

**2025-26 SESSION**

**SENATE  
THIRD READING PACKET**

**THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 2026**



OFFICE OF SENATE FLOOR ANALYSES  
651-4171

## SENATE THIRD READING PACKET

Attached are analyses of bills on the Daily File for Thursday, March 26, 2026.

| <b><u>Note</u></b> | <b><u>Measure</u></b>   | <b><u>Author</u></b> | <b><u>Location</u></b>                  |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---|
|                    | <a href="#">SB 922</a>  | Laird                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| +                  | <a href="#">SB 932</a>  | Hurtado              | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SB 968</a>  | Becker               | Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day |
|                    | <a href="#">SB 1005</a> | Caballero            | Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day |
|                    | <a href="#">SB 1080</a> | Valladares           | Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day |
| +                  | <a href="#">SB 1143</a> | Caballero            | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 84</a>  | Blakespear           | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 113</a> | Grove                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 116</a> | Alvarado-Gil         | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 118</a> | Gonzalez             | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 123</a> | Umberg               | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| +                  | <a href="#">SCR 124</a> | Wiener               | Consent Calendar First Legislative Day  |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 128</a> | Pérez                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 130</a> | Grove                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 136</a> | Laird                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 138</a> | Ashby                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 140</a> | Wiener               | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 141</a> | Wahab                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 142</a> | Becker               | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 143</a> | Umberg               | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 144</a> | Seyarto              | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SCR 145</a> | Weber Pierson        | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| +                  | <a href="#">SCR 146</a> | Laird                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| +                  | <a href="#">SCR 147</a> | Allen                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SJR 11</a>  | Cervantes            | Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day |
| +                  | <a href="#">SJR 12</a>  | Laird                | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SR 67</a>   | Blakespear           | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SR 68</a>   | Cervantes            | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
|                    | <a href="#">SR 86</a>   | Gonzalez             | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| RA                 | <a href="#">SR 87</a>   | Archuleta            | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| +                  | <a href="#">SR 88</a>   | Blakespear           | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| +                  | <a href="#">SR 89</a>   | Alvarado-Gil         | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| +                  | <a href="#">SR 90</a>   | Gonzalez             | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| +                  | <a href="#">SR 91</a>   | Gonzalez             | Senate Bills - Third Reading File       |
| +                  | <a href="#">AB 2156</a> | Rivas                | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |
|                    | <a href="#">ACR 133</a> | Johnson              | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |
|                    | <a href="#">ACR 135</a> | Patel                | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |
|                    | <a href="#">ACR 136</a> | Harabedian           | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |
|                    | <a href="#">ACR 138</a> | Hadwick              | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |
| +                  | <a href="#">ACR 139</a> | Calderon             | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |
|                    | <a href="#">ACR 144</a> | Hadwick              | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |
|                    | <a href="#">ACR 145</a> | Caloza               | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |
|                    | <a href="#">ACR 147</a> | Lackey               | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |
| +                  | <a href="#">ACR 153</a> | Calderon             | Assembly Bills - Third Reading File     |

+ ADDS

RA Revised Analysis

\* Analysis pending



---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 922  
Author: Laird (D), et al.  
Amended: 3/11/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 3/18/26  
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** Vehicles: local agency charges: use of streets or highways

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill allows local agencies to impose taxes, permit fees, or other charges for the privilege of using its streets or highways provided they are not based on weight to recover costs for street repair and public services.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Grants local agencies the authority to impose various fees, charges, and taxes to pay for public services.
- 2) Prohibits local agencies from imposing taxes, permit fees, or other charges for the privilege of using its streets or highways, other than a permit fee for particularly large loads, after December 31, 1990, unless the local agency had imposed the fee prior to June 1, 1989.

This bill:

- 1) States that fees, charges, or surcharges for local agencies to recover costs of street maintenance, repair, and other costs to provide public services do not count as a tax, permit fee, or other charge for the privilege of using its streets or highways.
- 2) Allows local agencies to impose a fee, charge, or surcharge described above.

- 3) Allows local agencies to impose taxes, permit fees, or other charges for the privilege of using its streets or highways, provided they are not based on weight.

## **Background**

*Local taxes, fees, and charges.* Prior to 1978, local agencies could enact taxes by ordinance. Proposition 13 (1978) amended the Constitution to require a 2/3 vote of the electorate to enact a local special tax. Proposition 62 (1986) prohibited local agencies from imposing general taxes without majority approval of local voters, and clarified the 2/3 vote necessary to impose special taxes. Proposition 218 (1996) extended those vote thresholds to charter cities and required local agencies to obtain voter approval to levy new assessments, fees, and taxes, which was subsequently limited by Proposition 26 (2010). Local agencies impose taxes, fees, and charges to finance a variety of public services. For example, state law requires local agencies to provide solid waste handling services, or contract with another local agency or solid waste enterprise. If the local agency provides the service, they charge customers directly. Most jurisdictions in the state operate with some form of “franchise,” or contract, that limits solid waste hauling within the jurisdiction to one or more specified companies. Under these agreements, the local agency charges the franchisee for the benefit of operating within the public right-of-way. The franchisee then charges customers for providing waste hauling services. Many local agencies include the costs to cover the wear and tear on the roads from the heavy waste hauling trucks in their fees. A typical car weighs roughly 4,400 pounds, while a loaded garbage truck can weigh as much as 60,000 pounds.

*Weight fees.* California collects fees based on weight from commercial vehicles to finance transportation projects, which generates over \$1 billion annually. In 1989, the Legislature passed Senate Constitutional Amendment 1, which became Proposition 111 on the June 1990 ballot. Proposition 111, along with its implementing legislation (AB 471, Katz, Chapter 1337, Statutes of 1989) increased weight fees. Along with these measures, the Legislature passed SB 286 (Campbell), which, when Proposition 111 passed, prohibited local agencies from imposing taxes, permit fees, or other charges for the privilege of using its streets or highways, other than a permit fee for particularly large loads, after December 31, 1990, unless the local agency had imposed the fee prior to June 1, 1989. The Legislature intended for this measure to assuage concerns that local agencies would follow suit and increase local fees, charges, or taxes for the privilege of using their roads.

*Rogers v. Redlands*. In 2025, a resident of Redlands, a city of over 70,000 residents in San Bernardino County, sued the city alleging that the portion of their waste hauling fees used to repair road damage from garbage trucks constituted a charge for the privilege of using the city's roads, violating SB 286's prohibition on these charges. In *Rogers v. Redlands* 112 Cal. App. 5th 667, the California Court of Appeals affirmed the Superior Court of San Bernardino's decision that agreed with the resident and required Redlands to stop factoring road repair into their waste hauling fees. The California Supreme Court denied the opportunity to review the case.

### **Comments**

*Purpose of this bill*. According to the author, "Senate Bill 922 affirms the local agency authority to collect service-related fees from public service operations, such as waste hauling, to recover street maintenance and repair costs. While local agencies have historically integrated these infrastructure costs into utility rates or franchise agreements, a 2025 court interpretation of existing law challenged this practice. SB 922 clarifies the statute to restore regulatory certainty, ensuring local agencies will continue to have funding for the repair of pavement deterioration caused by heavy-duty service vehicles."

*Getting it right*. SB 922 seeks to address two issues. First, it seeks to restore local agencies' ability to include road repair costs in their waste hauling fees, which the *Rogers* decision prohibited. Second, it seeks to limit the prohibition on fees for the privilege of using roads to weight fees so that other charges do not face similar legal challenges to those in *Rogers*. However, making these two changes could lead some local agencies to seek to impose fees, charges, and taxes for the privilege of using their roads—contrary to what may have been the intent of SB 286—merely by avoiding basing those fees on weight. For example, in 2019, the Legislature passed AB 1605 (Ting), which sought to impose a fee to mitigate congestion on and around the 1000 block of Lombard Street in the City and County of San Francisco (known as the "Crooked Street"). However, Governor Newsom vetoed the measure in part because it violated SB 286's prohibition. If SB 922 becomes law, San Francisco could decide to revisit this fee without legislation so long as the fee is not based on weight. The Committee may wish to consider narrowing the types of fees, charges, and taxes that local agencies can impose for the privilege of using its roads.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/18/26)

Mayor Todd Gloria, City of San Diego  
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Afl-cio  
California Police Chiefs Association  
California Special Districts Association  
California State Association of Counties  
California State Council of Service Employees International Union  
Californians Against Waste  
City and County of San Francisco  
City of Beverly Hills  
City of Capitola  
City of Fullerton  
City of Glendale  
City of Goleta  
City of Gonzales  
City of Grover Beach  
City of Hollister  
City of Lakewood CA  
City of Marina  
City of Moreno Valley  
City of Oxnard  
City of Oxnard Public Works  
City of Port Hueneme  
City of Rancho Cucamonga  
City of Redondo Beach  
City of Salinas  
City of San Bernardino  
City of Santa Paula  
City of Scotts Valley  
City of Stanton  
City of Tulare  
City of Upland  
County of Madera  
County of Monterey  
League of California Cities  
Recology  
Recyclesmart  
Republic Services  
Rural County Representatives of California  
Town of Apple Valley

Town of Truckee  
West Valley Solid Waste Management Authority

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/18/26)

California Building Industry Association  
California Taxpayers Association

Prepared by: Jonathan Peterson / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119  
3/19/26 16:14:52

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 932  
Author: Hurtado (D)  
Amended: 3/16/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 3/24/26  
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Reyes, Stern,  
Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby

---

**SUBJECT:** Civil proceedings: real party in interest

**SOURCE:** Conference of California Bar Associations

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires the assignee of rights in a legal proceeding to identify the assignor of the rights and the original real party in interest in the proceeding in the title of the case on the first document that the assignee files in the proceeding.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that a right arising out of an obligation is the property of the person to whom it is due, and may be transferred to another person as such. (Civil (Civ.) Code, § 1458.)
- 2) Provides that every action must be prosecuted in the name of the real party in interest in the action, except as otherwise provided by statute. (Code of Civ. Procedure (Proc.), § 367.)
- 3) Establishes, as an exception to 2), a procedure by which a person who is a participant in the state address confidentiality program for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking, child abduction, and elder or dependent adult abuse may proceed in a civil action using a pseudonym. (Code Civ. Proc., § 367.3.)

- 4) Provides that, in the case of an assignment of a thing in action, the assignment by the assignee is without prejudice to any set-off, or other defense existing at the time of, or before, notice of the assignment, except for specified cases involving a negotiable promissory note or bill of exchange. (Code Civ. Proc., § 368.)
- 5) Provides that an action or proceeding does not abate by the transfer of an interest in the action or proceeding or by any other transfer of an interest, and that when such an interest is transferred, the action or proceeding may be continued in the name of the original party, or the court may allow the person to whom the transfer is made to be substituted in the action or proceeding. (Code Civ. Proc., § 368.5.)

This bill requires an assignee who has been assigned rights in a proceeding by an assignor who is the original party in interest in the proceeding to identify the assignor and original party in interest in the title of the case on the first document the assignee files in the proceeding.

