

2025-26 SESSION

**SENATE
THIRD READING PACKET**

TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2026



OFFICE OF SENATE FLOOR ANALYSES
651-4171

SENATE THIRD READING PACKET

Attached are analyses of bills on the Daily File for Tuesday, January 20, 2026.

<u>Note</u>	<u>Measure</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Location</u>
+	<u>SB 96</u>	Umberg	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>SB 607</u>	Wiener	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
+	<u>SB 762</u>	Arreguín	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>SB 795</u>	Richardson	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>SB 799</u>	Allen	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>SCR 89</u>	Smallwood-Cuevas	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>SJR 9</u>	Durazo	Unfinished Business
+	<u>SR 67</u>	Blakespear	Senate Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS

RA Revised Analysis

* Analysis pending

THIRD READING

Bill No: SB 96
Author: Umberg (D)
Amended: 1/5/26
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 9-0, 1/12/26
AYES: Ashby, Choi, Archuleta, Arreguín, Grayson, Niello, Smallwood-Cuevas,
Umberg, Weber Pierson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Menjivar, Strickland

SUBJECT: Streaming services: commercial advertisements

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a social media video service, music streaming service, or podcast streaming service that serves California consumers from transmitting the audio of commercial advertisements louder than the video content the advertisements accompany.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits, beginning July 1, 2026, a video streaming service that serves California consumers from transmitting the audio of commercial advertisements louder than the video content the advertisements accompany, consistent with the regulations adopted by the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to the Commercial Advertisement Loudness Mitigation (CALM) Act (Public Law 111-311) for television broadcast stations, cable operators, and other multichannel video programming distributors. (Business and Professions Code (BPC) § 22776)
- 2) Defines “video programming” as having the same meaning as the term is defined in Section 613(h) of Title 47 of the United States Code, which is

programming by, or generally considered comparable to programming provided by a television broadcast station, but not including consumer-generated media. (BPC § 22775)

- 3) Defines “video streaming service” as an entity that makes video programming or video content the entity makes available for users to view. Specifies that “video streaming service” does not include a television broadcast station, cable operator, or other multichannel video programming distributor, or an entity that serves video programming or video content without commercial advertisements.
- 4) States that the prohibition in 1) above does not create a private right of action. (BPC § 22775)
- 5) Existing federal law establishes standards for the transmission of commercial advertisements by a television broadcast station, cable operator, or other multichannel video programming distributor by requiring, within 1 year after December 15, 2010, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to establish a regulation for the "Recommended Practice: Techniques for Establishing and Maintaining Audio Loudness for Digital Television" (Advanced Television Systems Committee's (ATSC) A/85 Recommended Practice ("ATSC A/85 RP") (47 U.S.C. § 621)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits a social media video service, music streaming service, or podcast streaming service that serves California consumers from transmitting the audio of commercial advertisements louder than the content the advertisements accompany.
- 2) Defines “social media video service” to mean an internet website that is open to the public, allows a user to create an account, consists primarily of content that is user generated and not preselected by the provider, and provides a landing page, main feed, or search function that presents the user with video content generated by other users.

Background

According to the FCC, Congress enacted the CALM Act to direct the FCC to establish rules to require commercials to have the same average volume as the

programs they accompany. These rules went into effect on December 13, 2012. Specifically, the CALM Act directs the FCC to establish rules that require TV stations, cable operators, satellite TV providers or other multichannel video program distributors to apply the Advanced Television Systems Committee's (ATSC) A/85 Recommended Practice ("ATSC A/85 RP") to commercial advertisements they transmit to viewers. The ATSC A/85 RP is a set of methods to measure and control the audio loudness of digital programming, including commercials. This standard can be used by all broadcast television stations and pay TV providers. The ATSC practice does not set an absolute cap on loudness. Rather, it requires commercials to have the same average volume as the programming they accompany, so that the volume a consumer chooses is the one at which both the programming and the advertisements will air. The FCC relies on consumer complaints to monitor industry compliance.

In 2023, Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI) and Representative Anna G. Eshoo (D-CA) introduced legislation, S. 1127 and H.R. 2422, to extend the CALM Act's prohibitions to all ad-supported streaming services to ensure that the volume of commercials on streaming services is not louder than regular programming. It also grants the FCC the ability to investigate and enforce violations of the CALM Act by broadcast, cable, and satellite TV operators and requires a study analyzing the effectiveness of the CALM Act in moderating ad loudness. The measures were referred to their respective policy committees, but it appears no further action was taken.

Comments

This bill specifies certain prohibitions on activity by entities that serve consumers throughout the nation and world. It is unclear whether it is feasible for social media video services, music streaming services, or podcast streaming services to establish advertisement transmission standards only for California residents. This effort may be more appropriate for the federal government to address by updating the CALM Act to include all ad-supported streaming services. This bill additionally lacks any type of enforcement mechanism and does not include a pathway for consumers to report a violation of the proposed prohibition and it is unclear if this bill will result in any meaningful change without enforcement or whether consumers will just continue to report complaints and concerns about advertising volume to the FCC as they do today.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: No Local: No

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/13/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/13/26)

None received

Prepared by: Sarah Mason / B., P. & E.D. / (916) 651-4104
1/14/26 15:44:33

**** **END** ****

CONSENT

Bill No: SB 607
Author: Wiener (D)
Amended: 1/5/26
Vote: 21

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 4/23/25
AYES: Blakespear, Valladares, Dahle, Gonzalez, Menjivar, Padilla
NO VOTE RECORDED: Hurtado, Pérez

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 5-1, 4/30/25
AYES: Choi, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Seyarto, Wiener
NOES: Durazo
NO VOTE RECORDED: Laird

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 4-0, 5/23/25
AYES: Caballero, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Dahle, Wahab

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 1/14/26
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

SUBJECT: University of California: California Institutes for Science and
Innovation

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill explicitly authorizes artificial intelligence (AI) as an additional concentration area that may be covered by the existing California Institutes for Science and Innovation established within the University of California (UC).

