Lindahl • January 20, 2019 at 3:58 pm

Marijuana production faces 'war' from Asian American communities in San Gabriel Valley
Matthew Ormseth

AngelesEmeralds.org
EXCLUSIVE: Commerce Coalition Collects More Than Enough Signatures to Pass Cannabis Ordinance Referendum

BY BRIAN HEWS

Last week, a coalition of concerned residents and local business owners fanned out into the city of Commerce gathering signatures to begin a referendum to revoke twenty-two cannabis ordinances recently passed in the city and stop any additional licenses from being issued.
CURRENT STATUS OF REGULATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Specialty Cottage Outdoor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1A</td>
<td>Specialty Cottage Indoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1B</td>
<td>Specialty Cottage Mixed-Light Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1B</td>
<td>Specialty Cottage Mixed-Light Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type ?</td>
<td>Specialty Outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type ?</td>
<td>Specialty Indoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type ?</td>
<td>Specialty Mixed-Light Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type ?</td>
<td>Specialty Mixed-Light Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>Small Outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2A</td>
<td>Small Indoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2B</td>
<td>Small Mixed Light-Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2B</td>
<td>Small Mixed-Light Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>Medium Outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3A</td>
<td>Medium Indoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3B</td>
<td>Medium Mixed-Light Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3B</td>
<td>Medium Mixed-Light Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>Nursery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 5</td>
<td>Large Cultivation License (Not till 2023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 6</td>
<td>Manufacturer; Nonvolatile Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 7</td>
<td>Manufacturer; Volatile Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type N</td>
<td>Manufacturer; Infusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type P</td>
<td>Manufacturer; Packaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type S</td>
<td>Manufacturer; Shared Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 8</td>
<td>Testing Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 9</td>
<td>Retailer: Non-Storefront Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 10</td>
<td>Retailer: Storefront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 11</td>
<td>Distributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 12</td>
<td>Microbusiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 13</td>
<td>Distributor Transport Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 14</td>
<td>Cannabis Event Organizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2019 SESSION: 47 STATE BILLS (FIXING CANNABIS REGULATION)

AB 3 - COOPER
AB 37 - JONES -SAWYER
AB 127 - LACKEY
AB 141 - COOPER
AB 147 - BURKE
AB 228 - AGUIAR-CURRY
AB 286 - BONTA
AB 397 - CHAU
AB 404 - STONE
AB 420 - LACKEY/COOLEY/WOOD
AB 545 - LOW
AB 717 - NAZARIAN
AB 833 - LACKEY
AB 858 - LEVINE
AB 953 - TING

AB 1085 - MCCARTHY
AB 1288 - COOLEY
AB 1291 - JONES-SAWYER
AB 1296 - GONZALEZ
AB 1356 - TING
AB 1417 - RUBIO/BLANCA
AB 1420 - OBERNOLTE
AB 1458 - QUIRK
AB 1461 - QUIRK
AB 1470 - QUIRK
AB 1525 - JONES-SAWYER
AB 1530 - COOLEY
AB 1569 - JONES-SAWYER
AB 1678 - CABRILLO
AB 1710 - WOOD

SB 34 - WIENER
SB 51 - HERTZBERG
SB 67 - MCGUIRE
SB 153 - WILK
SB 185 - MCGUIRE
SB 203 - BRADFORD
SB 223 - HILL
SB 305 - HUES
SB 475 - SKINNER
SB 527 - CABALLERO
SB 581 - CABALLERO
SB 595 - BRADFORD
SB 625 - HILL
SB 627 - MONNING
SB 658 - BRADFORD
SB 684 - UMBERG
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AB 1530 – COOLEY: UNAUTHORIZED CANNABIS ACTIVITY REDUCTION GRANTS LOCAL JURISDICTION RESTRICTIONS ON CANNABIS DELIVERY. BILL—DIED IN COMMITTEE

AB 1356 – CANNABIS: LOCAL JURISDICTIONS: RETAIL COMMERCIAL CANNABIS ACTIVITY PULLED BY AUTHOR

AB 228 - AGUIAR-CURRY : FOOD, BEVERAGE, AND COSMETIC ADULTERANTS INDUSTRIAL HEMP PRODUCTS.
MAINTAINING LOCAL CONTROL OVER:

ILLEGAL & LEGAL OPERATORS

LEGAL DELIVERY OPERATORS

NON-CANNABIS (HEMP) CBD RETAILERS
Maintaining Local Control over Illegal & Legal Operators
INNOVATIVE UNLICENSED OPERATORS

January 9, 2019
Collective Model Ends
LA Mayor’s Proposed Budget Doubles Down Against Unlicensed Cannabis Shops

Mayor Eric Garcetti’s budget puts millions toward law enforcement and cannabis regulators, and promises to establish an equity program.

$10M Enforcement
The County should establish sufficient civil penalties, not less than $20,000 per day or penalties levied by surrounding jurisdictions, and work with utility providers to shut off utilities as a deterrent to combat unlicensed operators.
The County should establish sufficient civil penalties, not less than $20,000 per day or penalties levied by surrounding jurisdictions, and work with utility providers to shut off utilities as a deterrent to combat unlicensed operators.
Do You Want to Maintain Local Control Over Illegal & Legal Operators?

- YES
- NO

- Oppose AB 1356

- Heavy Daily Penalties Against Property Owners. Mirror City of LA’s $20,000/Day Fine Against Landlords

- Ability to Shut Off Utilities

- Hotline to Report Illegal Operators

- Do Nothing
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Maintaining Local Control Over Legal Delivery Cannabis Operators
26200. (a) (1) This division shall not be interpreted to supersede or limit the authority of a local jurisdiction to adopt and enforce local ordinances to regulate businesses licensed under this division, including, but not limited to, local zoning and land use requirements, business license or to completely prohibit the establishment or operation of one or more types of businesses.

26201. A local jurisdiction may establish additional standards, requirements, and regulations.

(Added November 8, 2016, by initiative Proposition 64, Sec. 6.1.)
(d) A delivery employee may deliver to any jurisdiction within the State of California provided that such delivery is conducted in compliance with all delivery provisions of this division.
Pros:
- Provides Access to Tested Products
- Cities that license delivery Services can Profit from sales in surrounding cities

Cons:
- Becomes an Unfunded Enforcement Liability
- No Tax Revenue from transactions in cities
- Does not provide Education on Safe Consumption to the community
- Can be more impactful to public safety than Storefronts
The SIMPL coalition is supported by:

Fort Jones
Wasco.