### **Comments**

California law treats the right to pursue a civil action in court like property. This means that the right to file a case can be transferred, or “assigned,” to another person or entity. When a person assigns their case rights, the assignee can pursue the case exactly as the original party would have done—they can assert the same claims, make the same arguments, and, if they prevail, obtain the same recovery. Under current law, when an original real party in interest assigns their case rights to another person, the original real party in interest’s name does not need to be identified in the case caption, even though their rights are the ones being asserted in the proceeding. While the assignor will be identified over the course of the case, leaving the real party in interest off of the caption means they will not be listed as a party on the docket, making it significantly more difficult for journalists or other interested parties to discover that the assignor is involved in a case. According to the author and sponsors, some individuals deliberately assign claims to third parties, or corporate entities that they wholly control, to avoid public scrutiny of their cases.

This bill requires the original real party in interest to be listed in the case caption when an assignee first files a document in the case, thereby ensuring that the original real party in interest is listed on the docket.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/25/26)

Conference of California Bar Associations (source)

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/25/26)

Utility Wildfire Survivor Coalition

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the Conference of California Bar Associations:

This change is needed to ensure that the real party-in-interest is properly identified, and to bring transparency to the sphere of assignments. Search engines and public court records typically capture only the names listed in the case caption. When an assignee files a lawsuit without identifying the assignor in the case title, the original party transferring the legal claim remains effectively hidden from the public, creditors, government agencies, and injured parties. This lack of transparency can be exploited to conceal financial recoveries. Assignors can route claims through shell companies, often formed in states that allow anonymous ownership, allowing them to collect money indirectly without clear public visibility. As a result, this structure can make it easier to hide assets and avoid paying money that is legally owed to victims, creditors, or government agencies, undermining accountability and enforcement.

Identifying the assignor would not be a new or unusual concept, as similar disclosure requirements already exist for plaintiffs suing in a representative capacity, such as guardians ad litem or trustees. This approach is consistent with Section 367 of the same Code (namely the Code of Civil Procedure), which provides that every action must be prosecuted in the name of the real party in interest unless otherwise specified by statute. SB 932 is seeking to add a layer of transparency to clearly identify the real party in interest within civil proceedings.

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** According to the Utility Wildfire Survivor Coalition:

We are in opposition to SB 932 given that it provides for inequitable disclosure that may work against the public interest particularly within complex civil litigation. The proposed bill fails to address critical gaps in transparency and financial conflict disclosure.

While the bill is well intentioned and appears to take an important step toward transparency by requiring disclosures for the “original real party in interest,” it is incomplete and therefore insufficient to address the realities of modern complex litigation, particularly mass tort, coordinated or consolidated proceedings involving thousands of plaintiffs and overlapping legal representation

Prepared by: Allison Whitt Meredith / JUD. / (916) 651-4113  
3/25/26 16:17:24

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

---

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SB 968  
Author: Becker (D), et al.  
Introduced: 2/3/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 3/18/26  
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

---

**SUBJECT:** Community colleges: San Mateo County Community College  
District

**SOURCE:** San Mateo County Community College District

---

**DIGEST:** This bill removes a sunset date of July 1, 2028, for statute that authorizes the governing board of the San Mateo County Community College District (SMCCCD) to adopt a policy to use local unrestricted general funds to provide fee waivers and other assistance to help cover the total cost of attendance for students residing within the boundary of SMCCCD.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Community Colleges (CCCs), under the administration of the Board of Governors (BOG), as one of the segments of public postsecondary education in this state. It further requires community college districts to charge students an enrollment fee of \$46 per unit per semester. (Education Code (EC) § 70900 and 76300)
- 2) Requires a waiver of enrollment fees for students who meet specified income requirements based on any of the following criteria:
  - a) At the time of enrollment, the student is a recipient of benefits under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment Program, or a general assistance program.

- b) Demonstrates eligibility according to income standards established by regulations of the BOG.
  - c) Demonstrates financial need in accordance with the methodology set forth in federal law or regulation for determining the expected family contribution of students seeking financial aid.
  - d) At the time of enrollment, the student is a homeless youth or former homeless youth. (EC § 76300)
- 3) Additionally provides for a waiver of fees for certain types of students, including:
- a) Dependents or surviving spouses of California National Guard members, either killed or who died from a permanent disability, as a result of service to the state.
  - b) A surviving spouse or child of a California law enforcement officer or firefighter killed in the performance of active law enforcement or fire suppression duties or who died as a result of performing those duties.
  - c) The dependent of any California resident killed in the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.
  - d) The child of a United States military veteran who has a service-connected disability, or was killed in action, or died of a service-connected disability. (EC § 66025.3)
  - e) The child of a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor. (EC § 66025.3)
- 4) Authorizes the SMCCCD, until July 1, 2028, to adopt a policy to use local unrestricted general funds to provide fee waivers and other assistance to help cover the total cost of attendance for students residing within the boundary of SMCCCD. (EC § 76302)

This bill:

- 1) Removes a sunset date of July 1, 2028, and an inoperative date of January 1, 2029, for statute that authorizes the governing board of the SMCCCD to adopt a policy on the district's use of local unrestricted general funds to: (a) provide fee waivers to students with the greatest financial need, as determined by

SMCCCD, and (b) provide assistance to students for their total cost of attendance.

- 2) Includes a technical amendment to remove a report that the SMCCCD was required to submit on March 1, 2026, on the district's use of local unrestricted general funds for fee waivers and assistance to cover students' total cost of attendance. This report also required a copy of the policy adopted by SMCCCD's governing board, as well as data on students receiving a fee waiver from the district's local unrestricted general funds, disaggregated by age, race and ethnicity, unit load, and income level.

### Comments

- 1) *Need for the bill.* According to the author, "SMCCCD's free college pilot program has allowed the district to bridge inequities throughout San Mateo County by making college more accessible and affordable for students, particularly those in marginalized and underrepresented communities." By removing the sunset and inoperative dates, this bill would permanently allow SMCCCD "to use local funds to support students' basic needs and have the flexibility to charge less than the currently required state fee rate of \$46 per credit unit (including charging \$0), ... SMCCCD can make attending college less financially burdensome for students in need of assistance." The author's office indicates that removing the sunset date more than a year out would provide certainty to the district in their ability to move forward with this program.
- 2) *Statutory fee waivers.* Enrollment fees at CCCs are the lowest in the nation and are waived for almost half of students (48% in 2024-25) under the California College Promise Grant fee waiver, previously known as the BOG fee waiver. The California College Promise Grant fee waiver—not to be confused with the separate California College Promise Program established by AB 19 (Santiago, Chapter 735, Statutes of 2017)—waives fees for CCC students demonstrating financial need. A community college student meeting specified income standards may qualify and may receive the waiver, so long as they are eligible to take courses; there is no minimum unit requirement, and the fee waiver is applied to any course for which a student must pay the enrollment fee. Current law additionally requires fees to be waived for surviving dependents of certain military service members and first responders. The authority provided to SMCCCD in existing statute allows SMCCCD, until July 1, 2028, to provide fee waivers and other financial assistance beyond what is specified for the existing statutory fee waivers.

- 3) *Basic aid districts.* Community college districts earn general purpose apportionment funding under a statutory funding formula, and a district's apportionment is funded with a combination of local property taxes, enrollment fees, and state funds, including state general funds. A basic aid district, also known as an excess tax district or a community-supported district, is an educational entity that does not receive state funding for its apportionment, and this is because a basic aid district's local property taxes and enrollment fees exceed the apportionment amount calculated for that district. As of the 2024-25 recalculation apportionment report published in February 2026, there are nine community college districts that are basic aid status, including SMCCCD. Basic aid districts locally fund their general purpose apportionment funding, which means they have local authority over these funds and that these funds are generally considered local unrestricted general funds.
- 4) *SMCCCD Sought Statutory Authority in SB 893 (Becker, Chapter 937, Statutes of 2022) to Waive Enrollment Fees.* The CCC Chancellor's Office issued a legal opinion in March 2011 addressing whether a college may use district resources to pay the enrollment fees for a hypothetical cohort of students, and concluded that districts may not use district resources to pay for enrollment fees in this scenario, unless students already qualify for statutory fee waivers. EC § 76300 states that districts are required to collect enrollment fees unless otherwise exempted in statute, and that statute requires the BOG to reduce apportionments for districts that do not collect enrollment fees; the legal opinion then states that "paying for the enrollment fee with district resources ... is the equivalent of a district choosing not to charge the enrollment fee". As of the time of this analysis, the CCC Chancellor's Office continues to concur with this opinion.

In addition to this legal opinion, Section 6 of Article XVI of the California Constitution states that public money or funds shall not be used for a gift. Though this section does not specifically mention the use of public funds for fee waivers or assistance for total cost of attendance, paying for a fee waiver or other financial assistance without the statutory authority to do so could be construed as a gift. However, as the California Supreme Court stated in *City of Oakland v. Garrison* (1924): "... where the question arises as to whether or not a proposed application of public funds is to be deemed a gift within the meaning of that term as used in the constitution, the primary and fundamental subject of inquiry is as to whether the money is to be used for a public or private purpose. If it is for a public purpose within the jurisdiction for the appropriating board or body, it is not, generally speaking, to be regarded as a

gift.” Therefore, it could be argued that using funds for fee waivers and assistance for students’ total cost of attendance removes barriers to access to public postsecondary education, which is a public purpose, even if not explicitly described in statute.

Though SMCCCD’s status as a basic aid district means the BOG would not be able to penalize SMCCCD for waiving enrollment fees, and though it could be argued these funds are not considered a gift because they are being used for a public purpose, the enactment of SB 893 (Becker) provides explicit statutory authority for SMCCCD to provide fee waivers and other assistance relating to total cost of attendance for their students, and SB 968 would make this statute permanent.

- 5) *Findings from SMCCCD’s March 1, 2026, report.* In SMCCCD’s implementation of SB 893, SMCCCD adopted a “Free College” policy through its governing board to pay the enrollment fees for qualifying students with specified educational goals to (1) obtain an associate’s degree and transfer to a four-year institution; (2) obtain an associate’s degree without transfer; or (3) earn a vocational certificate without transfer. In addition, the policy also indicated that the district would pay for qualifying students’ other fees—including but not limited to registration, health, and student representation fees—and additional student supports related to the total cost of attendance, such as transportation, technology, and textbook supports.

SMCCCD indicated in its report that 33,500 unique students have received support through their Free College program, with the district spending \$9.2 million in 2023-24 and \$11.8 million in 2024-25 for this program. SMCCCD also attributed recent enrollment growth to this policy. According to the CCC Chancellor’s Office apportionments reports, SMCCCD’s total full-time equivalent students from 2022-23 to 2025-26 has grown nearly 19%, and though this should be viewed as part of a broader statewide enrollment growth surge, most community college districts in high cost-of-living areas have not seen this level of growth, and therefore it seems reasonable to attribute some of this growth to the Free College policy.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

SB 893 (Becker, Chapter 937, Statutes of 2022) authorized the SMCCCD, until July 1, 2028, to adopt a policy to use local unrestricted general funds to provide fee

waivers and other assistance to help cover the total cost of attendance for students residing within the boundary of SMCCCD.

