COUNTY CLERK LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

July 15, 2014

Minutes

Call to order 9:30 a.m. In attendance: Kammi Foote, Inyo; Joe Holland, Santa Barbara; Portia Sanders, Los Angeles;; Val Wood, San Diego; Donna Allred, Sacramento; Sandra Banaga, San Diego; Elisabeth Flores, San Diego; Margarita Williams, Santa Cruz; Laura Williams, Contra Costa; Laure Brinies, Alameda; Eva He, Alameda; Candy Grubbs, Butte; Sheila Harmon, Ventura; David Valenzuela, Ventura; Monique Blakely, Los Angeles; Elizabeth Gutierrez, contra Costa; Frederick Garcia, Contra Costa; Sandra Spencer, Los Angeles; Louise Martinez, Sacramento; Carolyn Crnich, Humboldt; Karen Yee, San Francisco; Jenny Stasik, San Bernardino; Diana Hernandez, San Bernardino; Deva Proto, Sonoma; Carrie Anderson, Sonoma; Jennifer Pechan, San Diego; Larry Ward, Revierside

On phone: Matt Siverling, Legislative Advocate; Bruce Crystal, Riverside; Wardell House, Santa Clara;

Meeting commenced at 1:00. Kammi Foote conducted the meeting. Joe Holland took notes. Kammi announced that Joe Holland was taking Kathie Moran’s place as Co-Chair

Matt Siverling gave his report over the phone. He said that the period June 25 through July 3 is usually quiet and there was nothing of substance this year. Moving forward through August Matt said he is always concerned that something weird might pop up and that the legislature usually sees one or two terrible bills this time of year.

Matt brought up **AB1525**. The City Clerks as marriage officiants bill that was proposed and supported by a certain city official from the City of Long Beach.

This bill will allow city clerks to conduct marriage ceremonies. This bill now has support of the Long Beach City Mayor. Apparently the bill has been changed to authorize only city clerks from charter cities. Very good chance this bill will pass both houses and get to the Governor’s desk. It has currently passed the Assembly and is in the Senate. Will need to consider sending letter of opposition to the Governor.

The main hurdle to convincing people to oppose this bill is it is difficult to demonstrate the harm the bill would cause. Main message is that it promotes mission creep and blurs the line between City and County Clerks. Although bill is moving – there hasn’t been a lot of traction to move it along. But there is no real “soft spot” that could hold this bill up. Matt has been contacted by other cities that do not want this added task.

 Although this bill will allow city clerks to conduct marriage ceremonies they do not have authority to issue marriage licenses. People wanting to get married will still need to go to the County to get a marriage license and then go to the City Clerk to get married if they so choose.

One negative aspect of this bill is that it will provide direct competition with the private marriage ceremony industry. There are currently 121 charter cities in the state that could begin conducting marriage ceremonies and taking away business from private entities.

Next bill brought up by Matt was **AB 2528** This bill would require diacritical marks on birth certificates. The bill was expanded to require marriage licenses to also allow diacritical marks.

This bill originated from a high school contest called “There ought to be a law”. This is a feel good bill. Many legislators have diacritical marks in their names. One of the criticisms of the opposition to this bill is “If Mexico can accommodate diacritical marks – then why not California?” At the end of the day this bill was stopped in appropriations. Analysis indicated that this bill would costs the SOS and the DMV upwards of $10 million each and coupled with county costs the total cost could exceed $50M.. Bill was held in appropriations and is effectively killed for this year.

Candy Grubbs brought up a discussion about **AB 1733** and specifically questioned why the committee had not taken an oppose position on this. This bill allows a homeless person to request and be furnished a certificate of live birth without a fee. Status of being homeless must be verified by a homeless service provider. There is a limit of one copy per application. This bill still does not include authorization for the County to withhold the cost of providing these free certificates from monies being sent to the State.

This bill has the support of CSAC. Kammi pointed out that CSAC has a policy stating that affiliate organizations, such as CACEO, cannot take positions contrary to positions held by CSAC. There was discussion about CACEO not being an affiliate organization of CSAC in spite of CSAC’s opinion that it is. Kammi was going to send out the CSAC policy.

It was brought up that this bill has very strong support throughout the legislature and that opposing the bill would have no effect upon its certain success in becoming law. It was agreed that opposing this bill would not be in the best long term interests of the committee.

There was discussion of the costs of this bill. It was suggested that it might be a good idea for counties to keep track of how many no fee Birth Certificates are issued so that a future report could be provided on the statewide costs. It was also mentioned trhat the Birth Certificate is stamped “For Government Use Only” and that when stamped as such the DMV will not issue a CDL with this document.

Other bills briefly discussed:

**AB 2275** Ridley-Thomas Certified copies of marriage, birth, and death certificates: electronic application. This bill was sponsored by LA County. This bill was effectively killed by the ACLU and the Privacy Rights Clearing House. CACEO had a support position.

**AB 2147** Dead

**AB 2286** Dead

Meeting was adjourned at 2:04