

2025-26 SESSION

**SENATE
THIRD READING PACKET**

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2026



OFFICE OF SENATE FLOOR ANALYSES
651-4171

SENATE THIRD READING PACKET

Attached are analyses of bills on the Daily File for Monday, February 2, 2026.

<u>Note</u>	<u>Measure</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Location</u>
	<u>SB 25</u>	Umberg	Unfinished Business
	<u>SB 310</u>	Wiener	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SCR 89</u>	Smallwood-Cuevas	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SCR 109</u>	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SCR 110</u>	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SCR 111</u>	Niello	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SCR 113</u>	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SCR 114</u>	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SR 67</u>	Blakespear	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SR 68</u>	Cervantes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SR 69</u>	Niello	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<u>SR 71</u>	Arreguín	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>ACR 71</u>	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>ACR 115</u>	Bennett	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>ACR 117</u>	Sharp-Collins	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS

RA Revised Analysis

* Analysis pending

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 25
Author: Umberg (D)
Amended: 1/14/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 4/8/25

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 6-0, 5/23/25

AYES: Caballero, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 36-1, 6/2/25

AYES: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Dahle, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

NOES: Strickland

NO VOTE RECORDED: Hurtado, Reyes, Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 52-17, 1/22/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Antitrust: premerger notification

SOURCE: California Commission on Uniform State Laws

DIGEST: This bill (1) requires a person who is obligated to file a notification pursuant to the federal Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (HSR Act) to file a copy of that form and any additional documentation, as specified, with the Attorney General (AG) if the person meets certain requirements; (2) prohibits the AG from disclosing the information received, with

limited exceptions, and (3) authorizes the AG to impose a civil penalty for a violation of the filing requirement.

Assembly Amendments of 1/14/26 change the date this bill would apply to only premerger notifications filed on or after January 1, 2027.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law:

- 1) Establishes the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 (Sherman Act). (15 United States Code (U.S.C.) §§ 1-7.) Makes illegal, under the Sherman Act, every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the states or with foreign nations. (15 U.S.C. § 1.) Authorizes a state attorney general to bring a civil action in the name of the state in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction over the defendant to secure monetary relief, as provided, for violations of the Sherman Act. (15 U.S.C. § 15c.)
- 2) Establishes the Clayton Act. (15 U.S.C. §§ 12-27.) Defines “antitrust laws” to include the Sherman Act, certain provisions of the Wilson Tariff Act, and the Clayton Act, as amended. (15 U.S.C. § 12.) Makes illegal the acquiring, by a person engaged in commerce, of stock or other share capital or assets of another person also engaged in commerce or in any activity affecting commerce, where the effect of such acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly. (15 U.S.C. § 18.)
- 3) Establishes the HSR Act to require businesses to file pre-merger notifications for certain transactions with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), as specified, and provides a waiting period before the merger may be commenced. (15 U.S.C. § 18a.) Declares unfair methods of competition in or affecting commerce and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce to be unlawful, and authorizes the FTC to enforce these provisions, with certain exceptions. (15 U.S.C. § 45.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Establishes the Cartwright Act as California’s antitrust law that prohibits anticompetitive activity. (Business (Bus.) & Professions (Prof.) Code §§ 16700 et. seq.) Provides that, except as expressly provided, every trust is unlawful, against public policy, and void. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 16726.) Authorizes the

AG to bring an action on behalf of the state or any of its political subdivisions or public agencies for a violation of the Cartwright Act or any comparable federal law, as provided. (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16750 et. seq.) Makes every trust unlawful, against public policy, and void, except as exempted under the Cartwright Act. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 16726.)

- 2) Establishes the Unfair Competition Law, which provides for a civil penalty for unfair competition, defined to include any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice and any unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading advertising. (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et. seq.)
- 3) Prohibits, under the Unfair Practices Act, acts which injure competition, including sales below cost, locality discrimination, and secret rebates or unearned discounts. (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000 et. seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Enacts the Uniform Antitrust Premerger Notification Act (Act), and provides that the Act only apply to a premerger notification filed on or after January 1, 2026.
- 2) Requires a person who files a pre-merger notification form under the HSR Act to file that form with the AG within one business day of filing that form if either of the following apply:
 - a) the person has its principal place of business in this state; or
 - b) the person or a person it controls directly or indirectly had annual net sales in this state of the goods or services involved in the transaction of at least 20% of the filing threshold.
- 3) Requires a person filing under 2)a), above, to include a copy of any additional documentary material when filing with the AG.
- 4) Provides that, upon request of the AG, a person filing under 2)b), above, must also file a copy of any additional documentary material to the AG within seven business days after receipt of the request.
- 5) Prohibits the AG from charging a fee connected with the filing of the initial form or any additional documentary material, except as specified.

- 6) Prohibits the AG from disclosing or making public any of the following:
 - a) an HSR Act form filed pursuant to 2), above;
 - b) any additional documentary material filed pursuant to 2), above;
 - c) an HSR Act form or additional documentary material provided by the attorney general of another state;
 - d) the fact that a form or additional documentary material was filed or provided by the attorney general of another state; and
 - e) the merger proposed in the form.
- 7) Provides that a form, additional documentary material, and other information listed in 6), above, are exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act (CPRA).
- 8) Authorizes the AG to disclose the information listed in 6), above, subject to a protective order entered by an agency, court, or judicial officer in an administrative proceeding or judicial action, if the proposed merger is relevant to the proceeding or action.
- 9) Specifies that the bill does not do any of the following:
 - a) limit any other confidentiality or information-security obligation of the AG;
 - b) preclude the AG from sharing information with the FTC or the U. S. Department of Justice Antitrust Division, or a successor agency; or
 - c) share information with the attorney general of another state, as provided in 10), below.
- 10) Authorizes the AG to disclose an HSR Act form and additional documentary information with the attorney general of another state that enacts the Uniform Antitrust Premerger Notification Act or a substantively equivalent act, so long as the other state's act includes confidentiality provisions at least as protective as the confidentiality provisions of the Uniform Antitrust Premerger Notification Act. Requires the AG to give at least two business days-notice to the filer before making a disclosure to the attorney general of another state.
- 11) Authorizes the AG to impose a civil penalty of not more than \$10,000 per day of noncompliance on a person that fails to comply with 2) through 4), above.
- 12) Provides that in applying and construing the Act a court is to consider the promotion of uniformity of the law among jurisdictions that enact it.