Agoura Hills
Angels Camp
Arcadia
Atwater
Beverly Hills
Ceres
Clovis
Covina
Dixon
Downey
McFarland
Newman
Oakdale
Palmdale
Patterson
Riverbank
Riverside
San Pablo
Sonora
Tehachapi
Temecula
Tracy
Turlock
Vacaville
County of Santa Cruz.
### Long Term Strategy

#### San Francisco Passes Cannabis Tax Measure D

OUTSIDE DELIVERY SERVICES

(h) The person or one or more of the person’s employees, representatives, or agents utilizes the streets within the City in connection with the operation of motor vehicles for business purposes for all or part of any seven days during a tax year; or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
<th>Carson</th>
<th>West Hollywood</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Santa Rosa</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$12/sqft</td>
<td>$25/sqft + 18%</td>
<td>0% first $500,000 1% up to $1M 1.5% over $1M</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>or $5.00/sqft</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0% first $500,000 1% up to $1M 1.5% over $1M</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0% first $500,000 1% up to $1M 1.5% over $1M</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0% first $500,000 1% up to $1M 1.5% over $1M</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Adult Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0% first $500,000 2.5% up to $1M 5% over $1M</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Medical Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to $5/ticket Surcharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Cannabis Businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retail - Adult Use 0% first $500,000 2.5% up to $1M 5% over $1M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Retail 0% first $500,000 1% up to $1M 1.5% over $1M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ 5403.
HOURS OF OPERATION.
A licensed retailer shall sell and deliver cannabis goods only between the hours of 6:00 a.m. Pacific Time and 10:00 p.m. Pacific Time.

26201.
A local jurisdiction may establish additional standards, requirements, and regulations.

(Added November 8, 2016, by initiative Proposition 64, Sec. 6.1.)

A licensed retailer shall sell and deliver cannabis goods only between the hours of 6:00 a.m. Pacific Time and 10:00 p.m. Pacific Time.

Pass an Ordinance Severely Limiting Hours Of Operations for Outside Deliver Services.

Example: Outside Delivery Services may only deliver between 6am - 6:30am
Hello,

Thank you for contacting the Bureau of Cannabis Control (Bureau). A local jurisdiction certainly has the authority to further limit the operating hours beyond the hours provided in the Bureau's regulations. However, a Bureau licensee would not be able to sell before 6:00 a.m. or after 10:00 p.m. under their state license regardless of the hours set by the local jurisdiction.

Best Regards,

Bureau Staff
Bureau of Cannabis Control
(833) 768-5880
www.bcc.ca.gov
https://cannabis.ca.gov
Do You Want to Maintain Local Control Over Inter-jurisdictional Cannabis Delivery?

- YES
  - Support SIMPL Lawsuit
  - Long Term Strategy Implement Tax Measure similar to San Francisco's
  - Short Term Strategy - Severely Limit Hours of Operation

- NO
  - Do Nothing
  - Oppose SIMPL Lawsuit
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NON-CANNABIS (HEMP) CBD RETAILERS: DANGER TO PUBLIC HEALTH
Weed company Green Growth Brands to open CBD shops in malls across US, as Barney's adds 'cannabis lifestyle shop'

Lauren Thomas • 8:04 PM ET Tue, 25 Sept 2018

The biggest mall owner in the country is about to open more than 100 shops selling products infused with CBD, short for cannabidiol.

Simon Property Group on Monday said it was partnering with Ohio-based marijuana company Green Growth Brands to open 108 locations selling CBD products this year at Simon's U.S. malls, which include Roosevelt Field Mall in New York and The Galleria in Houston.
CVS is now selling CBD products in California

Creams, sprays and roll-ons are ‘an alternative source of relief’

Karen D'Souza • March 22, 2019 at 10:22 pm

Walgreens to sell CBD products in 1,500 stores

Angelica LaVito
Published Wed, Mar 27 2019 • 1:38 PM EDT
Updated Thu, Mar 28 2019 • 2:37 PM EDT

Walgreens will sell CBD creams, patches and sprays in nearly 1,500 stores in select states, the company told CNBC on Wednesday.

The drugstore chain will sell the cannabis-based products in Oregon, Colorado, New Mexico, Kentucky, Tennessee, Vermont, South Carolina, Illinois and Indiana. Walgreens declined to specify which brands it would carry.
Outgoing FDA chief Gottlieb raises 'concern' over Walgreens, CVS selling CBD products

Angelica LaVito

Published Wed, Apr 3 2019 • 10:54 AM EDT
Updated Wed, Apr 3 2019 • 3:50 PM EDT

Outgoing Food and Drug Administration Commissioner Scott Gottlieb told lawmakers Wednesday that he’s uneasy about Walgreens’ and CVS’ recent decisions to start selling CBD products in their drugstores.
Some of the retail partners slated for the launch include Lord Jones, Foria, Apothecanna, and Eaze Wellness, as well as Cannabis Now’s own new line of vaporizers and full spectrum hemp oil produced by G Pen. The store will not sell THC products.”
A California company tested 20 popular CBD products and found 'insanely high levels' of dangerous chemicals and misleading labels

Jeremy Berke

• Just three of them, or 15%, actually contained what the labels said, the study found. The results were shared exclusively with Business Insider.
## CBD label claims vs. CBD lab test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>CLAIM (mg)</th>
<th>RESULTS (mg)</th>
<th>% of CBD IN RELATION TO CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD Hemp Additive</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD Milk Chocolate Bar</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD Oil Cotton Candy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemp Oil Concentrate Clearomizer</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD Oil</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Relaxation Syrup</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD Gummies</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD+ Vape Additive</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium CBD E-liquid</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Dose syringe</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Honey Hemp</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD Cold Brew Coffee</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peach Ginger</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD Softgels</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD Alkaline Water</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The tests were conducted blindly. The identity of the manufacturers weren’t reported.

Source: CannaSafe Laboratories
Cannabis CBD vs Non-Cannabis Sourced CBD Testing Requirements

Non-Cannabis Sourced CBD Products:
- Are not tested for pesticides, heavy metals, microbial and more, which presents a threat to consumers, such as the elderly.
- No guarantee of having the listed amounts of CBD
- No Tax Revenue Benefit to local jurisdictions
- Threatens Viability of Transitioning the Illicit Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE REQUIRED TESTING</th>
<th>Cannabis Sourced CBD</th>
<th>Non-Cannabis Sourced CBD (Hemp CBD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cannabinoid Testing:</strong> Verifying the amount of cannabinoids such as THC, CBD, and others.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Materials Testing:</strong> Inspection for Sand, Soil, Insect Fragments, Hair, Mammalian Excreta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Metals Testing:</strong> Cadmium, Lead, Arsenic, Mercury</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microbial Impurities Testing:</strong> Shiga toxin–producing Escherichia coli, Salmonella, Pathogenic Aspergillus species A. fumigatus, A. flavus, A. niger, and A.terreus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mycoxin Testing:</strong> Aflatoxin B1, B2, G1, G2, Ochratoxin A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual Pesticides Testing:</strong> Category I Residual Pesticide</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicarb, Carbofuran, Chlorдан, Chlorfenapyr, Chlordpyrifos, Coumaphos, Daminozoide, DDVP (Dichlorvos), Dimethoate, Ethoprophos, Etofenprox, Fenoxycarb, Fipronil, Imazalil, Methiocarb, Methyl parathion, Mevinphos, Paclbutrazol, Propoxur, Sprioxamine, Thioclorti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II Residual Pesticide Malathion, Metalaxyl, Methomyl, Myclobutanil, Naled, Oxamyl, Pentachloronitrobenzene, Permethrin, Phosmet, Piperonylbutoxide, Prazethrin, Propiconazole, Pyrethrins, Pyridaben, Spinetoram, Spinosad, Spiromesifen, Spirotetramat, Tebuconazole, Thiamethoxam, Trifloxystrobin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual Solvents and Processing Chemicals Testing:</strong> Category I Residual Solvent or Processing Chemical 1,2-Dichloroethane, Benzene, Chloroform, Ethylene oxide, Methylene chloride, Trichloroethylene</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II Residual Solvent or Processing Chemical Acetone, Acetonitrile, Butane, Ethanol, Ethyl acetate Ethyl ether, Heptane, Hexane, Isopropyl alcohol Methanol, Pentane, Propane, Toluene Total xylene (ortho-, meta-, para-)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AB-228- Aguiar-Curry: Food, beverage, and cosmetic adulterants: industrial hemp products.