SB 659 (Becker) of 2021 would have authorized a community college district to charge an enrollment fee that is lower than the amount established in statute to students not already benefiting from existing fee waiver policies. SB 659 would have further allowed a community college district the ability to use California College Promise funds to assist students with their total cost of college attendance. Unlike SB 893, SB 659 would have applied to all community college districts. SB 659 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/18/26)

San Mateo County Community College District (source)

Congressman Kevin Mullin, 15th District

Chamber San Mateo County

City of Half Moon Bay

City of Redwood City

Jefferson Union High School District

JobTrain

Monterra Credit Union

Peninsula Health Care District

San Mateo County Economic Development Association

San Mateo County Office of Education

San Mateo County Supervisor David Canepa

San Mateo County Supervisor Lisa Gauthier

San Mateo County Supervisor Noelia Corzo

San Mateo Labor Council

San Mateo Union High School District

StreetCode Academy

The San Francisco Peninsula

29 individuals

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/18/26)

None received

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SB 1005  
Author: Caballero (D)  
Introduced: 2/9/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 3/18/26  
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** Local agency: payment: rounding amount

**SOURCE:** California Association of County Treasurers and Tax Collectors

---

**DIGEST:** This bill allows local agencies to round payments or refunds made wholly or partly in cash to the nearest five cents if that agency passes a resolution by majority vote.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law allows local officers to receive payment of local taxes, fees, or charges by cash, check, credit or debit card, or electronic funds transfer. Local agencies can then use one of these payment methods to return any change due to the payor.

This bill allows local agencies to round payments or refunds made wholly or partly in cash to the nearest five cents if that agency passes a resolution by majority vote.

**Background**

*Local taxes, fees, and charges.* The California Constitution and various statutes grant local agencies the authority to impose various fees, charges, and taxes to pay for public services. Prior to 1978, local agencies could enact taxes by ordinance. Proposition 13 (1978) amended the Constitution to require a 2/3 vote of the electorate to enact a local special tax. Proposition 62 (1986) prohibited local agencies from imposing general taxes without majority approval of local voters, and clarified the 2/3 vote necessary to impose special taxes. Proposition 218 (1996) extended those vote thresholds to charter cities and required local agencies'

to obtain voter approval to levy new assessments, fees, and taxes, which was subsequently limited by Proposition 26 (2010).

*Pennies.* In early 2025, the U.S. Department of the Treasury (Treasury) announced that it would discontinue the minting of pennies as (1) the cost to produce them exceeds their monetary value, and (2) pennies have lower utility as more transactions shift away from cash. While Treasury announced that it will continue to accept pennies as valid currency, they also warned that at one point, there will be penny shortages. Treasury's decision to discontinue pennies forced public and private entities to consider how to prepare for a penniless world. While over 114 billion pennies remain in circulation, the National Council for State Legislatures advised its members to begin considering regulations to prepare their states for this new era. If local agencies no longer have pennies at their disposal, they cannot provide exact change to the payor unless the local agency writes a check. However, in some cases, the cost to produce the check may exceed the change due to the payor and may not be producible at the time of transaction. For example, if a resident pays for a parking permit in cash but does not have exact change, they may have to wait for the local agency to produce a check for a relatively small value.

## **Comments**

*Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, "The penny has been part of our monetary system since 1793. When the Trump administration elected to stop production of the penny through executive order, it created practical challenges for California's taxpayers, small businesses, and local governments. Without pennies in circulation, the ability to provide exact change has become a nationwide challenge. Californians who pay for fees, charges, or taxes in cash, and do not have exact change may not receive the appropriate change as a result of the penny shortage. For example, individuals who wish to pay their property tax in cash and do not have exact change are required to wait weeks to receive a check for the few cents owed to them, an administrative burden that costs more to process resulting in an inefficient use of taxpayer dollars. Local governments will be forced to issue checks for amounts worth less than the price of the paper they are printed on. Unlike private businesses, local governments do not have authority to retain excess change or round transactions without express authorization. SB 1005, the Public Entities Navigating the Need for Immediate Efficient Small-Change Act or PENNIES Act offers a practical solution that allows local governments to round cash transactions to the nearest five cents. This flexibility will save time, reduce administrative burdens, protect taxpayer dollars, and avoid confusion and litigation."

*A nickel for your thoughts.* While rounding cash payments sounds easy enough, state law does not explicitly authorize public agencies to round transactions, and some constitutional and statutory provisions appear to conflict with rounding. For example, if the local agency rounds a refund of \$10.08 up to \$10.10, the local agency is giving the payor more money than they are owed. Article XVI, Sec. 6 of the State Constitution prohibits a gift of public funds. Could these two additional pennies constitute a constitutional violation? Similarly, if the local agency rounds a refund of \$10.08 down to \$10.05, the local agency is taking away three cents the payor is due. Could these three additional pennies constitute a tax, which the State Constitution requires voters to approve? While local agencies could avoid either question by using checks, that could prove less timely and more costly. SB 1005 gives local agencies the option to address these issues without this legal uncertainty.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

AB 1793 (Ward, 2026) enacts the Californians for Common Cents Act, which addresses the same issue for merchants doing business in the state using a similar symmetrical rounding policy. The measure is currently pending in the Assembly Committee on Banking and Finance.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/18/26)

California Association of County Treasurers and Tax Collectors (Source)

California Special Districts Association

California State Association of Counties

City of Glendale

City of Rancho Cucamonga

League of California Cities

Rural County Representatives of California

Urban Counties of California

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/18/26)

None received

Prepared by: Jonathan Peterson / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119

3/19/26 16:14:51

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

---

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SB 1080  
Author: Valladares (R)  
Introduced: 2/13/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 3/18/26  
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** County clerks: certification of records: signature

**SOURCE:** California Association of Clerks & Election Officials

---

**DIGEST:** This bill allows a county clerk to use a printed, stamped, or digital signature in certifying to a record.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Requires counties to have 24 county officers, including the county clerk and the county recorder.
- 2) Provides that the county clerk serves ex officio as the clerk of the board of supervisors and provides various other duties for the county clerk.
- 3) Requires a county clerk to sign and affix a seal to documents when performing their official duties.
- 4) Allows for county boards of supervisors to consolidate offices in specified combinations, including combining the offices of county clerk and county recorder into a clerk-recorder.
- 5) Allows the county recorder to use a printed, stamped, photographically reproduced facsimile, electronic, or otherwise digitally created signature in certifying to a record in the recorder's office provided that the certification has the seal of the recorder's office affixed thereto.

- 6) Allows a clerk of the board of supervisors to use digital signatures on records, books, minutes, and ordinances of the board of supervisors.

This bill:

- 1) Allows a county clerk to use a printed, stamped, photographically reproduced facsimile, electronic, or otherwise digitally created signature in certifying to a record in the county clerk's office, provided that the certification includes the official seal of the county clerk's office.
- 2) Makes nonsubstantive changes to a separate section of law affecting county clerks, including eliminating gendered pronouns.

## **Background**

Clerks have held an important role in government for centuries. References to a *grammateus* responsible for keeping records of laws, decrees, and other documents date to the mid-sixth century before the common era in Athens. More recently, the original California Constitution adopted in 1849 named five county offices, one of which was the county clerk. Although the Constitution no longer specifically requires the office of county clerk, state law lists 24 different county officers, including the county clerk. The responsibilities of the county clerk include:

- Issuing public and confidential marriage licenses;
- Performing civil ceremonies;
- Filing Fictitious Business Name Statements;
- Administering loyalty oaths of office to county employees and elected officials;
- Filing powers of attorney for surety companies;
- Filing and posting public notices and environmental impact reports under the California Environmental Quality Act;
- Filing oaths of office for county officials and notaries within the county; and
- Filing conflict of interest statements for county officials.

In addition to these duties, county clerks act as the ex-officio clerk of the board of supervisors, unless the board appoints a separate clerk. In the role of clerk of the board, county clerks operate as the chief administrator of legislation for the county,

fulfilling a variety of responsibilities that ensure that local ordinances and other actions by the county comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws. These laws include the Ralph M. Brown Act, the Public Records Act, and other laws that mandate transparency and public access for county actions and disseminate information on those actions. In all, California law mandates more than 30 specific duties for the clerk of the board. County clerks also act ex-officio as the registrar of voters, unless a separate registrar is appointed by the board of supervisors, as many have done.

County boards of supervisors can adopt ordinances to consolidate certain other offices with the county clerk in various combinations, some of which are only available to medium and small counties. Fifty-three of the 58 counties consolidate the office of the county clerk with the office of the recorder into a clerk-recorder. County recorders are responsible for examining and recording all documents dealing with the ownership of land in counties. State law also allows the clerk to be combined with the auditor, the public administrator, or, in smaller counties, the tax collector, assessor, or treasurer.

*Digital signatures.* A county clerk must sign and affix a seal to documents when performing their official duties. State law allows a clerk of the board of supervisors to use digital signatures on record, books, minutes, and ordinances of the board of supervisors (SB 858 (Committee on Local Government, Chapter 242, Statutes of 2025)). County recorders may also use a printed, stamped, photographically reproduced facsimile, electronic, or otherwise digitally created signature in certifying to a record, as long as it has the recorders seal affixed to it (SB 882 (Committee on Governance and Finance, Chapter 187, Statutes of 2023)). However, state law doesn't explicitly authorize the use of digital signatures for county clerks. As a result, county clerks have been reluctant to adopt digital signatures in the course of their duties, even though the same official who holds a consolidated office (such as a clerk-recorder) may use them when carrying out other responsibilities. The California Association of Clerks and Election Officials wants the Legislature to allow county clerks to use digital signatures.

## **Comments**

*Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "Senate Bill 1080 will explicitly authorize county clerks to use electronic, digital, or facsimile signatures and seals when certifying records, similar to the authority already granted to county recorders. This proposal will provide statutory clarity and consistency across departments while enhancing public access to certified filed documents without compromising authenticity or legal validity. SB 1080 will also enable more

efficient, secure, and accessible delivery of County Clerk services throughout California, allowing many procedures and interactions between the public and counties to be conducted entirely online.”

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

SB 1439 (Committee on Local Government) contains various minor provisions affecting local agencies, including to make references to the county clerk gender-neutral. SB 1439 is currently pending referral in the Senate Rules Committee.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/19/26)

California Association of Clerks & Election Officials (source)

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/19/26)

None received

Prepared by: Anton Favorini-Csorba / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119  
3/19/26 16:14:50

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1143  
Author: Caballero (D), et al.  
Introduced: 2/18/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 3/24/26  
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

---

**SUBJECT:** Children’s advocacy centers: recordings

**SOURCE:** County Welfare Directors Association

---

**DIGEST:** This bill clarifies that children’s advocacy centers must release recordings of forensic interviews taken in the course of an investigation to child welfare agencies authorized to investigate child abuse and neglect.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Defines “child abuse or neglect” to include physical injury or death inflicted by other than accidental means upon a child by another person, sexual abuse, neglect, the willful harming or injuring of a child, or the endangering of the person or health of a child, and unlawful corporal punishment or injury against a child. (Penal (Pen.) Code, §11165.6.)
- 2) Allows that each county may use a children’s advocacy center to implement a coordinated multidisciplinary response to investigate reports involving child physical or sexual abuse, exploitation, or maltreatment and sets forth standards that a children’s advocacy center must meet. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4.)
- 3) Requires that the multidisciplinary team at a children’s advocacy center include one representative from each of the following disciplines: law enforcement, child protective services, district attorney’s offices, medical providers, mental

health providers, victim advocates, and in the case of an Indian child, a representative from the child's tribe. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(1).)