- 13) Defines various terms under the Act.
- 14) States that the Legislature finds and declares that the premerger notification information and materials subject to this act are highly sensitive, future-looking business information. Release of these materials outside of law enforcement and investigatory purposes could cause material harm to the filing companies and foster securities law violations and anticompetitive conduct by third parties. This is why these filings are confidential at the federal level and must remain confidential at the state level.

Comments

The HSR Act amended the Clayton Act to require businesses to file notifications with the FTC and the Antitrust Division of the federal Department of Justice before a merger of significant size occurs so that the transaction can be reviewed to ensure it will not violate federal antitrust laws – i.e. may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.¹ A waiting period applies after the filing of an HSR Act form before the transaction can be completed. If federal regulators require further information or documentation to assess the merger, the waiting period can be extended or the federal regulators can file an injunction to stop the transaction from occurring. As of February 2025, a transaction that exceeds \$126.4 million must be reported under the HSR Act, and filers must pay a filing fee that ranges from \$30,000 (for transactions under \$179.4 million) to \$2,390,000 (for transaction \$5.555 billion or more).² All information and documents submitted to the federal government under the HSR Act are confidential and exempt from disclosure to the public under the Freedom of Information Act, with specified exceptions including in certain judicial or administrative proceedings.

In 2022, the California Law Revision Commission (CLRC) was granted approval by the Legislature to study topics relating to antitrust law and its enforcement. (ACR 95 (Cunningham, Chapter 147, Statutes of 2022)) As a result of this, the CLRC formed eight working groups to study various topics related to antitrust law, including mergers and acquisitions.³ In the CLRC's report on mergers and acquisitions it was noted that at the time of the report being written that "the

¹ 15 U.S.C. § 18.

² *New HSR threshold and filing fees for 2025*, FTC, (Feb. 6, 2025), available at <https://www.ftc.gov/enforcement/competition-matters/2025/02/new-hsr-thresholds-filing-fees-2025>.

³ *Antitrust Law – Study B-750*, Cal. Law Rev. Comm., (rev. Mar. 25, 2025) available at <https://clrc.ca.gov/B750.html>.

California Attorney General’s office reviews only about five mergers per year, most of them in conjunction with the relevant federal agency.”⁴

The Uniform Law Commission (ULC) provides non-partisan legislation to states with the goal of offering uniform rules and procedures on various legal issues. The Uniform Antitrust Premerger Notification Act was drafted and proposed by the ULC in 2024. The ULC states that the uniform act: improves state attorneys general’s ability to investigate potential mergers; places no significant new burdens on business or state attorneys generals; provides strong confidentiality protections; and offers the potential for cooperation between enacting states.⁵ As of the time this analysis was written, seven states—California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Mexico, Washington, West Virginia, and Utah—and the District of Columbia have introduced legislation to enact the uniform act.⁶

This bill is substantially similar to the ULC’s Uniform Antitrust Premerger Notification Act. This bill requires a person who is obligated to file a pre-merger notification under the HSR Act to file a copy of that notice with the AG if: (1) the person has its principal place of business in California, or (2) the person or a person it controls directly or indirectly had annual net sales in this state of the goods or services involved in the transaction of at least 20% of the filing threshold. In order to protect the sensitive business information included in the filing, this bill makes that information confidential and not subject to disclosure under the CPRA. The only exceptions to this are: (1) the information can be released subject to a protective order entered by an agency, court, or judicial officer in an administrative proceeding or judicial action if the proposed merger is relevant to the proceeding or action, and (2) to the attorney general of another state that enacts the Uniform Antitrust Premerger Notification Act, so long as the other state’s act includes confidentiality provisions that are as protective as the confidentiality provisions of the Act. The bill also authorizes the AG to impose a civil penalty of not more than \$10,000 per day for noncompliance of the filing requirement.

California generally recognizes that public access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business is a fundamental and necessary right. At the same time, the state recognizes that this right must be balanced against the right to

⁴ *California Antitrust Law and Mergers*, Cal. Law Rev. Comm. fn. 30, at p. 16, available at <https://clrc.ca.gov/pub/Misc-Report/ExRpt-B750-Grp2.pdf>.

⁵ *Why Your State Should Adopt the Uniform Antitrust Pre-Merger Notification Act*, Uniform Law Comm., available at <https://www.uniformlaws.org/HigherLogic/System/DownloadDocumentFile.ashx?DocumentFileKey=334dd57b-7d3f-0524-acc0-9256891a4cc2&forceDialog=0>.

⁶ 2024 Antitrust Pre-Merger Notification Act: Legislative Bill Tracking, Uniform Law Comm. available at <https://www.uniformlaws.org/committees/community-home?communitykey=6bf5d101-d698-4c72-b7c1-0191302a6a95#LegBillTrackingAnchor>.

privacy. The general right of access to public records may, therefore, be limited where the Legislature finds a public policy reason necessitating the limit on access. In light of the proprietary and sensitive nature of the information contained in an HSR Act filing form and additional documentary information, this bill's finding on the need for limiting access to this information seems warranted.

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

The Senate Appropriations Committee writes:

Unknown, potentially significant costs to the DOJ, resulting from the implementation of this bill, with annual costs potentially reaching into the millions of dollars (General Fund). These costs would be associated with the development, implementation, and maintenance of a secure electronic filing system capable of preventing the inadvertent disclosure of confidential or sensitive information. Additional ongoing expenditures would be required for staff to review submitted notices for statutory compliance and for legal costs for associated litigation. Notably, this bill prohibits the imposition of filing fees, thereby removing the DOJ's ability to offset expenditures.

Cost pressures to the state funded trial court system (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) by allowing the Attorney General to bring civil penalties for violations of this bill and by authorizing disclosure of specified materials pursuant to a protective order. Cost pressures may also arise to the extent that this bill contributes to litigation regarding potential business mergers that otherwise would not have been brought. It is unclear how many proceedings would actually be commenced that otherwise would not have as a result of this bill. The fiscal impact of this bill to the courts will depend on many unknown factors, including the number of proceedings and the factors unique to each case. An eight-hour court day costs approximately \$10,500 in staff workload. The Governor's 2025-26 budget proposes a \$40 million ongoing increase in discretionary funding from the General Fund to help pay for increased trial court operation costs beginning in 2025-26. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a need for increased funding for courts from the General Fund to fund additional staff and resources and to increase the amount appropriated to backfill for trial court operations. If funding is not provided for the new workload created by this bill, it may result in delays and prioritization of court cases.