- Would expressly permit the retail sale of hemp-derived CBD in foods and supplements, and also in topical applications.

- Does Not require products to be safety tested.
Ban ALL Non-Cannabis Sourced CBD products (not limited to just food items), until the State requires testing equivalent or greater than is required of cannabis sourced CBD. Once testing is required you should consider allowing the sales of non-cannabis sourced CBD products, taxed and licensed at the same rate as your local cannabis businesses.
2) Loop Hole Allowing THC Sales
The High End (CBD Shop) - Barney’s Beverly Hills
The High End (CBD Shop) - Barney's Beverly Hills

THC Products on Display

iPad Used to Order Delivery
Arts District-based luxury cannabis brand Beboe, which has its own table in the shop, offers a collection of low-strength, “socially dosed” marijuana candies and vape pens. The company can’t sell the products in-store, but a delivery service brings purchases to customers within 15 to 35 minutes anywhere in the Beverly Hills area. Beboe sales associates even offered to have one couple’s order delivered to their lunch reservation at the Ivy. The husband and wife, who declined to be named, were on a business trip from Sweden and said they haven’t smoked pot since the ’90s. They selected one of the “mellowest” chocolate edibles to try when they returned home.

- LA Times 3/26/19
1) Lack of Regulations, Taxes, and overall lower financial barriers to entry make the business model highly attractive and lucrative to retailers from corner markets, to grocery stores, to CBD shops.

2) By displaying THC products and partnering with delivery services, Non-Cannabis based CBD Shops can become “Legal” Storefront Cannabis Retailers almost anywhere.
Ban ALL Non-Cannabis Sourced CBD products (not limited to just food items), until the State requires testing equivalent or greater than is required of cannabis sourced CBD. Once testing is required you should consider allowing the sales of non-cannabis sourced CBD products, taxed and licensed at the same rate as your local cannabis businesses.
To: All City Staff and Elected Officials

From: Jonatan Cvetko
Executive Director
Angeles Emeralds

Re: CBD Loop Hole Threatening Public Health

Recently, we've had an increase in concern from cities reaching out to us regarding the sales of Non-Cannabis based CBD products, such as Hemp based CBD.

Angeles Emeralds would like to provide some clarity and recommend potential policies to address both concerns.

On Dec. 20, 2018 President Trump signed into law The Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018 (the 2018 Farm Bill). Integrated into the Farm Bill is the Hemp Farming Act of 2018 which legalizes the industrial production of hemp allowing states to develop new regulatory plans. Due to the passage of this bill, "entrepreneurs" may be trying to take advantage of the potential loop hole that seemingly allows them to circumvent California’s local regulations regarding cannabis and its derivatives, CBD.

Your city, along with many others recently, may have been approached with inquiries to setup CBD shops in your city. There are strict legal restrictions around this that you may not be aware of. Many food retailers such as Grocery Stores, Gas Stations, and Restaurants can be seen regularly selling products with CBD in them and may not be aware that they are prohibited from doing so. As such we would recommend you implement a ban prohibiting the sale of non-cannabis based CBD products for the following reasons:

THC and CBD are two of the most notable cannabinoids found in both hemp and cannabis plants. While both may be considered to have medicinal properties, THC is the primary psychoactive compound while CBD has no psychoactive effects. The legalization of commercial cannabis allows for the production of products with either or both THC and CBD.

While Hemp is a close cousin to cannabis, it is legally distinguished from cannabis through certifications proving that the plant in question produces less than 0.3 percent THC. Entrepreneurs have taken note that the recent passing of the farm bill now allows for industrial production of Hemp and as such one of its derivatives, CBD. Some see this as a loop hole allowing them to sell NON-CANNABIS BASED CBD PRODUCTS. This has seemingly led to a recent increase in inquiries to cities in hopes of allowing CBD shops.

However, it is very important to note that there are strict limitations around what sort of products can contain Non-Cannabis Sourced CBD.

All legal cannabis based products are required to undergo extensive testing procedures prior to being released for sale, in order to ensure public safety. Below are some of the testing required of cannabis products. By comparison, non-cannabis sourced CBD products (Hemp CBD) are not required to undergo similar testing.

April 16, 2019

City of Hermosa Beach
Civic Center, 1315 Valley Drive, Hermosa Beach, California 90254-3884

Subject: Hermosa Beach prohibition on sales of CBD products.

Dear Business Owner,

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the City's position on CBD (Cannabidiol) and ask that you refrain from selling and offering CBD products at any location in Hermosa Beach. We realize that these products are emerging in retail and personal service industries for their therapeutic and wellness benefits. There are two types of CBD products: cannabis-based and hemp-based, neither of which are legal to sell in Hermosa Beach.

Cannabis-based CBD is regulated by state law and requires a state cannabis license to be sold. Since the City expressly prohibits all commercial cannabis activity for which a state license is required (HBMC Section 17.42.110), cannabis-based CBD products cannot be sold in Hermosa.

The state and city definition of "cannabis" excludes industrial hemp from the definition of cannabis. Nevertheless, hemp-based CBD products are also not legal to sell based on Federal Drug Administration and California Department of Public Health rules. In short, these agencies have determined that CBD food products (human and pet food) are illegal, and CBD topicals marketed as having therapeutic value are unapproved new drugs. Thus, these products are also not permitted for sale in Hermosa Beach.

The City understands that the law surrounding hemp is slowly evolving. While regulations have recently been adopted at the state and federal level related to the cultivation of hemp as permissible agriculture, those changes have not trickled down to the federal and state agencies regulating food, drugs and public health.

Therefore, if you are currently selling or considering the sale of hemp-based CBD products, please discontinue or refrain from this practice until the Federal Drug Administration and California Department of Public Health authorize the sale of edible and topical CBD products. Also, be advised that Cannabis-based CBD products will remain prohibited so long as the City retains its prohibition on all commercial cannabis products.