- 4) Provides that the files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in providing services through a children's advocacy center are confidential and not public records. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (d).)
- 5) Authorizes the members of a multidisciplinary team associated with a children's advocacy center, including agency representatives, child forensic interviewers, and other providers at the children's advocacy center, to share with other multidisciplinary team members any information or records concerning the child and family for the sole purpose of facilitating a forensic interview or case discussion or providing services to the child or family. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (e).)
- 6) Requires that the children's advocacy center verify that interviews conducted in the course of investigations are conducted in a forensically sound manner and occur in a child-focused setting designed to provide a safe, comfortable, and dedicated place for children and families. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(8).)
- 7) Requires that a children's advocacy center or other identified multidisciplinary team member custodian ensure that all recordings of child forensic interviews be released only in response to a court order with a protective order governing the use of the recording. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(9)(A)(i)-(vi).)
- 8) Provides that notwithstanding the above, the children's advocacy center or other identified multidisciplinary team member custodian shall release or consent to the release or use of any recording, upon request, to any of the following:
  - a) Law enforcement agencies authorized to investigate child abuse, or agencies authorized to prosecute juvenile or criminal conduct described in the forensic interview.
  - b) County counsel evaluating an allegation of child abuse. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(9)(B)(i)-(ii).)
- 9) Recognizes the inherent privacy interest that a child has with respect to the child's recorded voice and image when describing highly sensitive details of abuse or neglect and provides that all recordings of child forensic interviews are not subject to a Public Records Act Request and are exempt from any such request. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(9)(E)(i).)

- 10) Provides that the recording shall not become a public record in any legal proceeding. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(9)(E)(ii).)
- 11) Requires a court to order the recording be sealed and preserved at the conclusion of a criminal proceeding. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(9)(E)(iii).)
- 12) Provides that as used in this bill “recording” includes audio, video, digital, or any other manner in which the child’s voice or likeness is memorialized. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (g).)

This bill requires that a children’s advocacy center or other identified multidisciplinary team member custodian release or consent to the release or use of any recording of a forensic interview, upon request, to child welfare agencies authorized to investigate child abuse and neglect, in addition to the above agencies.

## **Background**

Existing law allows each county to use children’s advocacy centers to coordinate a multidisciplinary response to investigate reports involving child physical or sexual abuse, exploitation, or maltreatment. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4.) The multidisciplinary team at a children’s advocacy center must include one representative from each of the following disciplines: law enforcement, child protective services, district attorney’s offices, medical providers, mental health providers, victim advocates, and in the case of an Indian child, a representative from the child’s tribe. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(1).)

Children’s advocacy center teams may conduct forensic interviews in the course of their investigations. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4 (b)(8).) These interviews can be recorded for investigative purposes so they can be referenced later. Because interviews are recorded, the child victim generally only needs to be interviewed once about their abuse, which is intended to limit the risk of re-traumatization from repeated questioning.

Existing law provides that such recordings are generally confidential and may only be shared pursuant to a court order. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(9)(A).) However, existing law further states that the children’s advocacy center or its members may share any information or records concerning the child and family with members of the center’s multidisciplinary team, but only for the purposes of facilitating a forensic interview, case discussion, or providing services to the child or family. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (e).) Existing law also provides that

children’s advocacy centers or their team member custodian of the recording must release or consent to the release or use of any recording, upon request, to law enforcement agencies authorized to investigate child abuse, agencies authorized to prosecute juvenile or criminal conduct described in the forensic interview, or county counsel evaluating an allegation of child abuse. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(9)(B)(i)-(ii).)

Existing law is ambiguous as to whether recordings of forensic interviews may be shared with child welfare agencies, for two reasons. First, it is not clear whether “county counsel evaluating an allegation of child abuse” encompasses child welfare agencies. (Pen. Code, § 11166.4, subd. (b)(9)(B)(ii).) “County counsel” might include counsel employed at a child welfare agency. Second, it is not clear whether the recordings qualify as “information or records” as described in Penal Code section 11166.4, subdivision (e), which may be shared with all members of the multidisciplinary team.

Proponents of this bill assert that some counties interpret existing law to mean the recordings cannot be shared with anyone other than those specifically enumerated in Penal Code section 11166.4, subdivision (b)(9)(B), namely, law enforcement and county counsel. This interpretation precludes sharing the recordings with county welfare agency staff such as social workers, even though they are members of a center’s multidisciplinary team. As a result, social workers at child welfare agencies may sometimes be limited to relying on written notes and reports, rather than actual video, when investigating claims of abuse and neglect.

This bill attempts to remedy this ambiguity by clarifying that children’s advocacy centers must release such interview recordings to child welfare agencies authorized to investigate child abuse and neglect, upon request.

Notably, there is no specified limitation on the uses of these recordings for those agencies specifically enumerated in Penal Code section 11166.4, subdivision (b)(9)(B). By contrast, under the current scheme, children’s advocacy centers may share “any information or records” with any member of the multidisciplinary team, but only for the purpose of conducting a forensic interview, staff discussion, or providing services to the child and their family. This bill would allow child welfare agency staff, in addition to law enforcement and county counsel, to use the interview recordings for other purposes. Such purposes may include, for example, conducting dependency investigations and making recommendations regarding visitation.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

County Welfare Directors Association (source)

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

California District Attorneys Association

**ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT:** According to County Welfare Directors Association:

California established the framework for coordinated child abuse investigations through AB 2741 (2020), which authorized counties to utilize children’s advocacy centers (CACs) to coordinate multidisciplinary responses to cases involving child abuse, exploitation, or maltreatment. These centers bring together professionals from law enforcement, child protective services, prosecutors, medical providers, mental health professionals, and victim advocates to ensure investigations are conducted in a trauma-informed, child-focused environment. Subsequent legislation, SB 603 (2023), further strengthened the role of CACs and established detailed protocols governing the release and protection of forensic interview recordings.

Unfortunately, child welfare agencies were not explicitly listed among the entities authorized to receive recordings of child forensic interviews although the child welfare social worker is a member of the multi-disciplinary team. While social workers are typically at the forensic interview conducted by the CAC, there are times when they may need to be absent for emergency calls or court hearings. In practice, this means that county social workers responsible for investigating allegations of abuse or neglect may have access only to written summaries or notes rather than the recordings themselves. When reviewing only a transcript of the interview, the social worker may miss or misunderstand tone of voice or other non-verbal cues, leading to the need for a child to be reinterviewed by the social worker if they cannot view the video recording.

By clarifying that child welfare agencies can access these recordings, SB 1143 advances the collaborative, multidisciplinary approach California has built to respond to child abuse. This bill ensures that all appropriate investigative partners have the tools necessary to fully

evaluate allegations while maintaining strong privacy protections for child victims. This change will support more informed investigations, improve coordination among agencies, and reduce the likelihood that children must repeat traumatic experiences during the investigative process.

**ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION:** The California District Attorneys Association writes:

MDIC interviews are a critical part of investigating and prosecuting child abuse cases. Criminal investigation and prosecution of such serious crimes involving some of our most vulnerable victims often requires a significant amount of confidentiality, case building, and interagency cooperation. Often the suspects and defendants are the caregivers or guardians of the children, which can create tension between a welfare agency's goals of reunification and continuity of care and law enforcement's concern for the child's and public's safety.

An alternative approach would be to give the MDIC custodian the discretion to release MDIC recordings to child welfare agencies if it would not impact an ongoing criminal investigation or case or endanger the safety of the child. This would appropriately expand the scope of existing 11166.4, subdivision (e) which currently allows for discretionary disclosure only between MDIC team members.

Prepared by: Marshal Lawler / PUB. S. /  
3/25/26 16:17:23

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 84  
Author: Blakespear (D), et al.  
Amended: 3/12/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** California Rail Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes May 2026 as California Rail Month.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Since California became the 31st state in 1850, rail has been historically important in connecting communities to the rest of the nation and growing economic opportunity, making rail services a vital public infrastructure that is intrinsically linked to many of the state's most important goals and celebrated successes.
- 2) There are five local agencies responsible for operating regional rail services: the Southern California Regional Rail Authority operating Metrolink, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board operating Caltrain, the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission operating the Altamont Corridor Express, the North County Transit District operating COASTER, and the Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit District operating Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit.
- 3) The California State Rail Plan establishes a long-term vision for passenger and freight rail services across the state, recognizing the urgency of developing a rail network by 2050 that is zero emission, provides reliable and frequent service, and is interconnected as part of a multimodal transportation ecosystem.
- 4) The California State Rail Plan has set a goal of providing nearly 200 million daily passenger-miles on a statewide rail network by 2050.
- 5) The California State Rail Plan has identified \$65 billion in federal, state, local, and private investment to be completed in the state over the next 10 years, and

has a vision for a total investment of \$307 billion by 2050 which will create an economic return of over \$537 billion for the state; and be it further.

- 6) The state plans to have approximately 1,500 miles of rail electrified by 2050 and 440 miles of rail constructed over the next 10 years.

This resolution recognizes May 2026 as California Rail Month in recognition of the invaluable contributions that rail has made to the state.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/13/26)

None received

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520  
3/13/26 9:48:28

\*\*\*\* **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 116  
Author: Alvarado-Gil (R), et al.  
Introduced: 2/2/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** National School Choice Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution designates the week of January 25, 2026, to January 31, 2026, inclusive, as National School Choice Week.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Excellence in education is a primary goal of the state and is essential to preparing pupils for civic participation, workforce readiness, and lifelong learning.
- 2) School choice programs provide pupils and parents with access to high-quality schools and instructional models.
- 3) The state's pupil body is one of the most diverse in the world, encompassing urban, suburban, rural, and agricultural communities, and, therefore, requires a diverse educational system. A pupil's residence or geographic location should not determine the quality of that pupil's education.
- 4) School choice is particularly important for low-income families and families in rural or geographically isolated areas who may have limited educational options. Parents, pupils, and educators throughout the nation annually recognize the importance of educational opportunity and effective school options for all children.

This resolution designates the week of January 25, 2026, to January 31, 2026, inclusive, as National School Choice Week.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

HR 82 (Kiley, 2022) – Adopted in Assembly.