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/22/26)

California Commission on Uniform State Laws (sponsor)
Media Alliance
Uniform Law Commission

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/22/2026)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The author writes:

SB 25 aims to make the merger review process more efficient to the benefit of both the California Attorney General (AG) and merging parties. Federal anti-trust law, namely the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (“HSR”), requires that companies proposing to engage in most significant mergers and acquisitions file a notice to the Federal Trade Commission and the Justice Department’s Antitrust Division. These notices detail information such as corporate structure and presentations about the merger presented to the company’s board of directors. HSR filings enable federal antitrust agencies to efficiently engage with merging parties by allowing the agencies to scrutinize and challenge mergers and acquisitions before they are finalized.

However, state AGs do not have access to these filings because of the HSR’s strict confidentiality requirement. The subpoena process for the filings is time-consuming and disadvantages state AGs during merger review. Furthermore, the subpoena process for HSR filings creates additional uncertainty for the merging parties, causing them to experience further costs in time and resources to address the state AGs concerns on top of the federal concerns. This creates a dragged out merger process that is not desirable for both state AGs and businesses.

SB 25 attempts to solve this issue that hampers the merger review process by providing the AG with earlier access to HSR filings. This would not only give the AG more time to object to anticompetitive mergers, but also give businesses more timely warnings to address concerns from the AG. The California Commission on Uniform State Laws, the sponsor of the bill, writes that the notifications provided to the federal government under the HSR:

[...] provide substantial information about the proposed merger, and allow federal agencies to timely determine if there are any potential antitrust issues. However, under current state law, businesses are not required to provide the premerger notifications to the State of California. As a result, the state often does not timely learn of the details of a proposed merger deal that could have a substantial impact on local competition. This often leads to delayed subpoenas and duplicative and unnecessary expenses for the state and the business parties.

SB 25 solves this problem. [...] SB 25 will allow for California to make timely decisions on proposed merger deals, thereby reducing unnecessary litigation and providing businesses with enhanced certainty about the mergers in a timely manner.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 52-17, 1/22/26

AYES: Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Johnson, Macedo, Patterson, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

NO VOTE RECORDED: Addis, Arambula, Bonta, Flora, Lackey, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Sanchez, Schiavo

Prepared by: Amanda Mattson / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
1/23/26 15:39:07

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: SB 310
Author: Wiener (D), et al.
Amended: 1/20/26
Vote: 21

SENATE LABOR, PUB. EMP. & RET. COMMITTEE: 4-1, 4/9/25

AYES: Smallwood-Cuevas, Cortese, Durazo, Laird

NOES: Strickland

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 10-2, 4/22/25

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

NOES: Niello, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Caballero

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-1, 5/23/25

AYES: Caballero, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SUBJECT: Failure to pay wages: penalties

SOURCE: California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Legal Aid at Work

DIGEST: This bill establishes a new method for employees to recover a statutory penalty for employer late wage payment violations. This bill authorizes an employee to recover a statutory penalty through an independent civil action, rather than through the Labor Commissioner's Office (LC), or enforcement of a civil penalty through the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA). This bill also limits an employee to either pursuing a statutory penalty or enforcing a civil penalty through PAGA, but not both.

Senate Floor Amendments of 1/20/26 narrow the scope of this bill so that an employee can only pursue an independent civil action for each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, but not for an initial violation.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) in the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) and vests it with various powers and duties to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of California, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment. (Labor Code §50.5)
- 2) Establishes within DIR, various entities including the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (DLSE) under the direction of the Labor Commissioner (LC), and empowers the LC with ensuring a just day's pay in every workplace and promoting economic justice through robust enforcement of labor laws. (Labor Code §79-107)
- 3) Authorizes the LC to prosecute all actions for the collection of wages, penalties, and demands of persons who in the judgment of the LC are financially unable to employ counsel and the LC believes have claims which are valid and enforceable. This includes an action for the collection of wages and other moneys payable to employees or to the state arising out of an employment relationship or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and actions for wages or other monetary benefits that are due the Industrial Relations Unpaid Wage Fund. (Labor Code §98.3)
- 4) Authorizes the LC to investigate employee complaints and provide for a hearing in any action to recover wages, penalties, and other demands for compensation, including liquidated damages if the complaint alleges payment of a wage less than the minimum wage fixed by an order of the Industrial Welfare Commission or statute, as specified. (Labor Code §98)
- 5) Provides that within 30 days of the filing of a complaint, the LC shall notify the parties as to whether a hearing will be held, whether action will be taken in accordance with Section 98.3 or whether no further action will be taken. If the determination is made by the LC to hold a hearing, the hearing shall be held within 90 days of that determination. However, the LC may postpone or grant additional time before setting a hearing, as specified. (Labor Code §98)

- 6) Establishes a citation process for the LC to enforce violations of the minimum wage, as specified. (Labor Code §1197.1 et seq.)
- 7) Authorizes employees, under PAGA, to enforce labor laws by suing their employers on behalf of the state for violations of the Labor Code to recover civil penalties, as specified. (Labor Code §2699-2699.8)
- 8) Provides that for PAGA notices filed on or after June 19, 2024, 65 percent of the recovered penalties goes to the State and 35 percent to the aggrieved employees. (Labor Code §2699)
- 9) Provides that in any action brought for the nonpayment of wages, fringe benefits, or health and welfare or pension fund contributions, the court shall award reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the prevailing party if any party to the action requests attorney's fees and costs upon the initiation of the action. However, if the prevailing party in the court action is not an employee, attorney's fees and costs shall be awarded only if the court finds that the employee brought the court action in bad faith. This does not apply to an action brought by the LC. (Labor Code §218.5)
- 10) Specifies when wages must be paid for work performed in various positions and industries. (Labor Code §§201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 204.11, 205, 205.5)
- 11) Prohibits, under the California Equal Pay Act, an employer from paying an employee wage rates less than the rates paid to employees of the opposite sex or to employees of a different race or ethnicity for substantially similar work requiring the same skills, effort, and responsibility when performed under similar working conditions. Establishes exceptions to this prohibition, as specified. (Labor Code §1197.5)
- 12) Imposes a civil penalty, in addition to any penalties that normally apply, to any employer who fails to pay the wages of their employees by the required time, as follows:
 - a) \$100 dollars for each failure to pay each employee for any initial violation;
 - b) \$200 dollars for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld, for any subsequent or intentional violation.(Labor Code §210(a))

- 13) Provides that the penalty referenced in 12), above, can be recovered by an employee as a statutory penalty, pursuant to Section 98 (DLSE wage hearing), or by the LC as a civil penalty through the issuance of a citation or pursuant to Section 98.3. (Labor Code §210(b))
- 14) Provides that an employee is only entitled to recover the penalty in 12), above, through either the statutory penalty pursuant to Section 98 (DLSE wage hearing) or to enforce a civil penalty through PAGA, but not both for the same violation. (Labor Code §210(c))

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes an employee to recover a statutory penalty for employer late wage payment violations through an independent civil action for each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, but not for an initial violation.
- 2) Specifies that an employee is only entitled to recover the penalty described in 12), above, as a statutory penalty through a complaint to the LC or through an independent civil action, or as a civil penalty through PAGA, but not both for the same violation. An employee cannot pursue a statutory and a civil penalty for the same violation.
- 3) Provides that these provisions are severable. If any provision or its application is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.