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the UC Regents to establish four California Institutes for Science and Innovation at separate campuses of the UC for the purpose of combining technological and scientific research training and educating future scientists and technological leaders.
- 2) Requires that each institute be created through a competitive application process conducted by a panel selected by the Governor and administered by the UC.
- 3) Specifies that each institute develop programs in cooperation with the private sector and with California's other public and independent universities.
- 4) States that the concentration of each institute may include, but is not limited to, any of the following:
 - a) Medicine.
 - b) Bioengineering.
 - c) Telecommunications and information systems.
 - d) Energy resources.
 - e) Space.
 - f) Agricultural technology.
- 5) Makes the state's share of funding for operating and facilities costs for each institute subject to appropriation in the annual Budget Act. (Education Code § 92900)

This bill explicitly adds AI to the list of concentration areas that may be covered by the existing California Institutes for Science and Innovation established within the UC.

Comments

Need for this bill. According to the author, "SB 607 adds Artificial Intelligence to the list of enumerated concentrations that the California Institutes of Science and Innovation may focus on. As this technology continues to play a major role in our

state's economy, it is important that existing resources are leveraged to ensure California's position as a leader in safe and responsible AI. Since 2001, when the University of California was given funding to establish four California Institutes for Science and Innovation in order to help bridge the gap between research and business, the technology landscape has greatly shifted. Existing law references six areas in which the institutes may concentrate, adding AI best positions California to continue to lead on this technology."

California Institutes for Science and Innovation. AB 2883 (Villaraigosa, Chapter 79, Statutes of 2000) authorized the UC to establish three research institutes to be located on separate UC campuses, partially funded with state funds. A fourth institute was authorized the following year. Existing law allows each institute to focus on a range of concentration areas, including medicine, bioengineering, telecommunications and information systems, energy resources, space, and agricultural technology, but does not limit institutes to these areas, and they may pursue other topics without additional legislation. These multidisciplinary research centers are structured in partnership with industry to promote business growth in the state, serve as training grounds for student researchers, and future business leaders. All four institutes utilize the research capabilities of multiple UC campuses. The institutes include the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society, the California Nanosystems Institute, the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology, and the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences.

Artificial Intelligence. There is growing interest within the Legislature in expanding research on AI to better understand its impacts and to help inform the development of policy. According to the 2025 report, *The California Report on Frontier AI Policy*, AI encompasses a broad range of technologies that aim to replace or supplement human cognitive capabilities. California is home to many of the leading AI companies and research institutions. California has both the capability and responsibility to help ensure these powerful technologies remain safe so that their benefits to society can be realized. AI, as an area of concentration, aligns with the technology emphasis of the other concentration areas outlined in existing law. This bill aims to support research capacity in AI technology by highlighting it as a potential area of study within these established institutes.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: No Local: No

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/15/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/15/26)

None received

Prepared by: Olgalilia Ramirez / ED. / (916) 651-4105
1/15/26 15:57:38

****** END ******

THIRD READING

Bill No: SB 762
Author: Arreguín (D)
Amended: 1/5/26
Vote: 21

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 5-2, 1/14/26
AYES: Durazo, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Laird, Wiener
NOES: Choi, Seyarto

SENATE REVENUE AND TAXATION COMMITTEE: 4-1, 1/14/26
AYES: McNerney, Ashby, Grayson, Umberg
NOES: Valladares

SUBJECT: Transactions and use tax: City of Hercules

SOURCE: City of Hercules

DIGEST: This bill allows the City of Hercules to impose a district tax, by ordinance or voter initiative, of up to 1% even if it exceeds the 2% cap.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Imposes the sales tax on every retailer engaged in business in this state that sells tangible personal property, and requires them to remit taxes collected from purchasers to the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA).
- 2) Applies whenever a retail sale is made, which is basically any sale other than one for resale in the regular course of business.
- 3) Provides that unless the person pays the sales tax to the retailer, he or she is liable for the use tax, which is imposed on any person consuming tangible personal property in the state. The use tax rate is the same rate as the sales tax

rate, and must be remitted on or before the last day of the month following the quarterly period in which the person made the purchase.

- 4) Levies the sales and use tax at a current rate of 7.25%.
- 5) States that taxes levied by local governments are either general taxes, subject to majority approval of its voters, or special taxes, subject to 2/3 vote (California Constitution, Article XIII C).
- 6) Allows cities, counties, and specified special districts, including the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) and the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority, to increase the sales and use tax applied within their jurisdictions, also known as district or transactions and use taxes, for either specific or general purposes pursuant to the California Constitution's voter approval requirements.
- 7) Allows counties to impose a district tax solely in the unincorporated area of a county (AB 2119, Stone, Chapter 148, Statutes of 2014).
- 8) Caps the maximum district tax rate at 2% within a county; however, allows exceptions from the cap for the Cities of El Cerrito and Santa Fe Springs, Contra Costa County, Humboldt County, San Mateo County, Sonoma County (and any city in Sonoma County), the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, and the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority, among others.
- 9) Provides that BART's district tax does not count toward the 2% cap (AB 723, Quirk, Chapter 747, Statutes of 2019).

This bill:

- 1) Allows the City of Hercules to impose a district tax, by ordinance or voter initiative, of up to 1% above the 2% cap when combined with other district taxes imposed by local agencies in Contra Costa County.
- 2) Requires the Hercules City Council to adopt an ordinance proposing the tax unless it's proposed by voter initiative.
- 3) States that the ordinance must be submitted to the electorate for approval and be approved by voters according to the appropriate Constitutional voter approval threshold.