HR 9 (Kiley, 2021) – Adopted in Assembly.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/13/26)

CFT — A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO

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

3/13/26 9:36:15

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 118  
Author: Gonzalez (D), et al.  
Introduced: 2/10/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-0, 3/17/26  
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Pérez, Reyes, Wiener  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** Jeffrey Epstein files

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution formally condemns sex trafficking and denounces Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell, denounces the Trump Administration's attempts to prevent the release of the Epstein files, and urges Congress to continue to exercise its oversight authority to ensure compliance with United States House Resolution 4405.

**ANALYSIS:**

Exiting federal law:

- 1) The Epstein Files Transparency Act (hereinafter, "the Act"), requires the Department of Justice (DOJ) to publish (in a searchable and downloadable format), within 30- days of the enactment of the Act, all unclassified records, documents, communications, and investigative materials in DOJ's possession that relate to the following:
  - a) The investigation and prosecution of Jeffrey Epstein.
  - b) Ghislaine Maxwell.
  - c) Flight logs or travel records, as specified.

- d) Individuals, including government officials, named or referenced in connection with Epstein's criminal activities, civil settlements, immunity or plea agreements, or investigatory proceedings.
  - e) Entities (corporate, nonprofit, academic, or governmental) with known or alleged ties to Epstein's trafficking or financial networks.
  - f) Any immunity deals, non-prosecution agreements, plea bargains, or sealed settlements involving Epstein or his associates.
  - g) Internal DOJ communications, as specified.
  - h) All communications, memoranda, directives, logs, or metadata concerning the destruction, deletion, alteration, misplacement, or concealment of documents, recordings, or electronic data related to Epstein, his associates, his detention and death, or any investigative files.
  - i) Documentation of Epstein's death, as specified. (Pub. L. 119-38)
- 2) Existing federal law provides that no record within the Epstein files specified above may be withheld, delayed, or redacted on the basis of embarrassment, reputational harm, or political sensitivity, including to any government official, public figure, or foreign dignitary. (Ibid.)
  - 3) Existing federal law authorizes the Attorney General of the United States to withhold or redact the segregable portions of records that fall into specific sensitive categories, such as personally identifiable information, child sexual abuse materials, depictions of death, and materials that would jeopardize an active federal investigation or ongoing prosecution. (Ibid.)
  - 4) Existing federal law requires the Attorney General, within 15 days of completion of the release required under the Act, to submit to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary a report listing all categories of documents released and withheld, a summary of redactions made, and a list of all government officials and politically exposed persons named or referenced in the released materials. (Ibid.)

This resolution:

- 1) Finds that in 2019, Jeffrey Epstein was charged in federal court with sex trafficking of minors and conspiracy to commit sex trafficking of minors. In 2007, Epstein received a plea deal negotiated by former United States

Secretary of Labor, Alexander Acosta, getting 18 months of work release for child sex crimes that would normally result in decades in federal prison.

- 2) Finds that Epstein and his associates abused over 1,000 young women and children, including Californians, dating back to the early 1990s, in a systemic failure of our justice system and elected government who have a duty and responsibility to protect children from dangerous predators and provide justice for survivors.
- 3) Finds that H.R. 4405, 119th Congress (2025), known as the Epstein Files Transparency Act and authored by Representative Ro Khanna, passed with strong bipartisan support and became law on November 19, 2025, and required the United States Department of Justice to publish all unclassified records, documents, communications, and investigative materials in their possession that relate to the investigation and prosecution of Jeffrey Epstein, while allowing for narrowly tailored redactions to protect the identities of survivors.
- 4) Finds that President Donald J. Trump and his appointees, United States Attorney General Pam Bondi and Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Kash Patel, engaged in an active and overt campaign to prevent the release of these files, including direct attempts by the president to dissuade and pressure members of Congress from supporting H.R. 4405 and therefore deny survivors the transparency they deserve.
- 5) Finds that the United States Department of Justice failed to meet the deadline required under H.R. 4405, and failed to redact and protect the identifiable information of over 100 survivors, putting their lives in danger and retraumatizing them.
- 6) Finds that Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche confirmed that while there are 6,000,000 relevant documents in the Epstein case files, only 3,500,000 have been cleared for public access.
- 7) Finds that of those partially released files, many are heavily redacted with censoring that does not comply with the requirements of H.R. 4405, which prohibits any redactions on the basis of embarrassment, reputational harm, or political sensitivity, including to any government officials, public figures, or foreign dignitaries.
- 8) Finds that the United States Department of Justice has chosen to not comply with a United States House of Representatives' Oversight Committee subpoena

for all files related to the Jeffrey Epstein investigation issued on August 5, 2025.

- 9) Finds that Ghislaine Maxwell, who was convicted of sex trafficking of a minor and other crimes in conspiracy with Jeffrey Epstein, was moved to a minimum-security facility with dormitory-style housing seven days after being interviewed by Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche.
- 10) Finds that many powerful individuals from all political affiliations were mentioned in the files, but no criminal charges have been brought against any individual listed in the files, and Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche has stated that new charges based on the evidence in the files was unlikely.
- 11) Finds that survivors deserve justice, transparency, and expedient accountability against any official or individual that participated in the heinous and predatory actions of Jeffrey Epstein and his associates, and those who allowed this abuse to continue without repercussions.
- 12) Resolves that the Legislature formally condemns sex trafficking and denounces Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell, and any individual involved with or aware of their criminal enterprise and abuse.
- 13) Resolves that the Legislature denounces President Donald J. Trump's attempts to prevent the release of the Epstein files, and his administration's attempts to deny justice for survivors through continued self-serving efforts to withhold and redact information with no transparency.
- 14) Resolves that the Legislature urges the Congress of the United States to continue to exercise its oversight authority and hold President Trump and Attorney General Bondi accountable for not complying with its subpoena or H.R. 4405, which requires the release of all the remaining Epstein files, including all records, documents, communications, and investigative materials that relate to the investigation and prosecution of Jeffrey Epstein.
- 15) Resolves that the Legislature urges federal and local law enforcement to take immediate action to hold accountable all those who harmed survivors or who were complicit in Epstein's crimes, regardless of their elected title, royal title, party affiliation, or economic status, in order to provide justice and closure for survivors.

**Comments**

According to the Author, “from the early 1990s to 2019, Jeffrey Epstein ran a sex trafficking ring that abused over 1,000 women and children across the United States. During this time, the systems and people in power looked the other way and shielded the powerful from accountability. In 2025, in response to growing demands from the public, Congress passed HR 4405, The Epstein Files Transparency Act. This law required the release of all files related to the Epstein investigation. Instead, President Trump, Attorney General Bondi, and FBI Director Patel have redacted, stonewalled, delayed, and continue to defy a congressional subpoena. In doing so, they have failed over a hundred survivors whose identifying information was carelessly exposed, retraumatizing the very people this law was designed to protect. Through this resolution, we are demanding the release of all relevant information and that law enforcement pursue accountability for individuals complicit in Epstein's crimes regardless of their title or wealth and sending an unambiguous message to survivors: we see you, we believe you, and we will keep fighting for you. The survivors of Jeffrey Epstein’s criminal enterprise have waited long enough. Justice delayed is justice denied — and this Legislature refuses to let their voices be buried under millions of redacted pages.”

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/18/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/18/26)

None received

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /  
3/18/26 15:55:24

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 123  
Author: Umberg (D)  
Introduced: 2/12/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** California Peace Officers' Memorial Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims Monday, May 4, 2026, as California Peace Officers' Memorial Day.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Monday, May 4, 2026, is California Peace Officers' Memorial Day, a day Californians observe in commemoration of those noble officers who have tragically sacrificed their lives in the line of duty.
- 2) Peace officers have a job second in importance to none, and it is a job that is as difficult and dangerous as it is important. By the enforcement of our laws, these same peace officers have safeguarded the lives and property of the citizens of California and have given their full measure to ensure these citizens the right to be free from crime and violence.
- 3) Special ceremonies and observations on behalf of California peace officers provide all Californians with the opportunity to appreciate the heroic individuals who have dedicated their lives to preserving public safety.

This resolution designates Monday, May 4, 2026, as California Peace Officers' Memorial Day and urges all Californians to remember those individuals who have given their lives for our safety and express appreciation to those who continue to dedicate themselves to making California a safer place to live and raise our families

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 23 (Umberg, Resolution Chapter 76, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 110 (Umberg, Resolution Chapter 114, Statutes of 2024)

SCR 20 (Umberg, Resolution Chapter 80, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 2/23/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 2/23/26)

None received

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

2/25/26 16:26:27

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SCR 124  
Author: Wiener (D)  
Amended: 3/2/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 3/24/26

AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Reyes, Stern,  
Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby

---

**SUBJECT:** Transportation access: persons with epilepsy

**SOURCE:** California Neurology Society

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution is supportive of those with epilepsy and finding solutions to issues faced by those with epilepsy.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) may refuse to issue to, or renew a driver's license of, any person who has a disorder characterized by lapses of consciousness or who has experienced, within the last three years, either a lapse of consciousness or an episode of marked confusion caused by any condition which may bring about recurrent lapses, or who has any physical or mental disability, disease, or disorder which could affect the safe operation of a motor vehicle unless the DMV has medical information which indicates the person may safely operate a motor vehicle. In making its determination, the DMV may rely on any relevant information available to the DMV. (Vehicle (Veh.) Code § 12806 (c).)
- 2) Requires physicians and surgeons to immediately report to the local health officer in writing the name, date of birth, and address of every patient at least 14 years of age or older whom the physician and surgeon has diagnosed as having

a case of a disorder characterized by lapses of consciousness. (Health & Safety (Saf.) Code § 103900 (a).)

- 3) Specifies that if a physician or surgeon reasonably and in good faith believes that the reporting of a patient will serve the public interest, they may report a patient's condition even if it may not be required under the definition of disorders characterized by lapses of consciousness, as specified. (Health & Saf. Code § 103900 (a).)
- 4) Requires the local health officer to report in writing to the DMV the name, age, and address of every person reported to it as a case of a disorder characterized by lapses of consciousness. (Health & Saf. Code § 103900 (b).)
- 5) Provides that these reports shall be for the information of the DMV in enforcing the Vehicle Code, and shall be kept confidential and used solely for the purpose of determining the eligibility of any person to operate a motor vehicle on the highways of this state. (Health & Saf. Code § 103900 (c).)

This resolution:

- 1) Makes various statements regarding epilepsy and the impact of having epilepsy in California, including impacts on a person's ability to drive, their employment, financial stability, and contributions to the economy.
- 2) Asserts that Ireland has successfully implemented policies to improve transportation access for individuals living with epilepsy, demonstrating a feasible model for ensuring mobility and workforce participation.
- 3) Asserts that the establishment of the Congressional Epilepsy Caucus in Washington, D.C. provides an opportunity to elevate this issue to a national level, ensuring broader recognition and support for transportation accessibility for adults with epilepsy.
- 4) Resolves that the Legislature of the State of California:
  - a) recognizes transportation access as a critical determinant of employment, independence, and economic participation for adults living with epilepsy, particularly those subject to medically necessary driving restrictions, and urges future legislative action to address persistent transportation barriers that disproportionately affect working age adults with epilepsy, especially in suburban and rural regions;

- b) encourages relevant stakeholders to evaluate existing transportation programs, develop policy options, and consider pilot initiatives that improve reliable, affordable, and accessible transportation for individuals with epilepsy, with the goals of reducing unemployment, strengthening workforce participation, and promoting economic self-sufficiency; and
- c) encourages coordination with federal partners, including the United States Congress and the Congressional Epilepsy Caucus, and welcomes the participation of advocacy organizations in informing and advancing complementary state-federal strategies, while affirming that the responsibility for policy leadership and action rests with elected legislative bodies.