As a small, business-friendly beach community, we look forward to your voluntary compliance with this request.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions and concerns.
June 11, 2019

To: California Senate Health Committee
    Senator Richard Pan (Chair) & Members

Re: AB 228—(Aguilar-Curry) Food, beverage, and cosmetic adulterants: industrial hemp products. (As Amended on 6/3/19)
Notice of Opposition

The South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) respectfully opposes AB 228 (Aguilar-Curry). If AB 228 were to pass as written it would cause the following issues:

1) First and foremost, it’s a public health risk. Originally the bill had absolutely no safety testing requirements to it. The county health department is actively working to address this issue and concerns were raised to the bill’s author. As of June 3, the bill was amended to include extremely minimal testing requirement. It pales by comparison to what Cannabis sourced CBD has to go through in terms of safety testing. At a minimum hemp sourced CBD should be tested at the same levels as legal cannabis sourced CBD.

AB 228 only requires that it be tested by a ISO/IEC 17025 certified laboratory, only looking for levels of delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and that it’s does not contain contaminants that are unsafe for human consumption. It does not specify what types of “contaminants” nor does it specify what is “safe for human consumption”. The legal cannabis industry discovered that certain pesticides that were “safe for consumption in other agricultural products” were absolutely not safe to use in cannabis sourced CBD which is consumed differently. For example, microbubutin that is used on grapes for wine production, but in cannabis based products such as CBD it is heated in the extraction process or in combustion actually turning into a form of cyanide. https://www.cabc.com/2015/10/14/marijuana-

2) Cannabis sourced CBD is taxed both on a state level as well as a local level. Hemp sourced CBD is not. From the perspective of local jurisdictions that currently license commercial cannabis or intend to in the near future, their expected tax revenues will be negatively impacted should AB 228 pass. It will allow for virtually identical products to be sold with no tax revenue benefit to the local city. On the state level it will impact the tax revenues collected of which 60% go to illicit youth prevention programs.

3) Unintentionally, AB 228 allows for businesses to circumvent local control of legal cannabis sales. What we have seen happening is that CBD shops setup annals to become a loophole for legal cannabis sales by partnering with interjurisdictional delivery services to facilitate transactions/purchases of THC cannabis products. Beverly Hills is a prime example at the moment, their Barney’s Store has a CBD shop that also displays THC products and has an iPad next to it to help facilitate a purchase of those THC products from an outside delivery service. Beverly Hills currently has a ban in place against legal commercial cannabis sales. Should AB 228 pass we can expect a flood of CBD shops attempting to open up. This both circumvents local control as well as negatively impacts local tax revenue collection.

Ideally the state policy/legislation should be to allow hemp source CBD so long as it is required to have safety testing and be taxed at the same level as legal cannabis sourced CBD. For these reasons, we oppose AB 228 which does neither of those two things.

Thank you for your consideration,

Britt Huff, SBCCOG Chair
Councilmember, Rolling Hills Estates

CC: Melanie Moreno (Staff Director)
Senator Ben Allen
Senator Steven Bradford
Senator Holly Mitchell
League of California Cities

industry-could-be-uprooted-by-pesticide-lawsuit.html AB 228 poorly defines testing requirements (unlike legal cannabis sourced CBD) which is why it remains a public health threat.
Do You Want to Discourage Non-Cannabis(Hemp) CBD Sales?

YES  NO

- Oppose AB 228
- Do Nothing
- Support AB 228

• Ban ALL Non-Cannabis Sourced CBD products (not limited to just food items), until the State requires testing equivalent or greater than is required of cannabis sourced CBD. Once testing is required your city should consider allowing the sales of non-cannabis sourced CBD, taxed and licensed at the same rate as your local cannabis businesses.
### ILLEGAL & LEGAL OPERATORS
- Oppose AB 1356
- Heavy Daily Penalties Against Property Owners. Mirror City of LA’s $20,000/Day Fine Against Landlords
- Ability to Shut Off Utilities

### Legal Cannabis Delivery
- Support SIMPL Lawsuit
- Long Term Strategy Implement Tax Measure similar to San Fransisco’s
- Short Term Strategy - Severely Limit Hours of Operation

### CBD (Hemp) Sales
- Oppose AB 228
- Ban ALL Non-Cannabis Sourced CBD products (not limited to just food items), until the State requires testing equivalent or greater than is required of cannabis sourced CBD.

Once testing is required your city should consider allowing the sales of non-cannabis sourced CBD, taxed and licensed at the same rate as your local cannabis businesses.

AngelesEmeralds.org
VOTER INITIATIVES COMING!

Voted Yes: 71
Voted No: 18

AGOURA HILLS 62%  ALHAMBRA 54%  ARCadia 50%  ARTESIA 50%  AVALON 52%  AZUSA 54%  BALDWIN PARK 54%  BELL 53%  BELL GARDENS 55%  BELLEFLOWER 55%  BEVERLY HILLS 64%  BRADBURY 49%  BURBANK 61%  CALABASAS 62%  CARSON 56%  CERRITOS 44%  CLAREMONT 59%  COMMERCE 55%  COMPTON 62%  COVINA 52%  CUDAHY 58%  CULVER CITY 69%  DIAMOND BAR 47%  DOWNEY 51%  DUARTE 54%  EL MONTE 54%  EL SEGUNDO 61%  LOS ANGELES 65%  LYNWOOD 57%  MALIBU 55%  MANHATTAN BEACH 49%  MAYWOOD 55%  HAWAIIAN GARDENS 55%  HAWTHORNE 59%  HERMOSA BEACH 71%  HIDDEN HILLS 63%  HUNTINGTON PARK 51%  INDUSTRY 40%  INGLEWOOD 64%  IRWINDALE 54%  LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE 48%  LA HABRA HEIGHTS 49%  LA MIRADA 47%  LA PUENTE 53%  LA VERNE 49%  LANCASTER 54%  LAKEWOOD 53%  LAWNDALE 53%  LOMITA 53%  LONG BEACH 54%  LOS ANGELES 64%  LYNWOOD 57%  MALIBU 55%  MANHATTAN BEACH 62%  MAYWOOD 51%  MONROVIA 56%  MONTEBELLO 56%  MONTEREY PARK 49%  NORWALK 53%  PALM DALE 58%  PALOS VERDES ESTATES 48%  PARAMOUNT 56%  PASADENA 63%  PICO RIVERA 53%  POMONA 57%  RANCHO PALOS VERDES 53%  REDONDO BEACH 68%  ROLLING HILLS 47%  ROLLING HILLS ESTATES 47%  ROSEMEAD 53%  SAN DIMAS 49%  SAN FERNANDO 58%  SAN GABRIEL 52%  SAN MARINO 44%  SANTA CLARITA 53%  SANTA FE SPRINGS 52%  SANTA MONICA 75%  SIERRA MADRE 59%  SIGNAL HILL 64%  SOUTH EL MONTE 55%  SOUTH GATE 53%  SOUTH PASADENA 62%  TEMPLE CITY 47%  TORRANCE 52%  VERNON 53%  WALNUT 47%  WEST COVINA 51%  WEST HOLLYWOOD 83%  WEST LAKE VILLAGE 56%  WHITTIER 53%  AngelesEmeralds.org
ANGELES EMERALDS CAN Help

Angeles Emeralds can help guide your process to create a responsible cannabis ordinance for your community.