Background

What constitutes a late payment violation? Generally, Labor Code Section 204 governs regular payment of wages and requires that wages earned are due twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by an employer as the regular paydays. Work performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of that same month. Work performed between the 16th and the last day of any calendar month, must be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. Additionally, overtime wages earned in one payroll period must be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. Late payment of wages includes when an employer pays wages late, fails to pay them at all, or insufficiently pays them.

This is the general rule. The Labor Code also provides different pay schedules for temporary service employees (Labor Code §201.3), employees of a motor vehicle

dealer (Labor Code §204.1), hairstylists (Labor Code §204.11), and live-in domestic workers (Labor Code §205), among others.

By themselves, none of the above code sections specify penalties for late payments. Instead, Labor Code Section 210 identifies applicable penalties and authorizes the LC or an employee to recover them, as specified. The penalties are as follows: for any initial violation, \$100 for each failure to pay each employee or for each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, \$200 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld.

Recovering Penalties for Late Payment Violations. Labor Code Section 210 authorizes the LC or an employee to recover penalties for late payment violations. The LC can do so by pursuing civil penalties. An employee can do so by pursuing either civil *or* statutory penalties. The percentage of the penalty that an employee recovers depends on their choice of penalty.

Civil Penalties. The LC can recover civil penalties for late payment violations through the issuance of a citation or through an informal conference. In these instances, recovered penalties are paid to the State.

PAGA allows employees to assist in enforcing labor law by suing their employers on behalf of the State for violations of the Labor Code to recover civil penalties. Any employee who receives their wages late can file a PAGA lawsuit. For PAGA cases filed on or after June 19, 2024, 65 percent of the recovered penalties are paid to the State and 35 percent to the aggrieved employee.

Statutory Penalties. Beginning in 2020, employees were authorized to recover statutory penalties for late payment violations through the LC's wage claim process (AB 673, Carrillo, 2019). Statutory penalties are paid entirely to the employee, as opposed to civil penalties pursued through PAGA. An employee cannot simultaneously pursue statutory and civil penalties for the same violation.

This bill. The author and sponsors argue that the LC's extensive backlog of wage claim cases, as well as PAGA's 35 percent recovery limit, discourage workers from pursuing penalties for late payment violations. SB 310 would establish a new method for employees to recover penalties by authorizing an independent civil action for each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation. For an initial violation, an employee would be limited to pursuing either a statutory penalty, through the LC, or a civil penalty through PAGA. This bill would also prohibit an employee from pursuing a statutory penalty and a civil penalty simultaneously for the same violation.

[NOTE: Please see the Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee analysis on this bill for more background information on the DLSE audit, wage theft, and related legislation.]

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- The Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) indicates that its costs to administer the bill would be minor and absorbable.
- This bill could result in a reduction in state penalty revenue resulting from the Private Attorneys' General Act (PAGA). The magnitude is unknown, but potentially minor (Labor and Workforce Development Fund). According to the Legislative Analyst's Office, employees and employers typically reach a settlement agreement after initial legal proceedings have begun but before the trial begins. The settlement award typically includes a small penalty portion that is divided between the employees and the State, as specified.
- By offering specified employees an option to pursue, through an independent civil action, an increase of the percentage amount of penalty revenue they would receive relative to current law, this bill would result in cost pressures to the state funded trial court system (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund). It is unclear how many proceedings would actually be commenced that otherwise would not have as a result of this bill. The fiscal impact of this bill to the courts would depend on many unknown factors, including the number of proceedings and the factors unique to each case. An eight-hour court day costs approximately \$10,500 in staff in workload. The Governor's 2025-26 budget proposes a \$40 million ongoing increase in discretionary funding from the General Fund to help pay for increased trial court operation costs beginning in 2025-26. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a need for increased funding for courts from the General Fund to fund additional staff and resources and to increase the amount appropriated to backfill for trial court operations (See Staff Comments).

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/21/26)

California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation (Co-source)

Legal Aid at Work (Co-source)

Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California

Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders for Civic Empowerment

Asian Law Caucus
California Coalition for Worker Power
California Domestic Workers Coalition
California Employment Lawyers Association
California Farmworker Coalition
California Federation of Labor Unions
California Food and Farming Network
California Nurses Association
California State Association of Electrical Workers
California State Pipe Trades Council
California Teamsters Public Affairs Council
Center for Workers' Rights
Central California Environmental Justice Network
Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy
Centro Binacional Para El Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueño
Chinese Progressive Association
Clean Carwash Worker Center
Farm2people
Inland Empire Labor Council
LA Raza Centro Legal
Legal Link
Loyola Law School, the Sunita Jain Anti-Trafficking Initiative
Mexican-American Legal Defense and Ed Fund
Mixteco Indigenous Community Organizing Project
National Employment Law Project
Pilipino Workers Center
Public Counsel
Santa Clara County Wage Theft Coalition
Sierra Harvest
Trabajadores Unidos Workers United
UC Hastings Community Justice Clinics
United Food and Commercial Workers Western States Council
Wage Justice Center
Western States Council Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation
Worksafe
Individual Support Letters: 2

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/21/26)