## Comments

According to the author:

SCR 124 addresses the transportation barriers faced by individuals with epilepsy in California. The resolution highlights the need for equitable mobility options, recognizing that seizure disorders can limit personal driving privileges and restrict access to employment, healthcare, and essential daily activities.

SCR 124 encourages collaboration between public health experts, transportation authorities, and advocacy groups to ensure policy decisions reflect current medical understanding and inclusive practices. The resolution supports improvements in public transportation accessibility, as well as awareness initiatives that reduce stigma related to epilepsy. Ultimately, this resolution reaffirms that mobility is a key component of social inclusion and economic participation. Addressing the needs of people with epilepsy strengthens California's overall commitment to fairness, accessibility, and community wellbeing.

This resolution makes various statements regarding epilepsy and the impact of having epilepsy in California. It recognizes transportation access as a critical determinant of employment, independence, and economic participation for adults living with epilepsy, particularly those subject to medically necessary driving restrictions, and urges future legislative action to address persistent transportation barriers that disproportionately affect working age adults with epilepsy, especially in suburban and rural regions.

As explained in the Senate Floor analysis for SCR 11 (Cervantes, Resolution Chapter 179, Statutes of 2025), epilepsy “is a condition of the brain causing seizures. A seizure is a disruption of the electrical communication between neurons. A person is said to have epilepsy if they experience two or more unprovoked seizures separated by at least 24 hours or if the person experiences one seizure and is at a high risk of having more.” Moreover, “3.4 million people in the United States have epilepsy.”

Physicians are required to report lapses of consciousness, including those caused by epilepsy, to the DMV. This can result in a license suspension or revocation of the license of the person who had the lapse of consciousness. Losing the ability to drive impairs the person’s ability to efficiently get to their target destinations, including their job.

SCR 124 encourages relevant stakeholders to evaluate existing transportation programs, develop policy options, and consider pilot initiatives that improve reliable, affordable, and accessible transportation for individuals with epilepsy, with the goals of reducing unemployment, strengthening workforce participation, and promoting economic self-sufficiency. The measure also encourages coordination with federal partners, including the United States Congress and the Congressional Epilepsy Caucus, and welcomes the participation of advocacy organizations in informing and advancing complementary state-federal strategies, while affirming that the responsibility for policy leadership and action rests with elected legislative bodies.

The Epilepsy Foundation Los Angeles writes the following in support of the resolution:

Epilepsy is one of the most common chronic brain disorders in the world, affecting people of all ages, races, and backgrounds. The condition is defined by a tendency to experience seizures - sudden, abnormal bursts of electrical activity in the brain that can disrupt behavior, awareness, and bodily control. There are multiple types of seizures, and they can look different in different people. It is a spectrum disease comprised of many diagnoses, including a growing number of rare epilepsies that are increasingly being identified through their genetic links. With the growing research and ever evolving introduction of new therapies to treat seizures, 70% of people with epilepsy have control of their seizures through medication while 30% remain with uncontrolled seizures. Whether or not seizures are controlled, 100% of people living with epilepsy matter, and

reliable public transportation is essential for their ability to live and thrive – to travel to medical appointments, get to work, and visit loved ones.

According to the California Neurology Society, sponsors of the resolution:

Epilepsy affects approximately 450,000 Californians, more than any other state, and imposes significant economic, social, and medical burdens on affected individuals and their families. The majority of adults with epilepsy are employable and seeking financial independence.

[ . . . ] The recently introduced National Plan for Epilepsy Act (S. 494) would require the Department of Health and Human Services to establish a national plan coordinating research and services across all federal agencies, further signaling federal commitment to addressing epilepsy comprehensively. By encouraging stakeholders to evaluate existing programs and develop pilot initiatives, SCR 124 ensures California complements and advances the goals of the Congressional Epilepsy Caucus and the National Plan for Epilepsy Act. Together, these coordinated state and federal efforts can meaningfully reduce unemployment, strengthen workforce participation, and promote economic self-sufficiency for Californians with epilepsy.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/25/26)

California Neurology Society (sponsor)  
Epilepsy Foundation Los Angeles

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/25/26)

None received

Prepared by: Margie Estrada / JUD. / (916) 651-4113  
3/25/26 16:17:23

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 128  
Author: Pérez (D)  
Introduced: 2/18/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** High School Voter Education Weeks

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution declares Monday, April 13, 2026, to Friday, April 24, 2026, inclusive, as High School Voter Education Weeks and strongly encourages local educational agencies to dedicate at least one of those two weeks to educating pupils in grades 9 to 12, inclusive, on the electoral process, as provided. The resolution encourages local educational agencies to provide digital and physical resources necessary to provide this instruction and encourages the governing boards or bodies of local educational agencies to contract with third-party nonprofit organizations, as provided, to accomplish this instruction.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Pursuant to Section 49040 of the Education Code, the last two full weeks in April are known as “high school voter education weeks,” during which time persons authorized by the county elections official are allowed to register pupils and school personnel on any high school campus.
- 2) Young people, who represent the next generation of voters and leaders, remain a largely underrepresented group by exhibiting the lowest rates of voter turnout among age groups, and, more broadly, low levels of general civic engagement. California is committed to fostering civic engagement and increasing voter participation among youth.
- 3) Young people should be met in their educational environments, and be provided, with the history, knowledge, and resources to engage in the democratic process, for the purposes of revitalizing community ethos and promoting the importance of civic engagement.

This resolution encourages the governing boards or bodies of local educational agencies to contract on a volunteer basis with third-party nonprofit organizations that have demonstrated experience in nonpartisan youth civic engagement to accomplish this instruction.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 48 (Cervantes, Resolution Chapter 162, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 53 (Pérez, 2025) – Ordered to inactive file.

HR 89 (Pellerin, 2024) – Adopted in Assembly.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 2/23/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 2/23/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
2/25/26 16:26:30

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 130  
Author: Grove (R), et al.  
Introduced: 2/19/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Child Abuse Prevention Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution acknowledges April 2026 as Child Abuse Prevention Month.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) In 2024, according to the United States Department of Health and Human Services, 44,943 children in California were found to be victims of child abuse or neglect.
- 2) Children who have been abused or neglected have a higher risk of developing various health problems as adults, including alcoholism, depression, drug abuse, eating disorders, obesity, suicide, and certain chronic diseases.
- 3) Victims of child abuse, whether the abuse is physical, sexual, or emotional, or a combination of these, should have access to a safe place to live, appropriate medical care, and counseling or mental health services.
- 4) Providing community-based prevention services to those families can help avoid the costs of protective services, law enforcement, the judicial system, foster care, and the treatment of adults recovering from abuse as children.

This resolution acknowledges April 2026 as Child Abuse Prevention Month.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 34 (Grove, Resolution Chapter 71, Statutes of 2025)  
SCR 134 (Grove, Resolution Chapter 84, Statutes of 2024)  
ACR 178 (Jackson, Resolution Chapter 73, Statutes of 2024)

SCR 34 (Ashby, Resolution Chapter 53, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/3/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/3/26)

None received

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

3/4/26 15:53:04

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 136  
Author: Laird (D), et al.  
Introduced: 2/25/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** The California Coastal Act of 1976

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution acknowledges and celebrates 50 years of coastal protection and affirms the state's longstanding commitment to protecting its coastal waters, as specified.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) In 1972, the people of California passed Proposition 20, the California Coastal Zone Conservation Act, establishing that protection of the California coast and ocean is a paramount concern to present and future residents of the state and nation.
- 2) In 1976, the Legislature passed the California Coastal Act and the State Coastal Conservancy Act, based on findings that the California coastal zone is a distinct and valuable natural resource of vital and enduring interest to all the people.
- 3) The California Coastal Commission and the State Coastal Conservancy were created to implement these respective statutes, including the shared mandate to maximize public access to and along the coast.
- 4) The California Coastal Act creates a unique partnership between coastal local governments and the state through a land use planning framework that respects local control while ensuring statewide coastal protection policies are effectively carried out.
- 5) The partnership between the California Coastal Commission and the State Coastal Conservancy through their complementary authority has been responsible for the conservation of over 500,000 acres of natural lands as open space, the creation of more than 2,500 public accessways and easements to and

along the coast, the restoration of more than 50,000 acres of coastal habitats, the designation and opening of 875 miles of the California Coastal Trail, and the investment of over \$2 billion in coastal conservation, restoration, public access, and climate resilience all while supporting a thriving \$51 billion coast and ocean economy.

- 6) The State Coastal Conservancy Act ensures that all Californians are able to enjoy our iconic coastline and benefit from public investment in the permanent protection, restoration, and climate resilience of the coast.

This resolution acknowledges the value of ecologically sound coastal protection combined with carefully planned development as essential to the economic and social well-being of the state for the next 50 years and beyond, and reaffirms the findings of our predecessors from 1976 that the permanent protection of the state's natural and scenic coastal resources is a paramount concern to present and future residents of the state and nation.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/3/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/3/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/4/26 15:53:08

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 138  
Author: Ashby (D)  
Introduced: 3/3/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Architecture Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes the week of April 12, 2026, to April 18, 2026, inclusive, as Architecture Week in California and commends the architectural professionals whose work shapes the spaces that define our daily lives.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Architecture profoundly influences quality of life, shaping the communities where Californians live, work, and gather.
- 2) Architects play a vital role in advancing public health, safety, and welfare through thoughtful planning, sustainable design, and innovation.
- 3) Architecture Week provides an opportunity to celebrate the profession's contributions to California's diverse communities, inspiring civic pride and a shared vision for a resilient, inclusive, and beautiful future.

This resolution recognizes the week of April 12, 2026, to April 18, 2026, inclusive, as Architecture Week in California and commends the architectural professionals whose work shapes the spaces that define our daily lives.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/9/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/9/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/11/26 15:45:13

**\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\***

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 140  
Author: Wiener (D)  
Introduced: 3/5/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Parkinson's Disease Awareness Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims the month of April 2026 as Parkinson's Disease Awareness Month in California.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Parkinson's disease is a chronic, progressive neurological disease and is the second most common neurodegenerative disease in the United States. There is no known cure or drug to slow or halt the progression of the disease, and available treatments are limited in their ability to address patients' medical needs and remain effective over time.
- 2) According to the State Department of Public Health's California Parkinson's Disease Registry, over 130,000 people in California have Parkinson's disease. Estimates indicate Parkinson's disease costs the state \$5.8 billion annually for direct and indirect health care costs.
- 3) Strengthening statewide capacity for research and innovation will help ensure that California remains at the forefront of efforts to better understand, prevent, and treat Parkinson's disease and related disorders.