- 4) Requires the tax to otherwise conform to state district tax law, except for the 2% cap.

Background

Located on the coast of San Pablo Bay in Contra Costa County, the City of Hercules has a population of 26,016 according to the 2020 U.S. Census. The City has imposed a 0.5% district tax since January 1, 2012, which, when combined with the three other 0.5% district taxes imposed in Contra Costa County (BART, Contra Costa County Transportation Authority, and Contra Costa County), results in a 9.25% rate in the City. Currently, the City can impose another district tax of 0.5% without legislation because BART's rate does not count towards the cap.

Comment

Too high? California's sales and use tax rate is high compared to other states, especially when incorporating locally imposed district taxes. Tax experts generally agree that sales and use taxes are regressive, meaning the tax incidence falls more heavily on low-income individuals than on high-income individuals, because those of lesser means generally spend a greater percentage of their income on taxable sales, even if California exempts many necessities such as food and prescription medication. While below the highest rate in the state (the cities of Lancaster and Palmdale in Los Angeles County currently impose 11.25% rates), the rate could reach 10.25% in the City of Hercules should voters fully utilize SB 762's authority. Additionally, the City can currently impose a 0.5% tax without a legislative exemption from the cap.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: No Local: No

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/15/26)

City of Hercules (source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/15/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, “SB 762 provides the City of Hercules residents with a limited opportunity to vote on local tax measures. The increase in revenue would support the protection and maintenance of essential city services- such as faster 911 response times and improved park infrastructure - while achieving long-term financial stability and economic development.”

Prepared by: Colin Grinnell / REV. & TAX. / (916) 651-4117
1/15/26 15:57:39

**** **END** ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: SB 795
Author: Richardson (D)
Amended: 1/5/26
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 14-0, 1/13/26

AYES: Padilla, Valladares, Archuleta, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle,
Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber
Pierson

NO VOTE RECORDED: Hurtado

SUBJECT: Horse racing: out-of-state thoroughbred races: Delaware Handicap

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill adds the Delaware Handicap to the group of race meetings that are exempt from the 75 race-per-day limit on imported races into California for the purposes of wagering.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes, pursuant to Article IV, Section 19(b) of the Constitution of the State of California, the Legislature to provide for the regulation of horse races and grants the California Horse Racing Board the authority to regulate the various forms of horse racing authorized in this state.
- 2) Authorizes thoroughbred racing associations or fairs to distribute the audiovisual signal and accept wagers on the results of out-of-state and international thoroughbred races during the calendar period the association or fair is conducting live racing, including days on which there is no live racing being conducted by the association or fair.

- 3) Limits the number of races that may be imported by associations and fairs to no more than 75 races-per-day on days when live thoroughbred or fair racing is being conducted in this state, with specified exceptions.
- 4) Exempts from that 75 races-per-day limit any imported races that are part of the race card of the Kentucky Derby, the Kentucky Oaks, the Preakness Stakes, the Belmont Stakes, the Jockey Club Gold Cup, the Travers Stakes, the Pegasus World Cup, the Arlington Million, the Breeders' Cup World Championship, the Dubai World Cup, the Arkansas Derby, the Apple Blossom Handicap, the Blue Grass Stakes, the Whitney Stakes, or the Haskell Invitational.

This bill adds the Delaware Handicap to the group of race meetings that are exempt from the 75 race-per-day limit on imported races into California for the purposes of wagering.

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "the decline in horse racing has impacted live track and off-track racing venues. In my district, Hollywood Park used to be the home of the largest horse racing venue. While it has been replaced, Hollywood Park Casino still hosts satellite racing venues. Many venues such as Hollywood Park Casino have struggled since the COVID pandemic. SB 795 would provide them an opportunity to be competitive and thrive."

Satellite Wagering. Satellite wagering via an off-track facility has been legal in California since the 1980s when California racetracks began experiencing declining attendance and handle figures. The industry believed that making the product easier to access not only would expose and market horse racing to potential customers but also make it more convenient for the existing patrons to wager more frequently. However, while off-track-betting and simulcasting can open new revenue pathways, they may cannibalize traditional on-track income, putting tracks at further financial risk and potentially contributing to closures.

Simulcasting. Simulcasting is the process of transmitting the audio and video signal of a live racing performance from one facility to a satellite for re-transmission to other locations or venues where pari-mutuel wagering is permitted. Simulcasting provides racetracks with the opportunity to increase revenues by exporting their live racing content to as many wagering locations as possible, such as other racetracks, fair satellite facilities, and Indian casinos. Revenues increase because simulcasting provides racetracks that export their live content with

additional customers in multiple locations who would not have otherwise been able to place wagers on the live racing event.

Distribution of Audiovisual Signals and Wagering. Thoroughbred racing associations and fairs in California can distribute the audiovisual signal and accept wagers on the results of out-of-state thoroughbred races during their own race meetings. This is allowed even on days when no live races are being held at their venues. There is a limit on the number of out-of-state races that can be imported into California for betting purposes. On days when there is live thoroughbred or fair racing happening in California, the total number of races imported from out-of-state must not exceed 75 races-per-day.

However, there are exceptions to this limit. Races that are part of specific major events like the Kentucky Derby, Breeder's Cup, and other specified races can be imported without falling under the 75 race-per-day limit. Additional exceptions are made for importing races into certain geographical zones of California when no local live racing is occurring. Any wagering on these out-of-state races must comply with specific provisions of California's Horse Racing Law that govern how betting should be conducted. Wagers on out-of-state races are not allowed after 7 p.m. Pacific Standard Time unless there is consent from the local harness or quarter horse racing association conducting live racing in either Sacramento or Orange County.