Acclamation Insurance Management Services
Agricultural Council of California

Allied Managed Care
American Council of Engineering Companies
American Petroleum and Convenience Store Association
American Staffing Association
Anaheim Chamber of Commerce
Asian Business Association
Associated Builders and Contractors of California
Associated Equipment Distributors
Associated General Contractors California
Associated General Contractors San Diego
Brea Chamber of Commerce
California Alliance of Family-Owned Businesses
California Assisted Living Association
California Association for Health Services At Home
California Association of Health Facilities
California Association of Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association
California Attractions and Parks Association
California Automotive Wholesalers' Association
California Building Industry Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Construction and Industrial Materials Association
California Craft Brewers Association
California Farm Bureau
California Financial Services Association
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California Hospital Association
California Hotel & Lodging Association
California Landscape Contractors Association
California League of Food Producers
California New Car Dealers Association
California Pest Management Association
California Restaurant Association
California Retailers Association
California Staffing Professionals
California Trucking Association
Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce
Carson Chamber of Commerce
Central Valley Business Federation

Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce
Civil Justice Association of California
Coalition of Small and Disabled Veteran Businesses
Construction Employers' Association
Corona Chamber of Commerce
Family Business Association
Family Business Association of California
Family Winemakers of California
Flasher Barricade Association
Folsom Chamber of Commerce
Fontana Chamber of Commerce
Gateway Chambers Alliance
Golden Gate Restaurant Association
Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce
Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce
Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce
Hayward Chamber of Commerce
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce
Imperial Valley Regional Chamber of Commerce
International Warehouse Logistics Association
LA Cañada Flintridge Chamber of Commerce
Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce
Leading Age California
Livermore Valley Chamber of Commerce
Long Beach Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Murrieta Wildomar Chamber of Commerce
National Association of Theatre Owners of California
National Federation of Independent Business
Newport Beach Chamber of Commerce
Norwalk Chamber of Commerce
Oceanside Chamber of Commerce
Orange County Business Council
Pacific Association of Building Service Contractors
Paso Robles Templeton Chamber of Commerce
Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors Association
Rancho Cordova Area Chamber of Commerce
Rancho Mirage Chamber of Commerce
Roseville Area Chamber of Commerce

San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce
Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce
Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce
Santee Chamber of Commerce
Southern California Rental Housing Association
Southwest California Legislative Council
Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce
Tri County Chamber Alliance
United Contractors
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
West Ventura County Business Alliance
Western Car Wash Association
Western Electrical Contractors Association
Western Growers Association
Wine Institute

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The sponsors of the measure, the California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation and Legal Aid at Work, argue:

“Under current law, all wages are generally due and payable twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. When wages are not paid on time, this can cause extreme financial hardship for the many employees living paycheck to paycheck, who rely on a timely paycheck to pay for food, rent, and other daily necessities. Moreover, this delay in payment essentially amounts to an interest-free loan from the employee to the employer.

Prior to 2019, there was no explicit remedy for employees who were not paid on their designated payday. AB 673 (Carrillo, 2019) amended Labor Code section 210 to allow workers to recover penalties for such violations through a Labor Commissioner Office (LCO) wage claim hearing or through a PAGA civil action. However, in a PAGA action, aggrieved workers recover only 35% of the assessed penalty amount – the remaining 65% goes to the state. If a worker chooses instead to pursue her claim with the LCO, she will have to wait two to five years to even get a hearing date because of the extensive backlog of wage claims.

SB 310 would amend Labor Code section 210 so that an employee can recover 100% of the penalties due to her for late payment of wages through an independent civil action. Enactment of this bill would positively affect a worker who might be

discouraged from pursuing her claim for 100% of penalties because of the inordinate delays at the LCO, and discouraged from pursuing PAGA litigation because she would only receive 35% of the penalty intended to compensate her for the negative consequences of late payment. Importantly, the amount of penalties the employer must pay in a civil action would remain the same as what the employer would pay in a PAGA action or in an LCO wage claim hearing.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: A coalition of opponents, including the California Chamber of Commerce, argue:

“SB 310 undermines the recent PAGA reform by gifting trial attorneys a new means of leveraging wage and hour cases against employers of every size for high settlements...

SB 310 is problematic because it introduces a new pathway for trial attorneys to exploit penalties as leverage in meritless wage-and-hour cases – precisely the type of conduct that the PAGA reforms were designed to curb. SB 310 creates a private right of action to seek penalties under Labor Code section 210. Labor Code section 210 authorizes penalties of \$100 or \$200 per violation of multiple Labor Code provisions, including section 204. Presently, those penalties are recoverable by the Labor Commissioner or through PAGA. In fact, PAGA was created to serve as the private right of action for a plaintiff to seek penalties that had historically only been collectable by the Labor Commissioner, like section 210. Now, some attorneys are arguing that PAGA is insufficient, advocating for the creation of additional private rights of action.

There are several key concerns with SB 310. First, Labor Code section 204 violations are among the most common ‘derivative claims’ in wage-and-hour lawsuits. Under the derivative claim theory, if an employee asserts they are owed even a single dollar, it can be argued that their wages are late and that section 204 has therefore been violated. This strategy is often employed to increase leverage in class action cases and is typically coupled with claims that are difficult for employers to disprove, such as off-the-clock work or missed rest breaks. A violation of section 204 triggers penalties under section 210. By allowing these penalties to be pursued through a new private right of action, SB 310 effectively legitimizes the practice of pleading these derivative claims, even when there is no merit.

Second, SB 310 does not protect against stacking of penalties. While section 210 provides that the penalty cannot be stacked with PAGA for the ‘same violation,’ it does not prohibit both 210 and PAGA from being claimed in the same complaint.

This is precisely what trial attorneys aim to do: claim section 210 penalties for one derivative violation of section 204, while pursuing PAGA penalties for all other alleged violations. The practical consequence of SB 310 is that it becomes a procedural tool to inflate the overall settlement value of a case.

Granting trial attorneys a new mechanism to further inflate settlement values on the heels of PAGA reforms undermines this Legislature's efforts to curb litigation abuse."

Prepared by: Emma Bruce / L., P.E. & R. / (916) 651-1556
1/21/26 16:05:22

****** 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** ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 109
Author: Grove (R), et al.
Introduced: 1/13/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: National Mentorship Month: Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central California

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the month of January 2026 as National Mentorship Month in recognition of the commitment to mentorship by the Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) January is recognized across the nation as National Mentoring Month, a time to celebrate the power of mentorship and acknowledge the individuals and organizations that make a lasting impact in the lives of young people.
- 2) Since its founding in 1968, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central California (BBBSofCC) has served as a pillar of mentorship and youth empowerment, providing guidance, stability, and opportunity to children throughout the central valley.
- 3) Over the past five decades, BBBSofCC has positively impacted the lives of more than 10,000 children and their families, fostering resilience, leadership, and hope through one-to-one mentoring relationships.
- 4) BBBSofCC has successfully implemented the High School Bigs Program across 21 unified school districts, serving more than 4,000 children and families each year throughout central California.
- 5) Through dedicated mentors, community partnerships, and innovative programming, BBBSofCC continues to inspire young people to reach their full potential, strengthening the fabric of our communities.