Some of the Services We Provide:

- Cannabis Operator Tours
- Expungement Clinics
- Moderate Advisory Committees
- Organize Community Education Workshops
- Ordinance Consultation
- Tax Revenue Analysis
- Applicant Selection Committees

Jonatan Cvetko
310.686.0663
jonatan@angelesemeralds.org
How can DTSC support municipal efforts to address brownfields?

DTSC has staff throughout California who are dedicated to supporting the safe use, reuse and redevelopment of brownfields. Here are some of the ways DTSC can support efforts by public officials to eliminate blight and bring property to safe and highest and best use:

- **Know what’s in your community** - DTSC can share a listing of the sites in your city, district, or county where we have current involvement or have had historical involvement. Upon request, we can also share information on specific projects that may be of interest.

- **Use our brownfields expertise** - DTSC can set-up a call or a face-to-face meeting with your office to discuss specific projects or to provide an overview of DTSC’s process, and the tools and resources available to your constituents. DTSC can also participate in meetings with stakeholders to share brownfields information directly – and provide general consultation.

- **Learn about our voluntary agreements** - DTSC has fee-for-service agreements which allow us to work with motivated parties and provide regulatory oversight of environmental evaluation and cleanup of brownfields. Some of these agreements have special incentives such as a “covenant not to sue” or limited environmental liability immunity.

- **Our process has flexibility** - While DTSC has a comprehensive process to evaluate the nature and extent of contamination at a property, the exact scope varies from project to project. The process can be tailored based on a property’s end use. Through the voluntary process, DTSC can also offer consultation or conduct a document review if requested.

- **We have funding for environmental evaluation and for cleanup** - We have ~$300,000 through the Targeted Site Investigation program for environmental investigations – a competitive application process which opens every spring, where selected municipalities or non-profits receive services from a DTSC contractor. The Investigating Site Contamination Program provides low-interest loans to conduct preliminary endangerment assessments. We also have loans available for cleanup through a Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) and the Cleanup Loans and Environmental Assistance to Neighborhoods Program.

---

**What are brownfields?**

Brownfields are any property whose use or redevelopment is hampered because of known or perceived environmental contamination. Addressing brownfields through environmental investigation and cleanup allows safe use, reuse, redevelopment, and community revitalization, and provides safe living, working, and recreational spaces for Californians.

**What is DTSC’s role in brownfields?**

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is a lead regulatory agency for environmental evaluations and cleanups in California, with a staff of over 1,000, including scientists, engineers, toxicologists, geologists, and attorneys. DTSC works with property owners, operators, municipalities, non-profits, developers, potential buyers, and other parties, through voluntary agreements or enforcement actions to address environmental contamination. Generally, these parties retain environmental professionals to develop plans and reports and conduct field activities. Through various fee-for-service options, DTSC provides technical review, oversight of field work, and directs all aspects of environmental evaluation and cleanup. Specific activities vary from property to property.

**Who to contact for more information?**

Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi
Department of Toxic Substances Control
Maryam.Tasnif-Abbasi@dtsc.ca.gov
The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) offers loans and grants to assist with addressing environmental investigations and cleanups at properties throughout California. DTSC's goal with these funding resources is to empower communities and other stakeholders to work together in a timely manner to facilitate the return of blighted and underutilized properties to safe and productive uses.

### Grants

**Targeted Site Investigation (TSI) Program**

Under the TSI Program, DTSC selects sites to receive environmental services through a competitive application process. The TSI focuses on brownfield sites where redevelopment or reuse is being considered. The DTSC TSI Program is funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) through a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) 128(a) State and Tribal Response Program Grant. For the selected properties, DTSC provides assessment, investigation, or cleanup planning services at no cost to the applicant.

**Brownfields Revolving Loan Fund (RLF)**

The RLF provides US EPA-funded grants up to $200,000 for brownfields sites where redevelopment or reuse is planned. Under this program, local government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and tribes who are not considered to be responsible parties could be eligible for a grant to help with the cost of implementing a hazardous substance or petroleum cleanup.

### Loans

**Revolving Loan Fund (RLF)**

Through the RLF, DTSC provides below-market, low-interest loans for cleanup of a hazardous substance or petroleum site where redevelopment or reuse is planned. Eligible borrowers include local agencies and municipalities, nonprofit organizations, Indian Tribes, and private entities who are not considered to be responsible parties.

**Cleanup Loans and Environmental Assistance to Neighborhoods (CLEAN) Program**

CLEAN provides low-interest loans of up to $2.5 million for the cleanup of hazardous materials where redevelopment is likely to have a beneficial impact on the property values, economic viability, and quality of life of a community.

**Investigating Site Contamination Program (ISCP)**

ISCP provides low-interest loans of up to $100,000 to conduct preliminary endangerment assessments. If redevelopment of property is determined to not be economically feasible, up to 75 percent of the loan amount is forgiven.

### Other Funding Support

DTSC holds webinars and workshops with other agencies to share information on different state and federal funding sources. Additionally, DTSC supports parties pursuing U.S. EPA brownfields grants by writing letters of acknowledgment, which are a required aspect of the application process. DTSC also helps U.S. EPA grant applicants and recipients access federal brownfields funding by determining eligibility of petroleum-contaminated brownfields sites under CERCLA section 101(39)(D).

For more information on technical aspects of this funding, contact Maryam.Tasnif-Abbasi@dtsc.ca.gov

For more information on financial aspects of this funding, contact Jennifer.Black@dtsc.ca.gov

---

Which funding options apply to my brownfield?

**TSI**
- Assessment, investigation, or cleanup planning services at no cost to the applicant for sites with
  - Strong redevelopment potential
  - Real or perceived contamination
  - Clear need and municipal/community support for the property's revitalization
  - Redevelopment/reuse would benefit the community
  - Local governmental agencies, tribal governments, school districts, and nonprofit organizations are eligible
  - Annual competitive application

**RLF**
- Must not be a Responsible Party
- Must own the property
- Local governmental agencies, nonprofit organizations, or tribal governments are eligible
- Must have redevelopment plans
- Must have a cleanup plan approved by regulatory agency
- Maximum allowable grant is $200,000 per site
- Applications accepted continuously

**Clean Program**
- Must have a cleanup plan approved by regulatory agency
- Up to $2.5 million per site
- Up to $100,000 per site for assessment
- Must have redevelopment plans and cost estimate
- Applications accepted continuously

**ISCP**
- Up to $100,000 per site for assessment
- Must have a Phase I Assessment within three years
- Applications accepted continuously
DTSC Funding Resources

Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi
Department of Toxic Substances Control
Brownfields Coordinator
DTSC’s Funding Programs