This resolution proclaims the month of April 2026 as Parkinson's Disease Awareness Month in California.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 43 (Archuleta, Resolution Chapter 79, Statutes of 2025)  
ACR 56 (Michelle Rodriguez, Resolution Chapter 67, Statutes of 2025)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/17/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/17/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/18/26 13:52:50

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 141  
Author: Wahab (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/9/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Women's Equal Pay Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes March 26, 2026, as Women's Equal Pay Day in California, in recognition of the need to eliminate the gender gap in earnings by women and to promote policies to ensure equal pay for all.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) More than 60 years after the passage of the federal Equal Pay Act of 1963, women, especially women of color, continue to suffer the consequences of unequal pay. March 26 symbolizes the day in 2026 when the wages paid to women catch up to the wages paid to males from the previous year nationwide.
- 2) According to the United States Census Bureau, women who work full time year round make less than \$0.81 for every dollar a man is paid. The wage gap for Black, Latina, and Native American women is under \$0.66 for every dollar White, non-Hispanic men make.
- 3) According to the United States Department of Labor, the median salary for women in 2024 was \$57,520, while men earned a median of salary of \$71,090. Black and Hispanic women have the lowest median salary earnings, with Hispanic women earning an average of \$46,380 and Black women earning an average of \$51,660.
- 4) Four out of 10 women experience gender discrimination and are much more likely to work a part-time job compared to men. Nearly 4 in 10 mothers are the primary breadwinners in their households, and nearly two-thirds of mothers are the primary or significant earners, making pay equity critical to the financial security of their families.

- 5) Fair pay in California would strengthen the security of individuals and families today, regardless of education or socioeconomic status, while enhancing our statewide economy.

This resolution proclaims March 26, 2026, as Women's Equal Pay Day in California, in recognition of the need to eliminate the gender gap in earnings by women and to promote policies to ensure equal pay for all.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

ACR 53 (Bonta, Resolution Chapter 58, Statutes of 2025)

SR 31 (Wahab, 2025) – Adopted in Senate.

SCR 127 (Wahab, Resolution Chapter 79, Statutes of 2024)

SR 80 (Min, 2024) – Adopted in Senate.

HR 99 (Bains, 2024) – Adopted in Assembly.

ACR 42 (Addis, Resolution Chapter 44, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/18/26 13:52:51

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 142  
Author: Becker (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/10/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** March4Water Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution declares the month of March 2026 to be March4Water Month in California.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Communities across America face the dual challenge of aging water infrastructure and growing demand, requiring innovative solutions that balance affordability, public health protection, and economic development.
- 2) Water reuse systems, including graywater, blackwater, and rainwater catchment, can expand community water supply, protect drinking water sources, and reduce strain on wastewater treatment infrastructure.
- 3) California employs approximately 42,000 plumbers, pipefitters, and steamfitters, representing a vital segment of the state's skilled workforce essential for implementing water solutions that build community resilience.
- 4) March4Water Month serves as a platform for communities to raise awareness about water efficiency solutions, workforce development, and investments in infrastructure that support economic growth and community resilience.

This resolution declares the month of March 2026 to be March4Water Month in California.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/13/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/18/26 13:52:52

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 143  
Author: Umberg (D)  
Introduced: 3/10/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Hmong Laotian Special Guerilla Unit veterans

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution honors and celebrates Hmong Laotian Special Guerilla Unit veterans and their families and recognizes their sacrifice.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) From 1961 to 1975, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) recruited and trained Hmong and other Laotian soldiers to form a Special Guerilla Unit (SGU) to fight the Secret War during the Vietnam War. This SGU performed covert missions ordered and planned by the United States military and CIA to deter the movement of troops, supplies, and weapons on the Ho Chi Minh Trail and other areas in and around Laos.
- 2) At least 35,000 SGU soldiers were killed during this time, roughly 12% of the Hmong population in Laos at the time.
- 3) SGU soldiers have been honored with the construction and maintenance of a monument in the City and County of Fresno and the Cities of Stockton and Chico, and legislative recognition in the States of Connecticut, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.
- 4) Congress never granted these soldiers full veteran status, and they do not have military identification card or license plate eligibility.

This resolution honors and celebrates Hmong Laotian SGU veterans and their families and recognizes their sacrifice.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/18/26 13:52:52

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 144  
Author: Seyarto (R), et al.  
Introduced: 3/10/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Crime Victims' Rights Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes April 19, 2026, to April 25, 2026, inclusive, as Crime Victims' Rights Week.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Since 1981, National Crime Victims' Rights Week has raised awareness of the special needs of crime victims. This year, the theme for this week is "Listen. Act. Advocate. Protect Victims, Serve Communities." which asks friends, family members, neighbors, colleagues, community leaders, victim service providers, criminal justice practitioners, and health professionals how we can help crime victims.
- 2) This year's theme of "Listen. Act. Advocate. Protect Victims, Serve Communities." is a call-to-action to recognize that shared humanity should be at the center of supporting all survivors and victims of crime. The respect for, and protection of, victims' rights within the legal process is one of the most critical components of an effective criminal justice system.
- 3) The remembrances observed during National Crime Victims' Rights Week promote awareness of victims' issues and acknowledge the combined efforts of citizens, the government, and the criminal justice system to improve victims' services in California.

This resolution recognizes April 19, 2026, to April 25, 2026, inclusive, as Crime Victims' Rights Week.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 36 (Seyarto, Resolution Chapter 45, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 128 (Seyarto, Resolution Chapter 80, Statutes of 2024)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/13/26)

None received

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

3/18/26 13:52:53

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 145  
Author: Weber Pierson (D)  
Introduced: 3/11/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Mental Health Peer Appreciation Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes the 3rd week of May 2026 as Mental Health Peer Appreciation Week in California.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Peers, who are individuals with lived experiences of mental health or substance uses challenges, have unique perspectives on navigating the public behavioral health care system and can encourage, engage, and support other peers on their journey to recovery, health, and wellness.
- 2) Peers can provide voluntary support services that are cost-effective and Medi-Cal billable in a variety of settings that can help reduce and prevent incarceration, hospitalization, and institutionalization while uplifting people's health care autonomy.
- 3) Peer support is an evidence-based practice that is integrated into the delivery of mental health services provided by counties, including Assertive Community Treatment, Forensic Assertive Community Treatment, Coordinated Specialty Care for First Episode Psychosis, and Individual Placement and Support Supported Employment.
- 4) Peer services help reduce health disparities in underserved communities by empowering peers to work in the behavioral health industry, creating a workforce that is reflective of a community's diversity and health needs.

This resolution recognizes the third week of May 2026, during National Mental Health Awareness Month, as Mental Health Peer Appreciation Week in California.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

ACR 23 (Quirk-Silva, Resolution Chapter 87, Statutes of 2025)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/18/26 13:52:54

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 146  
Author: Laird (D)  
Introduced: 3/16/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month in California.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Cystic fibrosis impacts individuals of every race and ethnicity, but due to health disparities and newborn screening panels that fail to capture rare cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator mutations, many individuals with cystic fibrosis are misdiagnosed or diagnosed late.
- 2) The federal National Institutes of Health estimates that more than 10 million Americans are unknowing, symptomless carriers of the cystic fibrosis gene and have high odds of passing the gene to their children.
- 3) Support for those impacted by cystic fibrosis, a rare disease, begins with the raising of public awareness, and CFRI works within the diverse cystic fibrosis community on both the state and national level to advocate for continued research, access to quality care, and the development of new therapies to extend and enhance lives.

This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month in California.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 51 (Laird, Resolution Chapter 114, Statutes of 2025)  
SCR 124 (Laird, Resolution Chapter 116, Statutes of 2024)  
SCR 49 (Laird, Resolution Chapter 82, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/25/26 16:15:07

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 147  
Author: Allen (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/18/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Arts Education Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims March 2026 as Arts Education Month and urges all residents to become interested in and give full support to quality arts education programs for children and youth.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The arts are a necessary and required component of every California pupil's education to develop well-rounded, lifelong learners who contribute to the prosperity and quality of life for local and global communities.
- 2) Many national and state professional arts education associations hold celebrations in March, giving California schools a unique opportunity to focus on the value of the arts for all pupils, foster cross-cultural understanding, provide recognition to the state's outstanding young artists, and enhance public support for this essential part of the curriculum.
- 3) Research demonstrates that arts learning in early childhood and elementary grades supports brain development, language acquisition, motor skills, and social-emotional growth, laying a critical foundation for academic success across all disciplines.
- 4) Arts education strengthens California's creative economy by cultivating future artists, designers, media professionals, educators, and innovators while supporting local cultural institutions, small businesses, and community vitality.

This resolution proclaims the month of March 2026 as Arts Education Month and urges all residents to become interested in and give full support to quality arts education programs for children and youth.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 32 (Allen, Resolution Chapter 43, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 123 (Allen, Resolution Chapter 50, Statutes of 2024)

SCR 36 (Portantino, Resolution Chapter 54, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/23/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/23/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/25/26 16:15:08

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SJR 11  
Author: Cervantes (D)  
Introduced: 1/13/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 3/18/26  
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** The City of Eastvale: ZIP Code

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This joint resolution urges Congress and the President to authorize the granting of a new and independent ZIP Code to the City of Eastvale in Riverside County.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing federal law, under the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 (Pub. L. 91-375, 84 Stat. 719), establishes the United States Postal Service (USPS) as an independent entity within the executive branch of the federal government to provide for the administration of postal programs and operations.

This joint resolution:

- 1) Urges the President of the United States to sign, and the United States Congress to approve, legislation that would authorize the City of Eastvale to be assigned an independent ZIP Code.
- 2) Makes several findings and declarations supporting its purposes.
- 3) Directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of the resolution, for appropriate distribution, to:
  - a) The President and the Vice President of the United States;

- b) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives;
- c) The Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the United States Senate;
- d) Each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States; and
- e) The author of SJR 11.

## **Background**

*Postal ZIP codes.* The U.S. Postal Service (USPS) began dividing large cities into delivery zones in 1943. 20 years later, in response to increased mail volume, USPS introduced nationwide five-digit Zone Improvement Plan (ZIP) codes to improve the efficiency of mail sorting and delivery. These codes corresponded to the post offices where final sorting of mail was done and from which letter carriers were dispatched to make deliveries. Mass mailings were first required to use ZIP codes in 1967 and today their use is ubiquitous. There are currently 41,552 ZIP codes in the U.S. This number fluctuates.

The ZIP code provides the basis for the automated sorting of nearly all mail. The first number of a ZIP code represents a broad geographic area, moving from “0” for places in the East to “9” for locations in the West. The next two numbers represent regional areas, while the fourth and fifth digits route the mail to specific post offices. The USPS added the four final ZIP code numbers (ZIP+4) in 1983 to allow mail to be further sorted by block, street, or building.