This resolution recognizes the Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central California for its unwavering commitment to the mentorship of children and families throughout the central California region and its enduring impact on future generations.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/21/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/21/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
1/21/26 16:05:29

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 110
Author: Grove (R), et al.
Introduced: 1/14/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Women's Military History Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes "Women Warriors" by proclaiming the week of March 16, 2026, to March 22, 2026, inclusive, as Women's Military History Week in California, recognizes the hard-fought contributions of women to the military and freedom, and encourages Californians to honor the courageous sacrifices that women have made since the historic lifting of the ban on women in combat on January 24, 2013.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Women have served bravely in every major United States conflict since the American Revolutionary War, but their courage and service have gone unrecognized. Our current servicewomen would be unable to serve without the precedence, persistence, determination, and unyielding resilience of the incredible strides of women of previous generations.
- 2) The over 3 million women who have served in or with the armed forces since the American Revolution have contributed immensely to the strength and resilience of our armed forces.
- 3) Over 400 women have been killed in combat since World War I and over 90 women have been identified as prisoners of war since World War II.
- 4) It is recognized that women have always been capable of serving in combat and that it is policies like the 1994 ban on women in combat that have precluded women from serving. From the Revolutionary War to modern-day humanitarian efforts, women in our military have led the way for progress, despite decades of obstacles, ultimately serving in positions of leadership and combat roles.

This resolution recognizes “Women Warriors” by proclaiming the week of March 16, 2026, to March 22, 2026, inclusive, as Women’s Military History Week in California.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 38 (Grove, Resolution Chapter 47, Statutes of 2025)
ACR 30 (Wilson, Resolution Chapter 35, Statutes of 2023)
SCR 86 (Grove, Resolution Chapter 44, Statutes of 2022)
HR 27 (Nguyen, 2021) – Adopted in Assembly.
SR 13 (Grove, 2021) – Adopted in Senate.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/20/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/20/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
1/21/26 16:05:29

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 111
Author: Niello (R)
Introduced: 1/15/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Certified public accountants: 125th anniversary

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution commemorates, recognizes, and celebrates the 125th anniversary of the certified public accountant profession, commends the California Board of Accountancy for its commitment to consumer protection and professional excellence, and honors the many certified public accountants who have contributed to California's economic strength, public accountability, and community well-being.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The California Board of Accountancy is charged with protecting the public as its highest priority, and accomplishes this through its mission of ensuring that only qualified licensees practice public accountancy in accordance with established professional standards and its vision of consumers being well informed and receiving high-quality accounting services from professionals they can trust.
- 2) Certified public accountants operate at the center of business, consumer, and financial decision-making, bringing knowledge, expertise, problem-solving skills, and independent judgment to address complex and evolving challenges facing California's businesses, governments, nonprofit organizations, and communities, and providing objective assurance and insight that inform practical solutions, make sense of what comes next, and shape key operational and long-term planning decisions.
- 3) Certified public accountants are licensed and regulated by the California Board of Accountancy, having met comprehensive education requirements, passed a rigorous professional examination, and completed an experience requirement,

and adhere to a code of professional conduct, ethical standards of practice, and applicable statutes and regulations for the protection of the public interest.

This resolution commemorates, recognizes, and celebrates the 125th anniversary of the certified public accountant profession, commends the California Board of Accountancy for its commitment to consumer protection and professional excellence, and honors the many certified public accountants who have contributed to California's economic strength, public accountability, and community well-being.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/27/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/27/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
1/28/26 15:45:14

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 113
Author: Grove (R)
Introduced: 1/16/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Gold Star Mothers' and Families' Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims September 27, 2026, as Gold Star Mothers' and Families' Day in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The history of Gold Star families began in the United States shortly after World War I to provide support for mothers who lost sons or daughters in the war.
- 2) The reference to the Gold Star comes from the custom of families of service members hanging a service flag in the window of their homes displaying a blue star for every living family member in the Armed Forces and a gold star for those who have perished.
- 3) Since 2009, the President of the United States has designated the last Sunday in September as Gold Star Mothers' and Families' Day, continuing the tradition of honoring the sacrifice of these families. Supporting Gold Star families demonstrates the commitment of the American people to those families, now and in the future.
- 4) As a nation, we must continually look for new ways to support Gold Star families both in the days immediately following the tragedy and in the years that follow.

This resolution proclaims September 27, 2026, as Gold Star Mothers' and Families' Day in California.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 28 (Grove, Resolution Chapter 170, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 109 (Grove, 2024) – Adopted in the Senate.

SR 43 (Grove, 2023) – Adopted in the Senate.

SR 101 (Grove, 2022) – Adopted in the Senate.

ACR 7 (Salas, Resolution Chapter 131, Statutes of 2021)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/27/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/27/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171

1/28/26 15:45:15

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 114
Author: Grove (R)
Introduced: 1/20/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: National Surveyors Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims March 15, 2026, through March 21, 2026, as National Surveyors Week.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Surveying is the art and science of accurately determining the position of points and the distances between them, and is often used to establish land boundaries for ownership or governmental purposes.
- 2) Surveying has been an essential element in the development of the human environment since the beginning of recorded history and is required in the planning and execution of nearly every form of construction, with its most familiar modern uses in the fields of transportation, building and construction, communications, mapping, and the definition of legal boundaries for land ownership.
- 3) There are over 45,000 professional surveyors in the United States, and nearly 4,000 in the State of California.
- 4) Since the colonial days of the United States, surveyors have been leaders in the community, statesmen, influential citizens, and shapers of cultural standards. Former notable surveyors include George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, Daniel Boone, and Henry David Thoreau, among many others.

This resolution recognizes the week of March 15, 2026, through March 21, 2026, as National Surveyors Week.

Related/Prior Legislation

HR 77 (Soria, 2024) – Adopted in Assembly.

SR 19 (Wilk, 2023) – Adopted in Senate.

SR 72 (Jones, 2022) – Adopted in Senate.

HR 96 (Bigelow, 2022) – Adopted in Senate.

SR 18 (Jones, 2021) – Adopted in Senate.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/27/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/27/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171

1/28/26 15:45:16

**** **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** ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 68
Author: Cervantes (D)
Introduced: 1/8/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: Sexual Assault Awareness Month and Denim Day.