Racetrack Attendance. Prior to the COVID-19 Pandemic, and closure of non-essential businesses in California, the horse racing industry had already been experiencing a general decline in the number of people attending and wagering at live tracks in California. This has been ongoing for more than three decades due to myriad factors including increased competition from other forms of gaming, unwillingness of customers to travel a significant distance to racetracks, and the easy access to off-track wagering.

Despite poor weather conditions and a sloppy racing surface, Churchill Downs reported that 147,406 people attended the 2025 Kentucky Derby. The all-sources betting handle on the Derby and the entire racing card reported records of \$234.4 million and \$349 million, respectively. [NBC Sports reported](#) an average of 17.7 million viewers across NBC and Peacock for their 25th Kentucky Derby broadcast, the largest television audience for the race since 1989. The declining attendance at live horse racing events in California has prompted racetracks to rely on revenues from in-state and out-of-state satellite wagering and account wagering.

Status of the Horse Racing Industry in California. The California horse racing industry's long-term health is threatened by a combination of factors including competition from racing in other states and over-seas, other forms of gaming within California, declining attendance, and the potential for higher value return by redeveloping the track property rather than continuing to operate in the face of declining revenues. As resources shrink, the industry is experiencing deficits in virtually every one of its revenue sources. Traditional take out, allocation, and distribution formulas are no longer able to sustain ongoing operations.

As the value of racing operations decline, track ownership is struggling to maximize the necessary return on the investment and tempted by alternative uses of the property potentially yielding higher returns. Consequently, the racing industry is suffering unprecedented instability and capital flight. Tens of thousands of industry jobs are in jeopardy, along with breeding farms and open space in urban centers throughout California. Also at risk is a substantial amount of local and state revenue generated both directly and indirectly by the industry.

Further exacerbating the horse racing industry's woes, the *USA Today* published an article in June of last year titled, "[ICE raid on track workers sends shockwaves around racing, 'puts horses at risk.'](#)" The article notes that federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents raided the Delta Downs racetrack in Vinton, Louisiana on June 17, 2025. More than 80 backstretch workers were reportedly detained, which the article notes "should be a wake-up call for an industry that would simply not be able to function without a workforce of grooms and hotwalkers and stall cleaners who are, by some credible estimates, 75% immigrants. They come from places like Venezuela, Panama, Colombia and Mexico, working low-wage jobs but filling indispensable roles, caring round-the-clock for animals worth hundreds of thousands, even millions of dollars."

The Delaware Handicap. The Delaware Handicap is a Grade 2 race open to fillies and mares three years-old and up. Sometimes referred to as the "Del Cap," it is run at a distance of one and three-sixteenth of a mile in mid-July. The race is held at Delaware Park in Stanton, Delaware, which is located about ten miles from Wilmington, the largest city in the state. The race was first run in 1937 – the inaugural year of the track – as the New Castle Handicap. In 1953, it became the first-ever \$100,000 race for fillies and mares, making it the richest race in the world for female racers. The 2026 Delaware Handicap is scheduled to take place on July 18th.

Prior/Related Legislation

SB 397 (Strickland, 2025) authorizes thoroughbred and Appaloosa horses to enter into quarter horse races at any distance, as specified; and amends the conditions that a licensed quarter horse racing association can conduct thoroughbred racing as part of its racing program, as specified. (Pending in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee)

SB 844 (Rubio, 2025) increases the limit on the importation of out-of-state thoroughbred races by a California thoroughbred racing association or fair for pari-mutuel wagering from 75 to 80 races-per-day, as specified. (Pending in the Assembly Governmental Organization Committee)

AB 1389 (Rubio, 2025) adds the New York Stakes to the group of identified race meetings which are exempt from the 75-race per day limit on imported races into California for the purposes of wagering. (Pending on the Senate Inactive File)

AB 1526 (Committee on Governmental Organization, 2025) makes various technical and non-substantive changes to provisions of law related to horse racing. (Pending on the Senate Inactive File)

AB 1946 (Alanis, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2024) added the Whitney Stakes to the group of races which are exempt from the imported race-per-day limitation.

AB 3261 (M. Fong, Chapter 439, Statutes of 2024) raised the previous limit on the importation of out-of-state thoroughbred races, for the purposes of accepting wagers on those races, from 50 to 75 out-of-state races-per-day; as specified.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: No Local: No

Senate Rule 28.8.

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/14/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/14/26)

None received

Prepared by: Brian Duke / G.O./ (916) 651-1530
1/15/26 15:57:40

****** END ******

THIRD READING

Bill No: SB 799
Author: Allen (D)
Amended: 1/15/26
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 10-2, 4/8/25

AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Wiener

NOES: Niello, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Weber Pierson

SENATE REVENUE AND TAXATION COMMITTEE: 2-1, 4/23/25

AYES: McNerney, Ashby

NOES: Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Grayson, Umberg

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 1/14/26

AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Laird, Seyarto, Wiener

SUBJECT: Joint powers authorities: South Bay Regional Housing Trust

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill allows the South Bay Regional Housing Trust board of directors to appoint alternates and makes other changes.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Allows the County of Los Angeles and cities within the jurisdiction of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG), to enter into the agreement to create and operate the South Bay Regional Housing Trust (SBRHT), which must be governed by a board of directors the size of which the SBCCOG board determines. SBCCOG appoints the board members, which

must include mayors, city council members, or county supervisors from cities or the county that join the Joint Powers Authority (JPA), and two homeless or housing policy experts. Members from the county board of supervisors can serve if their district is located wholly or partially with the SBCCOG territory. At its first meeting of each year, the board must select a chair and vice chair.