Assessment
- Targeted Site Investigation Program
- Investigation Site Contamination Program

Cleanup
- Revolving Loan Fund
- Cleanup Loans and Environmental Assistance to Neighborhoods Program
Assessment Funding
Targeted Site Investigation Program

- Annual competitive application process
- No direct funding; DTSC’s contractor performs work
- Stepping stone to apply for US EPA grants
- Seven sites were selected for the last cycle
- Grants range from $35,000 to $65,000 in assessment services

New schools on vacant land
Modernization of existing school
Affordable housing on vacant land
Evaluation of properties to support revitalization of the Los Angeles River
Eligibility Criteria for the TSI

**Applicant Eligibility**
- Local governments
- School districts
- Tribes
- Non-profit organizations

**Property Eligibility**
- **Not** state or federally owned
- **Not** proposed or listed on the National Priority List
- **No** current or planned enforcement actions
- Redevelopment planned or in progress
- Ownership not needed, but written authorization to access property, from the property owner is required
- Property should be accessible for sampling
Selection Criteria for the TSI

1. The project area has a clear need for revitalization
2. There is clear municipal/community support for the property's revitalization
3. There are adequate resources and high developer interest
4. DTSC assessment assistance is crucial
5. Existing information supports directing resources to the site
TSI Application

- Applicant Information
- Site Identification
- Property Owner Information
- Services Requested
- Eligibility Criteria
- Site Information
- Site Considerations
TSI Application Instructions

Applicants may submit individual applications for multiple properties.

Email application and required attachments (access agreement, figures and photographs) to Triss.Chesney@dtsc.ca.gov.

Subject line: TSI Application 2019 + Applicant (Organization)

Attachments: Include Applicant (Organization) and content descriptor.

If confirmation email is not received within two working days of submittal, contact Triss.Chesney@dtsc.ca.gov.

All applications and required attachments must be received by June 28, 2019.
TSI Schedule

June 28th 2019: TSI application due

July 2019: Applicants will be contacted for verification and/or supplemental information

August 2019: Applicants will receive decision letters for TSI applications

September 2019: DTSC will initiate site-specific activities

April/May 2020: Project complete
AFFORDABLE HOMES

Habitat for Humanity
East Bay/Silicon Valley - Walnut Creek

- Removal Action Work Plan for arsenic in soil, from a former railroad
- Construction of 42 affordable homes for low income families on a two-acre vacant property
- Located near a Bay Area Rapid Transit station
- In line with Walnut Creek City Council’s support of dense infill design
- Strong support from the City of Walnut Creek and the community
- Redevelopment plans approved by Walnut Creek City Planning Commission and Design Review Commission
- Funding for redevelopment anticipated from the City of Walnut Creek, County HOME financing, AHSC, CalHome, and private donations
Preliminary Environmental Assessment to evaluate impact from agricultural use, lead-based paint, polychlorinated biphenyls from caulking and transformers, and naturally-occurring asbestos

Modernize South Valley Middle School (built circa 1930s), on the same 20.5-acre property

Technological upgrades necessary to support common core curriculum

Strong community support, including $90.5 million in local bonds allocated for this project

Local bond funds will be used for additional investigation or cleanup (if needed), and redevelopment
PROPOSED SCHOOLS
Fontana and Visalia Unified School Districts

- Preliminary Environmental Assessments to evaluate potential impact from agricultural use
- Construction of new schools on vacant property
- Fulfills critical need for new residential developments
- School districts plan to apply for State School Facility Program funding for new construction
IMPROVING ACCESS TO NATURAL RESOURCES

Los Angeles River Revitalization

- Background research for nine undeveloped parcels along a 3-mile stretch of the Los Angeles River to identify potential environmental concerns and help prioritize parcels for further assessment.

- Portion of the Los Angeles River Bikeway and Greenway project that will connect existing facilities to enable access to the revitalized river and expanded green space.

- Part of the long-term Los Angeles River Revitalization plan.
STREET END PARKS | AMIGO AVENUE

LA RIVERWAY | WEST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY DESIGN COMPLETION PROJECT
Investigating Site Contamination Program (ISCP) - *New!*

- Local agencies, tribes, nonprofits and private entities
- Provides low-interest loans of up to $100,000
- For development of Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA)
ISCP

Eligibility

- Phase I environmental assessment required
- Ownership not required - owner’s consent to use property as security interest needed
- State regulatory oversight required
- Funding transferred
- If redevelopment infeasible, a portion of loan may be waived
- Apply Now! Accepting applications continuously
Cleanup Funding
Revolving Loan Fund

- Funded by USEPA
- Public or private entities with full access eligible for loans
- Government, non-profit, Tribal property owners eligible for grants
- Cannot be responsible for contamination
- No orders on property
- Agency-approved cleanup plan required
Loan Details

- Must demonstrate creditworthiness and provide collateral
- Loan funds limited to cleanup costs
- Repayment terms of 6 months to three years preferable
- Below market interest rate

Apply Now!
Accepting applications continuously
Fellowship Garden of Love at Holmes Avenue, Los Angeles

- Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust
- ~$100,000 allocated for soil removal
- Vicinity of the Del Amo superfund site
- Property needed to be suitable for park use
- Local agency was the lead regulatory agency for soil cleanup
- One of LA’s first communal community gardens
- Fruits and vegetables can be planted and harvested by anyone in the community
- Partnership with the Martin Luther King Jr. Community Health Center
Fellowship Garden of Love at Holmes Avenue - Before
Fellowship Garden of Love at Holmes Avenue - After
Cleanup Loans and Environmental Assistance to Neighborhoods (CLEAN) Program - New!

- Provides low-interest cleanup loans of up to $2.5 million
- For redevelopment in urban areas
- Preliminary Endangerment Assessment equivalent, cleanup plan and cleanup cost estimate required
- Shovel-ready projects
- State oversight required

Apply Now! Accepting applications continuously
General & Technical Questions:
Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi
Brownfields Coordinator
Maryam.Tasnif-Abbasi@dtsc.ca.gov

TSI Questions:
Triss Chesney
TSI Coordinator
Triss.Chesney@dtsc.ca.gov

Loan Questions:
Jennifer Black
RLF/ISCP/CLEAN Loan
Program Manager
Jennifer.Black@dtsc.ca.gov
Connect SoCal Outreach and Envisioning and RHNA Methodology Development

MaAyn Johnson, AICP
Housing & Land Use Planner
June 12, 2019

www.scag.ca.gov
Scenario Outreach and Envisioning Overview

- Local input process
- Initial scenario development
- Public outreach
- Next steps
Local Input Process (Fall 2017-2018)

Data collected through local input underpinned scenario development

- Local general and specific plan land use
- Local growth projections
- Entitled projects
- Planned transportation investments (future transit priority areas and high quality transit areas)
Local Data + Research + Sustainable Communities Working Group=
Initial priority growth areas and constraints

Sustainable Communities Working Group convened 4 times over the past year to discuss strategies and concepts for Connect SoCal Sustainable Communities Strategy
Transit Priority Areas (TPAs): An area within one-half mile of a major transit stop that is existing or planned.