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes April 29, 2026, as Denim Day in California and encourages everyone to wear jeans on that day to help communicate the message that there is no excuse for, and never an invitation to commit, rape.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) In 1998, the Supreme Court of Cassation in Italy overturned the conviction of a man who sexually assaulted an 18-year-old woman after the court determined that, “because the victim wore very, very tight jeans, she had to help him remove them, and by removing the jeans it was no longer rape but consensual sex”.
- 2) Enraged by the court decision, within a matter of hours, the women in the Italian Parliament launched into immediate action and protested by wearing jeans to work. Nations and states throughout the world have followed the lead of the Italian Parliament by designating their own “Denim Day” to raise public awareness about rape and sexual assault.
- 3) The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey reports that there are over 38,000,000 survivors of rape throughout the United States, with 3,250,000 of those survivors of rape currently living in the State of California.
- 4) In addition to the immediate physical and emotional costs, sexual assault survivors too frequently suffer from severe and long-lasting consequences, such as post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, major depression, homelessness, eating disorders, low self-esteem, and suicide.

- 5) California is a national leader in promoting victim-centered approaches within the judicial, criminal justice, medical, rape crisis, and health communities. In 2021, California joined the States of New Hampshire and Florida in fulfilling the promise of Denim Day by approving and enacting Assembly Bill 939 (Cervantes, Chapter 529 of the Statutes of 2021), which prohibits a survivor's manner of dress from serving as evidence of consent in sexual assault cases.

This resolution recognizes April 29, 2026, as Denim Day in California and encourages everyone to wear jeans on that day to help communicate the message that there is no excuse for, and never an invitation to commit, rape.

Related/Prior Legislation

SR 89 (Rubio, 2024) – Adopted in the Senate.
HR 85 (Cervantes, 2024) – Adopted in the Assembly.
SCR 44 (Caballero, Resolution Chapter 81, Statutes of 2023)
HR 81 (Cervantes, 2022) – Adopted in the Assembly.
SR 28 (Rubio, 2021) – Adopted in the Senate.
HR 38 (Carrillo, 2021) – Adopted in the Assembly.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/21/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/21/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
1/21/26 16:05:30

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 69
Author: Niello (R)
Introduced: 1/12/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: Montessori Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates February 2026 as Montessori Month in California, and urges all Californians to take note of that month and to participate fittingly in its observance.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) In February 2026, Montessorians will celebrate the 119th anniversary of the first Montessori school.
- 2) A system for the education of children from birth through secondary schools, the Montessori program focuses upon providing materials, techniques, and experiences that support the learners' natural development and encourages children to "learn how to learn," to gain independence and self-confidence, and to promote the principles of peace and responsible world citizenship.
- 3) It is fitting and proper that we recognize the immeasurable contributions of California's Montessori schools, and congratulate all Montessorians upon the 119th anniversary of the first Montessori school.

This resolution pays tribute to the long and distinguished history of the Montessori Method and to the teachers, both past and present, who have contributed immeasurably to the education of our citizens.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 17 (Niello, Resolution Chapter 26, Statutes of 2025)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/20/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/20/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
1/21/26 16:05:31

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 71
Author: Arreguín (D), et al.
Introduced: 1/20/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: Affordable Homeownership

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes the vital and unique role of affordable homeownership in strengthening California's economic future, promoting racial and economic equity, and building intergenerational stability for working families.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Access to affordable homeownership for lower income families, particularly through nonprofit-led, equity-building pathways, creates generational wealth and stability otherwise unattainable in California's housing market, helping to reduce the racial wealth gap and create long-term economic mobility for families historically excluded from ownership opportunities.
- 2) Affordable homeownership programs, such as those delivered by nonprofit homebuilders in California, provide far more than a housing unit. Those programs offer families the stability of permanent affordability, a deep stake in their communities, and the cycle of growth that equity can provide.
- 3) California has underproduced housing for decades, leading the nation in housing deficit in 2021 with a shortfall of nearly 900,000 units. The lack of housing supply, particularly the shortage of entry-level ownership homes affordable to lower income families, is a root cause of skyrocketing home prices and limited opportunity for first-time buyers. Housing affordability in California has reached crisis levels, with 18% of households able to afford the median-priced home in 2024.
- 4) There are significant benefits to California when access to homeownership is prioritized across all areas of state action, including budget allocations,

regulatory reforms, permit streamlining, land use policy, and program administration.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/27/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/27/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
1/28/26 15:45:16

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 71
Author: Kalra (D), et al.
Amended: 6/19/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 14-0, 1/13/26
AYES: Cortese, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Gonzalez,
Grayson, Menjivar, Pérez, Richardson, Seyarto, Umberg, Valladares
NO VOTE RECORDED: Strickland

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

SUBJECT: Little Saigon Freeway

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates the portion of State Route 101, from Story Road, at postmile 34.224, to the junction with State Highway Route 280 and State Highway Route 680, at postmile 34.873, in the County of Santa Clara, as the Little Saigon Freeway.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law assigns the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) the responsibility of operating and maintaining state highways, including the installation and maintenance of highway signs.

Committee Policy:

The committee has adopted a policy regarding the naming of state highways or structures. Under the policy, the committee will consider only those resolutions that meet all of the following criteria:

- 1) The person being honored must have provided extraordinary public service or some exemplary contribution to the public good and have a connection to the community where the highway or structure is located.
- 2) The person being honored must be deceased or a former elected public official who has been out of office for at least 25 years.
- 3) The naming must be done without cost to the state. Costs for signs and plaques must be paid by local or private sources.
- 4) The author or co-author of the resolution must represent the district in which the facility is located, and the resolution must identify the specific highway segment or structure being named.
- 5) The segment of highway being named must not exceed five miles in length.
- 6) The proposed designation must reflect a community consensus and be without local opposition.
- 7) The proposed designation may not supersede an existing designation unless the sponsor can document that a good faith effort has uncovered no opposition to rescinding the prior designation.

This resolution:

- 1) Recounts the role of Little Saigon as a major cultural, social, and commercial center for the Vietnamese community in the City of San Jose.
- 2) Designates the portion of State Route 101, from Story Road, at postmile 34.224, to the junction with State Highway Route 280 and State Highway Route 680, at postmile 34.873, in the County of Santa Clara, as the Little Saigon Freeway.
- 3) Requests Caltrans to determine the cost of appropriate signs consistent with the signing requirements for the state highway system showing this special designation and, upon receiving donations from nonstate sources sufficient to cover that cost, to erect those signs.