- 2) Authorizes the SBRHT to:
 - a) Fund the planning, acquisition, and construction of housing for individuals experiencing homeless and persons and families of extremely low, very low, and low income, including, but not limited to, permanent supportive housing;
 - b) Receive public and private financing or funds; and
 - c) Authorize and issue bonds, certificates of participation, or other debt instrument repayable from public and private financing and funds it receives.
- 3) Requires that board members serve without compensation, but allows for reimbursement of actual expenses if approved prior to incurring the expense.
- 4) Provides that, if there is a vacancy, the SBCCOG board must appoint a qualified individual to fill the vacancy within 60 days.
- 5) Requires the SBRHT to incorporate into its joint powers agreement annual financial reporting and auditing requirements that maximize transparency and public information as to the receipt of the Trust's use of funds. The report must show how the funds have furthered the Trust's purposes.
- 6) Requires the SBRHT to comply with the regulatory guidelines of each state funding source received.

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes the SBRHT board of directors to appoint and designate alternate members to the board of directors. An alternate member may be:
 - a) An elected or appointed member of the governing body of the JPA;
 - b) An appointed member of an advisory body of the party to the JPA;
 - c) A staff member of the party to the JPA; or
 - d) A member of the public who is a homeless or housing policy expert.

- 2) Requires all directors and alternates are subject to the board's adopted conflict of interest code.
- 3) Limits the number of meetings per year at which alternates that are not elected officials can vote.
- 4) Provides flexibility regarding when the SBRHT elects the chairperson and vice chairperson by adding the option to elect them at the first meeting of the either the calendar year or fiscal year.

Background

Joint powers agencies. The Joint Exercise of Powers Act allows two or more public agencies to use their powers in common if they sign a joint powers agreement. Sometimes an agreement creates a new, separate public entity called a joint powers agency or joint powers authority (JPA). Agencies that can exercise joint powers include federal agencies, state departments, counties, cities, special districts, school districts, federally recognized Indian tribes, and even other joint powers authorities.

Public agencies can also use the JPA law and the related Marks-Roos Local Bond Pooling Act to form bond pools to finance public works, working capital, insurance needs, and other public benefit projects. JPAs can issue one large Marks-Roos Act bond and then loan the capital to local agencies, thus creating a "bond pool." Bond pooling saves money on interest rates and finance charges. It also lets smaller local agencies enter the bond market. Because JPAs are entities separate from its members, and so are not bound by the same limitations on debt issuance, voters need not approve bonds JPAs issue.

Housing trusts. In recent years, the Legislature has created five new JPAs for the purpose of funding the development of housing for homeless and low-income individuals and families. Those are:

- Orange County Housing Finance Trust (AB 448 (Daly, Chapter 336, Statutes of 2018))
- San Gabriel Valley Regional Housing Trust (SB 751 (Rubio, Chapter 670, Statutes of 2019))
- Western Riverside County Housing Finance Trust (AB 687 (Seyarto, Chapter 120, Statutes of 2021))
- Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Regional Housing Trust (SB 1177 (Portantino, Chapter 173, Statutes of 2022))

- South Bay Regional Housing Trust (SB 1444 (Allen, Chapter 672, Statutes of 2022))

Comments

Purpose of this bill. According to the author, “California has an affordable housing crisis, which is especially acute in the South Bay Cities region of the County of Los Angeles due to the high cost of housing in that area, even in formerly affordable communities. SB 1444 (Allen, 2022) authorized the establishment of the South Bay Regional Housing Trust (SBRHT), a joint powers authority, to fund the planning and construction of affordable housing, receive public and private financing and funds, and authorize and issue bonds. As SBRHT is currently in the process of being established, certain needed revisions to the original authorizing statute were identified that would help the trust operate more effectively. SB 799 makes these changes to support SBRHT in its mission to address housing and homelessness in our district.”

Special legislation. Section 16 of Article Four of the California Constitution prohibits special legislation when a general law can apply. SB 799 contains findings and declarations explaining the need for legislation that applies only to the cities within SBCCOG’s jurisdiction.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: No Local: No

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/14/26)

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/14/26)

None received

Prepared by: Itzel Vargas / L. GOV / (916) 651-4119
1/15/26 15:57:40

**** **END** ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 89
Author: Smallwood-Cuevas (D), et al.
Amended: 6/25/25
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-1, 7/8/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab,
Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Niello
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SUBJECT: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution affirms the Legislature's commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) principles at a time when DEI efforts and programs are under attack.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that no state shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. (United States Constitution (U.S. Const.), 14th Amend., § 1.)
- 2) Provides that a person may not be denied the equal protection of the laws, and that a citizen or class of citizens may not be granted privileges or immunities not granted on the same terms to all citizens. (California Constitution (Cal. Const.), art. I, § 7.)
- 3) Provides that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. (U.S. Const., 1st amend.)

This resolution:

1) Declares that:

- a) The American Dream has been a beacon of hope for generations.
- b) The American Dream embodies the ideals of opportunity, prosperity, and upward mobility, promising that every person should have the chance to achieve what they themselves define as success and fulfillment through hard work and determination.
- c) Many today feel that their American Dream is unattainable.
- d) The American Dream belongs to all of us.
- e) Our highest accomplishments as a state and nation have been achieved when we harness the strengths of all people regardless of their identities to overcome our greatest challenges.
- f) DEI is a centuries-old movement deeply rooted in America's founding principles and its subsequent legacy of civil rights and social justice efforts aimed at delivering the laws, policies, and initiatives that enable America to live up to our Constitution's promises.
- g) DEI policies, from the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, among others, reflect the corrective legislative and legal actions taken across our nation's history to expand and guarantee access to the educational, economic, and civic obligations and capacities of our nation.
- h) California has been a leader in promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion within the California state service to achieve equitable work cultures.
- i) Governor Newsom signed an executive order directing state agencies and departments to take additional actions to embed equity analysis and considerations in their mission, policies, and practices and establishing the Racial Equity Commission.
- j) The California State Assembly passed a resolution to require the Assembly to explore methods to integrate equity more formally into its daily activities, including the potential adoption of an equity impact analysis into the existing committee and floor bill analysis process.