High Quality Transit Areas (HQ TAs): Areas within one-half mile of a high-quality transit.

Livable Corridors: This arterial network is a subset of the high quality transit areas based on level of transit service and land use planning efforts.

Neighborhood Mobility Areas (NM As): Areas with high intersection density, low to moderate traffic speeds, and robust residential retail connections.

Job Centers: Areas with significantly higher employment density than surrounding areas.
Growth Constraint Areas

**Absolute constraints**
- Military lands
- Existing Open space
- Conserved land
- 2 ft. Sea Level Rise
- Agriculture (Unincorporated)
- No housing in 500 ft. buffer of high capacity roadway (Except when overlaps with TPA)

**Variable Constraints**
- Wildland Urban Interface
- Agriculture (Incorporated)
- 500 year flood plains
- CalFire Very High Severity fire risk (state and local)
- Natural lands and habitat corridors (Connectivity, Habitat Quality, Habitat Type layers)
Transportation Strategy Development

**Investments**
- Regional Express Lane Network
- First/Last Mile
- Transit (including Microtransit)
- Bike and Ped Infrastructure
- Mobility Innovations- Bike/Car Share, TNC Partnerships

**Policies**
- Pricing
- Transportation Demand Management
- Employer-based trip reduction
- Parking Management
- PEV charging network
Draft Scenario Methodology

Key Principles:

• Include entitled projects

• Refer to local adopted plans (type and density)

• Maintain consistent growth projections (except for 1 unconstrained scenario)

• Develop 3 scenarios: 2 constrained and 1 unconstrained

Scenario: Existing Plans

- Reflects the land use and growth patterns as submitted to SCAG
- Includes projects submitted by County Transportation Commissions.
More growth is directed near transit infrastructure and in walkable neighborhoods.
- Includes CTC projects.
- Includes regional strategic projects like increased Active Transportation investment.
- More growth is directed near jobs centers and near transit priority areas
- Includes CTC projects
- Includes regional strategic projects like increased Active Transportation investment
- More growth is directed near jobs centers and near transit priority areas
- Includes CTC projects
- Includes regional strategic projects like increased Active Transportation investment
- Includes unfunded improvements such as more frequent transit and consumer EV rebates
Public Outreach (May- June 2019)

- 28 Open house workshops across the region
  - See workshop material at connectsocal.org > Resources
- Community based organization partners
- Public intercept surveys at pop-up locations
- Online engagement and survey

Take the survey at: Connectsocal.org/survey
Next steps

- Review modeled performance of draft scenarios
- Review and analyze public feedback
- Prepare final scenario for proposal to SCAG Committees late summer/early fall 2019 before inclusion into Connect SoCal
Next steps

- Review modeled performance of draft scenarios
- Review and analyze public feedback
- Prepare final scenario for proposal to SCAG Com m ittees late summer/early fall 2019 before inclusion into Connect SoCal
RHNA Methodology: Existing Need

Regional Existing Need

- 30% Distributed based on population within an HQTA
- 70% Distributed based on population share

Jurisdiction Existing Need

- Jurisdiction’s share of regional population
- Jurisdiction’s share of regional population within HQTA
RHNA Methodology: Existing Need

Jurisdiction Existing Housing Need \times 110\% \text{ social equity adjustment} = \begin{array}{c}
\text{Jurisdiction Existing Housing Need (only three categories)} \\
\text{Very low} \\
\text{Low} \\
\text{Moderate}
\end{array}
RHNA Methodology Projected Need

Jurisdiction’s share of regional projected HH growth + Future vacancy need (owner) + Jurisdiction’s share of regional replacement need = Jurisdiction Projected Housing Need
RHNA Methodology Projected Need

Jurisdiction Projected Housing Need \( \times \) 150% social equity adjustment = Jurisdiction Projected Housing Need

- Very low
- Low
- Moderate
- Above moderate
RHNA Methodology Projected Need

Jurisdiction Existing Need
- Very low
- Low
- Moderate

Jurisdiction Projected Need
- Very low
- Low
- Moderate
- Above moderate

Jurisdiction Total RHNA Allocation
- Very low
- Low
- Moderate
- Above moderate
RHNA Next Steps

- Next RHNA Subcommittee meeting:
  - July 1, 2019
  - Webcasting available
  - Proposed RHNA methodology

- Proposed methodology public comment period
  - August/Sept 2019
  - At least one public hearing
Thank you
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Name</th>
<th>Population Density per Square Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>27,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>23,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Park</td>
<td>19,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>19,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>17,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>17,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>15,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>14,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>13,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>12,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellflower</td>
<td>12,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>11,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>10,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesia</td>
<td>10,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>9,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>8,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>8,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>8,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>8,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>7,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>7,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>7,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>6,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>5,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>5,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>5,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>2,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>2,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>1,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
1. Cities include for comparison purposes (Population from 2010 Census)
2. Values obtained from EnergyAtlas (Population from 2010 Census) - EnergyAtlas provides disaggregated energy data developed by the UCLA California Center for Sustainable Communities (CCSC) and funded by the SoCoIREN and the County of Los Angeles' Office of Sustainability.
AB 1279 (Bloom) High Resource Areas. Density Increase. Height Increase

Bill Summary:
This measure would require HCD to designate areas in this state as high-resource areas by January 1, 2021, and every 5 years thereafter. In any area designated as a high-resource area, cities would be required to approve housing projects, by right, with density up to 100 units per acre and heights up to 55 feet.

Bill Description:
Key definitions.
“High-resource area” means an area of high opportunity and low residential density that is not currently experiencing gentrification and displacement, and that is not at a high risk of future gentrification and displacement, designated by the department pursuant to subdivision (b).

“Infill site” means a site in which at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins parcels that are developed with urban uses. For the purposes of this section, parcels that are only separated by a street or highway shall be considered to be adjoined.

“Use by right” means that the local government’s review of the development project under this section may not require a conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary local government review or approval that would constitute a “project” for purposes of Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code. Any subdivision of the sites shall be subject to all laws, including, but not limited to, the local government ordinance implementing the Subdivision Map Act (Division 2 (commencing with Section 66410)).

A local ordinance may provide that “use by right” does not exempt the development project from design review. However, that design review shall not constitute a “project” for purposes of Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code.

Important Provisions
No later than January 1, 2021, and every five years thereafter, the department shall designate areas in this state as high-resource areas. In designating areas of the state as high-resource areas, the department shall collaborate with the California Fair Housing Task Force, convened by the department and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, and shall solicit input from members of the public and ensure participation from all economic segments of the community as well as members of those classes protected pursuant to Section 12955. The designation of an area as a high-resource area shall remain valid for five years.

A city or county that includes within its jurisdictional boundaries an area designated as a high-resource area may appeal to the department to remove that designation at any point during the five-year period by submitting an appeal to the department.