Comments

Purpose of the resolution. According to the author, “The City of San Jose is home to the largest Vietnamese community in any city in the U.S., with the Little Saigon area serving as a major cultural, social, and commercial hub. Recognizing its significance, in 2007, the City of San Jose officially designated this area along Story Road as ‘Little Saigon.’ ACR 71 would ensure future generations can honor and recognize the many contributions of the Vietnamese community by designating a portion of State Route 101 in the City of San Jose as the Little Saigon Freeway.”

Background. Since April 1975, when the capital of South Vietnam fell, approximately 2,300,000 people of Vietnamese origin have become permanent residents or citizens of the United States, 140,000 of whom are residents of the County of Santa Clara, with the City of San Jose claiming home to the highest population of people of Vietnamese origin per area outside of Vietnam.

In 2007, the City of San Jose recognized the importance of Little Saigon as a major cultural, social, and commercial center for the Vietnamese community and officially designated the area along Story Road as “Little Saigon.” “Little Saigon” recalls the name of the South Vietnamese capital decades after it was renamed.

Little Saigon is a destination for tourists and refugees from all over the world. One can find all types of services and businesses in Little Saigon, including restaurants, supermarkets, shopping malls, banks, and jewelry stores serving the Vietnamese American community, as well as other local and surrounding area residents in the City of San Jose. Tết festivals and parades in Little Saigon celebrating the Vietnamese lunar new year have attracted thousands of participants.

Consistent with committee policy. This resolution is consistent with Senate Transportation Committee Highway Naming policy.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/20/26)

Advanced Consulting, LLC
California Young Democrats
City of San Jose, Councilmember Bien Doan
County of Santa Clara
East Side Union High School District

Miss Vietnam California
North East Medical Services
San Jose; City of
Santa Clara County Board of Education Trustee Tara Sreekrishnan
The Northern California Association of Friends From Tây Ninh
The United Vietnamese American Community of Northern California
Vietnamese American Professional Women of Silicon Valley

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/20/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Writing in support of the resolution, the United Vietnamese American Community of Northern California states, “[t]his resolution carries profound meaning for the Vietnamese American community. The Little Saigon district in San Jose is more than a cultural and economic hub—it represents the resilience, sacrifice, and achievements of generations of Vietnamese refugees and immigrants who rebuilt their lives in the United States after the Vietnam War. By naming this segment of Highway 101 the ‘Little Saigon Freeway,’ the State of California formally recognizes the legacy, heritage, and enduring contributions of the Vietnamese American community in Santa Clara County and throughout the state. It is a meaningful tribute that affirms the importance of diversity, inclusion, and cultural preservation in our shared civic spaces.”

Prepared by: Isabelle LaSalle / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
1/21/26 16:05:33

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 115
Author: Bennett (D), et al.
Introduced: 1/6/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: National Blood Donor Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes the month of January as National Blood Donor Month in the State of California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) More than 50 years ago, January was designated as National Blood Donor Month, as an annual observance meant to honor voluntary blood donors and encourage more people to donate blood at a time when blood supplies are historically low.
- 2) A blood transfusion occurs in the United States every two seconds, but only 3 percent of the eligible population actually donate blood, bringing about chronic blood shortages nationwide that have exposed the vulnerability of our nation's blood supply and revealed its need to be included in emergency preparedness plans.
- 3) Patients requiring blood transfusions include cancer patients, accident, burn, or trauma victims, newborn babies and their mothers, transplant recipients, surgery patients, chronically transfused patients suffering from sickle cell disease or thalassemia, and many more. In our communities the need for a diverse blood supply is constant, but the supply is not. This makes volunteer blood donors the foundation for ensuring a safe and stable supply of blood products are available to help meet the medical needs of patients nationwide.

This resolution recognizes the month of January as National Blood Donor Month in the State of California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/21/26)

Blood Centers of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/21/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
1/21/26 16:05:33

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 117
Author: Sharp-Collins (D)
Introduced: 1/6/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Maternal Health Awareness Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims January 23, 2026, as Maternal Health Awareness Day.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The United States ranks highest among industrialized nations in maternal mortality. More than 700 women die each year in the United States as a result of pregnancy or delivery complications, and more than one-half of these deaths are preventable.
- 2) The California Maternal Quality Care Collaborative (CMQCC), a multistakeholder organization committed to ending preventable morbidity, mortality, and racial disparities in California maternity care, was founded in 2006 at Stanford University School of Medicine, in coordination with the California Pregnancy-Associated Mortality Review (CA-PAMR) and the Public Health Institute, in response to rising maternal mortality and morbidity rates.
- 3) CMQCC uses research, quality improvement toolkits, statewide outreach collaboratives, and its innovative Maternal Data Center to improve health outcomes for mothers and infants. Since the inception of CMQCC and CA-PAMR, California has achieved a roughly 65% reduction in maternal mortality between 2006 and 2016.
- 4) While California has set an example for the rest of the country and has made progress to reduce maternal mortality through investment in maternal health programs, strong leadership and engagement of the maternity care community, and targeted hospital quality improvement, more needs to be done to narrow

racial and ethnic disparities, especially with Black women, who account for only 5% of pregnancies in California but represent 21% of pregnancy-related deaths and whose pregnancy-related mortality ratio is three to four times greater than the mortality ratios for women of other racial or ethnic groups, including White, Hispanic, and Asian and Pacific Islander.

- 5) California should continue to promote positive birth outcomes for all women through actions, including maternity care quality improvement and home visiting for vulnerable pregnant women, providing additional support for Black women, and increasing culturally and linguistically relevant public awareness about maternal mental health risk factors, signs, symptoms, treatment, and recovery.

This resolution proclaims January 23, 2026, as Maternal Health Awareness Day to draw attention to the efforts that have improved maternal health in California and to highlight the need for continued improvement of maternal health for all women.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 9 (Weber Pierson, Resolution Chapter 10, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 122 (Aguilar-Curry, Resolution Chapter 17, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 2 (Weber, Resolution Chapter 3, Statutes of 2023)

ACR 120 (Bauer-Kahan, Resolution Chapter 14, Statutes of 2022)

HR 11 (Bauer-Kahan, 2021) – Adopted by the Assembly.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/21/26)

American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists, District IX

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/21/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171

1/21/26 16:05:34

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