- k) DEI principles and policies promote equal access to opportunities, foster an environment of respect and belonging, and ensure that every individual—regardless of background—can fully participate in all aspects of society.
- l) DEI policies are intended not only to promote access, but to proactively dismantle systematic inequalities in education, employment, housing, health care, and civic participation that have disproportionately impacted communities of color, indigenous peoples, women, LGBTQ+ individuals, individuals with disabilities, and other historically excluded groups.
- m) DEI initiatives often include targeted recruitment, culturally competent workplace training, equity-focused budgeting, inclusive curriculum development, and disaggregated data reporting to address measurable disparities in outcomes.
- n) DEI is essential to creating a society where all individuals are valued, heard, and included.
- o) DEI is based on removing barriers to opportunity so our merits can speak for themselves.
- p) DEI is committed to widening pathways to the American Dream for every community so that all people can reap the benefits of shared prosperity in our nation.
- q) Freedom of speech and expression are fundamental constitutional rights, protecting the ability of individuals to voice their ideas and opinions without interference, punishment, or retaliation by the government.
- r) Retaliatory actions such as terminating, silencing, or marginalizing qualified public servants, educators, and professionals based on their advocacy for equity or their identities—including race, gender, or LGBTQ+ status—represent a dangerous erosion of civil liberties and a threat to representative leadership in public life.
- s) Attempts to prohibit DEI practices diminish the diversity of perspectives that strengthen our society, and conflict with antidiscrimination laws.
- t) The federal government under the Trump Administration and ongoing political actors have sought to dismantle DEI frameworks, including banning DEI training in federal agencies, attempting to eliminate race-conscious admissions policies, and threatening funding for universities that incorporate equity-related content.

- u) These efforts not only undermine civil rights progress but contradict core democratic values enshrined in the United States Constitution and upheld through decades of precedent, such as *Brown v. Board of Education* and *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*
 - v) Efforts to attack DEI are harmful to our country.
- 2) Resolves, by the Senate of the State of California and with the Assembly concurring:
- a) The Legislature affirms its commitment to DEI as an essential foundation for achieving the American Dream and fostering environments where all individuals have the freedom to be healthy, prosperous, and safe and have the opportunity to realize their full potential.
 - b) The Legislature encourages local, state, and federal policymakers, educational institutions, workplaces, and other organizations to adopt and uphold DEI principles that promote inclusivity, protect freedom of expression, remove barriers, and provide equitable opportunities for all individuals to pursue their dreams.
 - c) The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the author for appropriate distribution.

Comments

In the face of ongoing attacks on DEI and the dismantling of DEI programs, this resolution reaffirms the Legislature's commitment to DEI as a necessary foundation for ensuring that all persons have the opportunity to realize their full potential. This resolution recites the history and purpose of DEI and California's leading role in promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion within state government and across the state. This resolution also recognizes that attempts to prohibit DEI practices and programs diminish the diversity of perspectives, which weakens, rather than strengthens, our society. This resolution states that these anti-DEI efforts are harmful to our country. Finally, this resolution states that the Legislature encourages local, state, and federal policymakers, educational institutions, workplaces, and other institutions to adopt and uphold DEI principles that promote inclusivity, protect freedom of expression, remove barriers, and provide equitable opportunities for all individuals to pursue their dreams.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: Fiscal Com.: No Local:

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

Prepared by: Allison Whitt Meredith / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/9/25 16:03:42

**** **END** ****

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SJR 9
Author: Durazo (D), Arreguín (D), Caballero (D) and Hurtado (D), et al.
Amended: 9/2/25
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 6/24/25
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Gonzalez, Pérez, Wiener
NOES: Seyarto

SENATE FLOOR: 29-6, 7/3/25
AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon,
Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Laird,
Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Richardson, Rubio,
Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Choi, Jones, Niello, Strickland, Valladares
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Grove, Ochoa Bogh, Reyes, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-11, 9/2/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Immigrants in California: mass immigration raids

SOURCE: The Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles; Central
American Resource Center; California Immigrant Policy Center

DIGEST: This resolution strongly condemns and denounces recent mass immigration raids that have targeted immigrant workers and families in California and the engagement of the military in immigration enforcement operations in response to community protests.

Assembly Amendments of 9/2/25 add coauthors and make technical changes.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law:

- 1) Provides that the federal government has the exclusive authority to regulate immigration and naturalization. (United States Constitution (U.S. Const.), Art. 1, Sec. 8.)
- 2) Provides that the Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding. (U.S. Const. Art. VI)
- 3) Provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. (U.S. Const. Amend. 1)
- 4) Provides that the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. (U.S. Const. Amend 4.)
- 5) Provides that no person shall [...] be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. (U.S. Const. Amend 5)
- 6) Provides that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people, and prohibits the federal government from “conscripting” the states to enforce federal regulatory programs. (U.S. Const. Amend 10.)
- 7) Provides that all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside, and that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. (U.S. Const. Amend 14, Sec. 1.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Establishes the Values Act, which prohibits law enforcement agencies (LEAs) from using resources to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect or arrest people for immigration enforcement purposes, as specified. (Government (Gov.) Code, § 7284.6, et. seq.)