The department may remove the designation of a city or county that submits an appeal if it finds, based on substantial evidence, that the city or county has adopted policies after the area was designated as a high-resource area that meet the following requirements:
The policies permit development of higher density housing in the high-resource area, in a manner substantially similar to this measure, than were allowed under the city’s or county’s policies in effect at the time the area was designated as a high-resource area.

The policies are sufficient to accommodate a similar number of housing units within the area and at similar levels of affordability as would be allowed under this measure.

The policies are consistent with the city’s or county’s obligation to affirmatively further fair housing.

In considering an appeal of a city or county, the department shall consult with the California Fair Housing Task Force and shall issue a decision within 90 days of receiving the appeal. The decision of the department regarding an appeal shall be final.

After areas of a city or county have been designated as high-resource areas a housing developer may request, and the city or county shall approve, by right the development if it satisfies the following criteria:

- **Single-family residential zones:**
  - The development project consists of no more than four residential units and has a height of no more than 20 feet.
  - Either of the following apply:
    - The initial sales price or initial rent for units are affordable to households with income equal to or less than 100 percent of the area median income.
    - If the initial sales price or initial rent exceeds 100 percent of area median income, the developer shall agree to pay a fee to the county or city equal to 10 percent of the difference between the actual initial sales price or initial rent and the sales price or rent that would be affordable to households making up to 100 percent of the area median income. The city or county shall deposit any fee received into a separate fund reserved for the construction or preservation of housing with an affordable housing cost or affordable rent to households with income less than 50 percent of the area median income.
  - The development project shall comply with all objective design standard of the city or county. However, the city or county shall not require the development project to comply with an objective design standard that would preclude the development from including up to four units or impose a maximum height limitation of less than 20 feet.

- **Residential zones:**
  - The development project consists of no more than 40 residential units and has a height of no more than 30 feet.
  - The development project is located on a site that is one-quarter acre in size or greater and is either adjacent to an arterial road or located within a central business district.
  - For development projects consisting of 10 or fewer units, either of the following apply:
    - The initial sales price or initial rent for units are affordable to households with income equal to or less than 100 percent of the area median income.
    - If the initial sales price or initial rent exceeds 100 percent of area median income, the developer shall agree to pay a fee to the county or city equal to 10 percent of the difference between the actual initial sales price or initial rent and the sales price or rent that would be affordable to households making up to 100 percent of the area median income. The city or county shall deposit any fee received into a
separate fund reserved for the construction or preservation of housing with an affordable housing cost or affordable rent to households with income less than 50 percent of the area median income.

- For development projects consisting of more than 10 units, at least 10 percent of the units in the development project have an affordable housing cost or affordable rent to lower income households and at least 5 percent have an affordable housing cost or affordable rent to very low income households. However, if the city or county requires that the development project include a greater percentage of units that are affordable to lower income and very low income households, the development project shall comply with that greater requirement.

- The development project complies with all objective design standards of the city or county. However, the city or county shall not require the development project to comply with an objective design standard that would preclude the development from including up to 40 units or impose a maximum height limitation of less than 30 feet.

- Commercial zones:
  - The development project consists of no more than 100 residential units and has a height of no more than 55 feet.
  - The development project is located on a site that is one-half acre in size or greater and is either adjacent to an arterial road or located within a central business district.
  - At least 25 percent of the units in the development project have an affordable housing cost or affordable to lower income households and at least 25 percent have an affordable housing cost or affordable rent to very low income households.
  - The development project complies with all objective design standards of the city or county. However, the city or county shall not require the development project to comply with an objective design standard that would preclude the development from including up to 100 units or impose a maximum height limitation of less than 55 feet.

A development project that is a use by right pursuant to this paragraph shall be eligible for a density bonus.

An applicant for a development project shall agree to, and the city or county shall ensure, the continued affordability of units included in the development project that are affordable to lower income and very low income households in accordance with the applicable affordability requirement under this subdivision for at least the following periods of time:

- Fifty-five years for units that are rented.
- Forty-five years for units that are owner occupied.

A development project shall not be eligible for approval if it is on site that contains any of the following (SB 35 site limitations): – coastal zone, prime farmland, wetlands, rental housing that is currently occupied by tenants or has been occupied by tenants within the past 10 years, etc.
### Gateway Cities Corridor Matrix

| Highway Corridors | Artesia | Avalon | Bell Gardens | Compton | Cudahy | Downey | Hawaiian Gardens | Huntington Park | Industry | La Mirada | Lakewood | Long Beach | Lynwood | Maywood | Montebello | Norwalk | Paramount | Pico Rivera | Pico Rivera Springs | Signal Hill | South Gate | Vernon | Whittier | LA County |
|-------------------|---------|--------|--------------|---------|--------|--------|------------------|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-------------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|----------|-----------|---------------------|---------------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|----------|
| CA 91 / I-405 / I-605 | 91/605  | 91/605 | 91/605 | 91/605 | 91/605 | 605    | 605             | 605          | 605      | 91/605   | 605       | 605         | 605    | 91/605 | 605         | 605    | 605      | 605       | 605             | 605           | 605       | 605    | 605    | 605    | 605      |
| I-105*            |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| I-5               |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| I-710             |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Alondra Boulevard |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Artesia Boulevard |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Atlantic Avenue/Boulevard |     |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Florence Avenue   |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Imperial Highway  |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Lakewood/Rosemead Boulevard | |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Long Beach Boulevard |       |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Slauson Avenue    |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Telegraph Road    |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Amtrak - Metrolink |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Eco-Rapid Transit¹ |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| High Speed Rail   |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Metro Blue Line   |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension | |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Metro Green Line* |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Foothill Transit  |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Long Beach Transit |       |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Montebello Transit |       |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Norwalk Transit   |         |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Los Cerritos Channel Watershed | |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Lower Los Angeles Upper Reach 2 Watershed | |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Lower Los Angeles Watershed |     |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Lower San Gabriel Watershed |     |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Disadvantaged/ Low Income Communities** |     |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |
| Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) Eligible + |     |        |              |         |        |        |                 |               |          |          |            |             |        |        |              |        |          |            |                  |               |           |        |        |        |          |

*Footnotes and Legend on Reverse.*

As of May 2019
Metro Green Line runs on I-105

**SB 535** identifies Disadvantaged Communities through CalEPA’s CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scoring the top 25% based on geographic, public health, socio-economic and environmental hazard factors. If at least one census tract is identified as a disadvantaged community, then the whole city is shown to be a disadvantaged community.

**AB 1550** identifies Low-Income Communities as those with either a household income at or below 80% of the statewide median income, or a household income at or below the low-income threshold designated by HCD’s list of 2016 State Income Limits.

+TCC Communities are those located in the top 5% disadvantaged census tracts per CalEnviroScreen 3.0 or in a low-income census tract per AB 1550.

1 Eco-Rapid Transit cities shown in dark purple are members of the Eco-Rapid Joint Powers Authority.

As of May 2019