- 2) Provides individuals who are in the custody of local LEAs with information about their procedural and legal rights in the event that immigration authorities want to contact them. These provisions are commonly known as the Truth Act. (Gov. Code, §§ 7283, 7283.1, & 7283.2.)
- 3) Known as the TRUST Act, defines the circumstances in which local law enforcement agencies may comply with immigration detainer requests. (Gov. Code, §§ 7282, 7282.5.)
- 4) Requires the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security by providing the use of prison facilities, transportation, and general support, as needed, for the purposes of conducting and expediting deportation hearings and subsequent placement of deportation holds on undocumented immigrants who are incarcerated in state prison. (Penal Code, § 5026.)

This resolution:

- 1) Finds that California is home to more than 10 million immigrants, the nation's largest by population and proportion, including over 2 million undocumented residents, who enrich our communities, strengthen our economy, and contribute to the cultural and social fabric of the Golden State.
- 2) Finds that immigrants are deeply rooted in our state's communities, families, and workforce, with 45% of all children in California having at least one immigrant parent and over 50% of all California workers being immigrants or children of immigrants.
- 3) Finds that deporting a parent or family member has serious detrimental impacts on children, affecting 3.3 million mixed-status families in California.
- 4) Finds that Latino and Asian families make up some of the largest undocumented groups, with a majority coming from Mexico, Central America, Asia, and South America.
- 5) Finds that deportations tear families apart by separating parents from their children, leaving lasting emotional scars by increasing psychological distress, physical health issues, social isolation, and setbacks in their educational future.
- 6) Finds that United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement has targeted Home Depot stores, car washes, business vendors, construction sites, and garment factories in predominantly Latino communities.

- 7) Finds that United States citizens, based on their skin color and appearance, have been unlawfully harassed, handcuffed, arrested and deported.
- 8) Finds that since June 6, 2025, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), along with armed federal agents, conducted military-style immigration raids and arrests at work sites, homes, and public spaces, creating a climate of fear among immigrants dropping their children off at school, going to work, attending faith services, seeking medical or emergency services, or shopping for essential needs.
- 9) Finds that since June 6, 2025, more than 1,600 people have been arrested in the indiscriminate raids at work sites, homes, and public spaces across the County of Los Angeles and dozens more people have been arrested across the Counties of Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura.
- 10) Finds that while conducting immigration raids and arrests, ICE and Customs and Border Protection agents sealed off entire streets with the assistance of local law enforcement and federalized National Guard troops, utilized unmarked armored vehicles, and conducted warrantless raids in a militarized and indiscriminate manner, sparking widespread panic, fear, and terror among immigrant workers, families, and communities.
- 11) Finds that the recent immigration raids have been heavily militarized, included the unconstitutional detention and arrest of residents without due process, disproportionately affected communities of color, separated families, undermined public safety and trust in local governments, and deterred families from accessing health care, education, and emergency assistance.
- 12) Finds that members of Congress were denied access to conduct oversight visits at the federal “B-18” detention facility and the Adelanto ICE Processing Center to inspect the conditions of detention, despite their right to do so under federal law, and attorneys were repeatedly denied access to people who were arrested during the indiscriminate immigration raids and arrests.
- 13) Finds that the unconstitutional immigration raids and arrests quickly prompted tens of thousands of community, labor, and faith protests at multiple locations, including the Edward R. Roybal Federal Building and the City of Paramount, where immigration raids were ongoing.
- 14) Finds that the protests were overwhelmingly peaceful, with demonstrators exercising their First Amendment rights to oppose the Trump Administration’s

mass immigration raids and to stand in solidarity with immigrant families impacted by these federal actions.

- 15) Finds that during the course of these protests, Service Employees International Union California President David Huerta was injured, arrested, and detained after federal authorities alleged he was obstructing enforcement activities, while union representatives and community members assert he was wrongfully arrested while lawfully observing law enforcement.
- 16) Finds that the immigration raids and arrests consist of potential violations of constitutional rights, including raids and arrests conducted without warrants and using racial profiling.
- 17) Finds that despite clear evidence that local authorities were fully capable of responding to these events, President Trump unilaterally deployed 4,000 California National Guard members and 700 Marines over the objection of California Governor Gavin Newsom, with President Trump's stated intent to crush dissent and further intensify and militarize immigration raids and arrests.
- 18) Finds that the federal escalation appears to be part of a deliberate strategy to provoke chaos, suppress and criminalize dissent, and terrorize immigrant communities across California and the nation.
- 19) Finds that President Trump's administration has signaled an intention to intensify nationwide immigration raids and arrests, creating an ongoing threat and danger to California families, workplaces, and neighborhoods.
- 20) Finds that multiple elected officials, religious groups, labor unions, and advocacy organizations have denounced the mass immigration raids and pledged to protect and support immigrant communities.
- 21) Finds that immigrants play a vital role in stimulating the economy as workers, business owners, taxpayers, and consumers and that their contributions boost national economic growth and lower the United States deficit.
- 22) Finds that immigrants help power the fourth largest economy in the world, sourcing one-half of a trillion dollars' worth of products, which represents 5 percent of the state's gross domestic product, and that immigrants also make up nearly one-half of California's agricultural workers, and fuel key industries like manufacturing, construction, and hospitality.
- 23) Finds that California's immigrants contributed \$8.5 billion in state and local taxes in 2022 and play a vital role in stimulating the state's economy.

- 24) Finds that on June 12, 2025, President Trump announced that changes were coming and that “Our great Farmers and people in the Hotel and Leisure business have been stating that our very aggressive policy on immigration is taking very good, longtime workers away from them, with those jobs being almost impossible to replace,” but on June 16, 2025, the United States Department of Homeland Security and ICE told staff that it must continue to conduct immigration raids at agricultural businesses, hotels, and restaurants, creating a whiplash of confusion that continues to wreak havoc on our economy, agricultural industry, and small businesses.
- 25) Resolves that the Legislature hereby strongly condemns the mass immigration raids, targeting of immigrant workers and families, and the militarized federal response in California, and denounces President Trump’s deployment of military forces to suppress community protests and engage in immigration enforcement operations.
- 26) Resolves that California stands with immigrant families, workers, and community leaders, and will not tolerate the terrorizing of our neighborhoods under the guise of “enforcement.”
- 27) Resolves that California rejects the criminalization of peaceful protest and reaffirms the constitutional rights of all residents to organize, demonstrate, and demand justice without fear of violent retaliation.
- 28) Resolves that the Legislature affirms its commitment to safeguarding the rights and safety of all Californians, regardless of immigration status, by upholding the fundamental principles of equal treatment, due process, and civil liberties under the law.
- 29) Resolves that the Legislature supports the expansion of legal services and emergency response resources to protect workers, children, and families affected by immigration enforcement.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: No Local: No

N/A

SUPPORT: (Verified 9/2/25)

California Immigrant Policy Center (co-source)

Central American Resource Center (co-source)

The Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles (co-source)

A New Way of Life Reentry Project

ACLU California Action
Alliance for a Better Community
Alliance for Boys and Men of Color
Almas Libres
American Friends Service Committee
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Asian Law Alliance
Avan Immigrant Services
Beverly-Vermont Community Land Trust
Brotherhood Crusade
Buen Vecino
Cair California
California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
California Community Action Partnership Association
California Faculty Association
California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO
California for Safety and Justice
California Lulac State Organization
California Public Defenders Association
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California School-based Health Alliance
California United for a Responsible Budget
Center for Gender and Refugee Studies-California
Centro Binacional Para El Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueño
Centro Community Hispanic Association (Centro Cha Inc.)
Centro Legal De LA Raza
CFT- a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, Aft, Afl-cio
Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County
Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County, INC.
Community Health Project Los Angeles
Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
Contra Costa Immigrant Rights Alliance
Courage California
CPCA Advocates
Dreamer Fund
Drug Policy Alliance
East Bay Community Law Center
Education and Leadership Foundation
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights

Empowering Women Impacted by Incarceration
End Child Poverty California Powered by Grace
Ensuring Opportunity Campaign
Equality California
Esperanza Community Housing
Fair Chance Project
Freedom for Immigrants
Fresh Lifelines for Youth
Hpeace: Health Professionals for Equality and Community Empowerment
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
Immigrant Legal Defense
Immigration Institute of the Bay Area
Immigration Resource Center of San Gabriel Valley
Inclusive Action for the City
Indivisible CA Statestrong
Initiate Justice
Initiate Justice Action
Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice
Instituto De Educacion Popular Del Sur De California
Korean Resource Center
LA Defensa
LA Raza Community Resource Center (san Francisco)
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California
Local 148 LA County Public Defenders Union
Los Angeles LGBT Center
Los Cien Sonoma County
Mixteco/indigena Community Organizing Project
National Lawyers Guild Los Angeles
New Light Wellness
Northeast Valley Health Corporation
Northern California Coalition for Just Immigration Reform
On the Move
Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition Liberation and Empowerment
People for Mobility Justice
Pico California
Pomona Economic Opportunity Center
Prevention Institute
Public Counsel
Raizes Collective
Restoring Hope California

Rubicon Programs
Salvadoran American Leadership and Educational Fund
San Bernardino Community Service Center, INC
San Bernardino Community Service Center, INC.
SEIU California
Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network
Silicon Valley De-bug
Sister Warrior Freedom Coalition
Smart Justice California
Social Justice Collaborative
Sonoma County Sanctuary Coalition
South Asian Network
South Bay People Power
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center
St John's Community Health
T.r.u.s.t. South LA
Thai Community Development Center
The Children's Partnership
The San Fernando Valley Young Democrats
The W. Haywood Burns Institute
UnidosUS
Unitarian Universalists of Petaluma
USF School of Law Racial Justice Clinic
Valor
Vera Institute of Justice
VIDAS
Vision Y Compromiso
Western Center on Law & Poverty
World Relief Southern California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 9/2/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-11, 9/2/25

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers,

Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani,
Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Hadwick, Patterson,
Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Berman, Castillo, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Hoover,
Lackey, Macedo, Wallis

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /
9/3/25 13:34:02

**** **END** ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 67
Author: Blakespear (D), et al.
Introduced: 1/5/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: 250th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution commemorates the 250th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, honors the principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and encourages all Californians to celebrate this milestone with pride.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) On July 4, 1776, the Continental Congress formally adopted the Declaration of Independence, proclaiming the birth of the United States of America, affirming that all people are endowed with certain unalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
- 2) The year 2026 will mark the 250th anniversary of this historic occasion, offering an opportunity to reflect on the enduring ideals of liberty, democracy, and self-governance.
- 3) Although not one of the original 13 colonies, California has played a vital role in advancing and sustaining the American experiment, growing into the most populous and diverse state in the union and serving as a global leader in innovation, culture, and democratic engagement.
- 4) Commemorating the 250th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence is not only an occasion to celebrate our shared history, but also a call to recommit ourselves to the ongoing and unfinished work of creating a more perfect union.

This resolution commemorates the 250th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, honors the principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit

of happiness, and encourages all Californians to celebrate this milestone with pride.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: No Local: No

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/13/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/13/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
1/14/26 15:44:35

**** **END** ****