ZIP codes are easily accessible public information and, as such, various entities use them for purposes unrelated to mail delivery. For instance, researchers turn to ZIP codes to collect demographic data and auto insurance companies determine premiums based, in part, on traffic statistics within a customer’s ZIP code.

*Postal vs. municipal boundaries.* A 2006 Congressional Research Service (CRS) Report, “Changing Postal ZIP Code Boundaries,” states that, because ZIP codes are based on mail routes and delivery points, they often do not correspond to political or municipal jurisdiction boundaries. This means millions of households, particularly those in rapidly growing suburban areas, receive their mail from a post office in an adjacent town or neighborhood and their mailing address reflects the name and ZIP code of that post office rather than the jurisdiction where they actually live. The CRS states that problems can arise when mailing addresses do not align with the actual towns or cities of residence, including higher automobile insurance rates for drivers who live in suburban areas but are charged city rates based on their ZIP codes; confusion about where residents should vote in

municipal elections because they do not distinguish between voting and mailing addresses; misdirecting of sales tax revenue collected by businesses with ZIP codes in overlapping jurisdictions; the mailing of jury duty notices to persons who are ultimately not eligible to serve based on their actual residence; potential delays in emergency service response times because of confusion over what city a call comes from if it has shared ZIP codes; and a lack of community identity associated with the required use of mailing addresses in neighboring jurisdictions.

*USPS boundary review process.* USPS's policies to consider and, if possible, accommodate requests to modify ZIP code boundaries or change the last lines of an address, such as the city or town name, are outlined in its "Management Instruction: ZIP Code Boundary Review Process" document that it published in 2016. Any municipality or community group seeking a ZIP code change must submit the request in writing to the USPS district manager who is responsible for the area, along with any rationale and justification. According to USPS, the requested boundary should be consistent with the actual municipal boundary and identity of the affected area. The documented endorsement of the request by local government officials is strongly recommended to help ensure that the interests of the affected communities are represented fairly and are reflective of long-term municipal planning.

USPS generally limits its consideration of these requests to factors that involve mail delivery, but will reasonably consider factors related to community identity, particularly if the request is from an undeveloped or newly developed area. However, USPS policy states that it will not review boundary review requests more frequently than once every ten years.

When a request is received, the district manager must identify its feasibility based on internal and external factors, including:

- Whether the requested boundary is cohesive and manageable for mail delivery;
- If the revised or new boundary would create duplicate street addresses within a single ZIP code;
- If existing facilities can accommodate the change; and
- How the change might impact timeliness of mail delivery and customer satisfaction.

If the request is deemed to be feasible, USPS then conducts a survey of the customers who would be affected by the proposed ZIP code boundary change. A simple majority of survey respondents must indicate their support in order for USPS to proceed with implementing the change. The boundary review process also includes procedures that are in place for customers to appeal to USPS headquarters if the request is denied.

*City of Eastvale.* Eastvale was formally incorporated in 2010 and is located in Riverside County's Inland Empire region of Southern California. Once a rural area primarily comprised of dairy farms and agricultural land, Eastvale began to suburbanize in the 1990s as more families from Los Angeles and Orange counties moved there seeking affordability. Today it has a population of approximately 71,000 residents and covers about 13 square miles. Eastvale is surrounded by the cities of Jurupa Valley, Corona, Chino, Ontario, and Norco. Currently, Eastvale shares two ZIP codes: 91752 with the City of Jurupa Valley and 92880 with the City of Corona.

The City is concerned that the sharing of ZIP codes with neighboring cities has caused frustrating challenges for the community, including mail delivery disruptions, difficulty attracting and retaining business development, confusion with voter registration and elections, miscalculated or restricted insurance rates, particularly for residents living in fire-prone areas, and interference with emergency response activities. The City wants the Legislature to urge the federal government to authorize a new ZIP Code to be assigned specifically to the City.

## **Comments**

*Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, "With nearly 70,000 residents as of the 2020 Census, Eastvale has become one of the fastest-growing cities in California. The lack of an independent ZIP code for the City of Eastvale has led not only to chronic mail delivery issues—affecting timely legal notices, code enforcement activities, and important public outreach efforts—but has also caused challenges in emergency management, business attraction and retention, and insurance coverage. In many instances in which an Eastvale resident's or small business's address is improperly associated with another jurisdiction, the lack of an independent ZIP code has led to higher auto insurance rates or the loss of home insurance coverage due to wildfires in neighboring cities. Without having an independent ZIP code of their own, the City of Eastvale has seen their community identity, economic culture, and quality of life all negatively affected. Senate Joint Resolution 11 calls upon the President of the United States and Congress to enact

legislation that would provide the City of Eastvale with its own, independent ZIP code.”

*Try, try again.* Various local, state, and federal efforts to designate a unique ZIP code for Eastvale have occurred since Eastvale was incorporated in 2010. USPS first conducted a boundary review of Eastvale’s request in 2011 but denied the request, citing costs associated with additional daily mileage for mail carriers and adjusted delivery routes. In 2022, the City requested that USPS review the boundary again. USPS denied that request in December 2022, and Eastvale’s appeal of that decision was denied in June 2023. Two federal bills in 2023, H.R. 696 and H.R. 860, that would have required USPS to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for the City of Eastvale failed to advance through the U.S. Senate. However, effective January 1, 2024, USPS changed the official municipality designation for 92880 from “Corona” to “Eastvale.” As a result, Eastvale is now the recommended city designated for the 92880 ZIP code. Eastvale is also a recognized city name for addresses in the 91752 ZIP code. Legislative efforts continue: most recently, in July 2025, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a similar measure, H.R. 672. That measure is currently pending in the U.S. Senate. SJR 11 continues these efforts at the state level.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

SJR 3 (Roth, Resolution Chapter 105, Statutes of 2023), this joint resolution is nearly identical to SJR 3.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/19/26)

City of Eastvale

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/19/26)

None received

Prepared by: Anton Favorini-Csorba / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119  
3/20/26 9:06:01

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SJR 12  
Author: Laird (D), et al.  
Amended: 3/16/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 5-1, 3/24/26  
AYES: Becker, Allen, Cabaldon, Laird, Stern  
NOES: Grove  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** Proposed 2026–2031 National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas  
Leasing Program: opposition

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution declares the Legislature’s strong and unequivocal opposition to the proposed leasing of federal lands offshore California for oil and gas development given the risks to coastal resources, recreation and economy, and the Legislature’s commitment to take action to maintain the existing prohibition on new federal leasing; and requests the US Bureau of Ocean Engineering Management (BOEM) hold public meetings in the state in advance of any proposed leasing to receive input and prepare an appropriate environmental document for the proposed leasing, among other provisions.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing federal law:

- 1) Establishes the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA)(43 U.S.C. §§1331 *et seq.*) that declares, among other things, that it is the national policy that the OCS is a vital national resource reserve held by the federal government for the public, which should be available for expeditious and orderly development, subject to environmental safeguards, in a manner that is consistent with the maintenance of competition and other national needs.

- 2) Defines the OCS as all submerged lands lying between the seaward extent of the state jurisdiction and the seaward extent of federal jurisdiction.

Existing state law establishes the California Coastal Sanctuary Act of 1994 (Public Resources Code §§6240 *et seq.*) which prohibits the State Lands Commission from issuing new oil and gas leases for unleased state tide and submerged lands underlying the Pacific Ocean, as specified. Existing leases are authorized to remain in production.

This resolution:

- 1) States that the California Legislature:
  - a) Considers new oil and gas offshore drilling to be a threat to the nation's and the state's ocean environment and wildlife, ancestral lands and waters of California Native American tribes, marine and coastal economy, national security, and the well-being of all Californians; and inconsistent with the state's ambitious renewable energy goal.
  - b) Requests that BOEM hold public hearings on the proposed leasing plan in the State of California to ensure that all Californians have an opportunity to be heard.
  - c) Requests that BOEM prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement to accompany the 2026 – 2031 National OSC Leasing Program.
  - d) Strongly and unequivocally oppose any new offshore drilling, including the federal government's proposed leasing plan, which would expose the entire California Coast to new offshore drilling and the accompanying risks to coastal environment, fishing, tourism, and recreation from an oil spill.
  - e) Urges the US Secretary of the Interior to remove California from the federal government's proposed leasing plan.
  - f) Declares unequivocal support for the current federal prohibition on new oil or gas drilling in federal waters offshore of the Pacific coast, its opposition to the proposed five-year National OSC Leasing Program or any attempts to modify that prohibition, and its determination to consider any appropriate actions to maintain that prohibition.
- 2) Requires the Secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of the resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Governor of California, certain US Senate and Congressional leaders, the Senators and US

Representatives from California, the Secretary of the US Department of the Interior, the Acting Director of BOEM, and each member of the California Legislature.

- 3) Makes numerous findings in support of the resolution including, among others:
- a) In 2018 the Legislature passed and the Governor signed two bills – SB 834 (Jackson, Chapter 309, Statutes of 2018) and AB 1775 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 310, Statutes of 2018) to prohibit the commission from issuing new leases in support of the construction of new federal OCS oil and gas leases.
  - b) In 2024, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed SB 704 (Min, Chapter 292, Statutes of 2024) to require that any new federal OCS oil and gas development had to fully comply with the California Coastal Act of 1976.
  - c) Twenty-seven municipalities in California have passed ordinances prohibiting or requiring the vote of the people to approve zoning changes to support onshore facilities to support offshore oil and gas production. Over 100 local jurisdictions on the US West Coast have adopted resolutions opposed to an expansion of offshore oil and gas development.
  - d) According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in 2021 the healthy, clean, and biodiverse ocean supports more than 350,000 jobs, paying over \$12 billion in wages, and generating almost \$26 billion in annual economic activity through fishing, tourism, and recreation.

## **Background**

There are 30 federal OCS oil and gas leases offshore California. No new federal leases have been issued since 1984. The Biden Administration removed offshore California and the rest of the Pacific Coast from future federal OCS oil and gas leasing permanently in January 2025. The Trump Administration has moved to offer 6 federal OCS oil and gas lease areas offshore California as part of the 11<sup>th</sup> National OCS Oil and Gas Leasing program.

[Additional information regarding this resolution may be found in the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee’s analysis.]

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

350 Humboldt  
350 Santa Barbara  
Active San Gabriel Valley  
Azul, Bixby Residential, Inc.  
California Coastal Protection Network  
California Coastkeeper Alliance  
California Environmental Voters  
California Land Watch  
Center for Biological Diversity  
Center for Environmental Health  
Clean Water Action  
Defenders of Wildlife  
CalWild  
CleanEarth4Kids.org  
Climate Action California,  
Climate First: Replacing Oil & Gas  
Coastal Corridor Alliance  
Earth Island Institute – International Marine Mammal Project  
Environment California  
Environmental Action Committee of West Marin  
Environmental Defense Center  
Environmental Justice Catholic Charities of Stockton  
Fish On  
Friends Committee on Legislation of California  
FutureSwell  
Heal the Ocean  
Humboldt Waterkeeper  
League of California Cities  
Monterey Bay Aquarium  
Ocean Conservancy  
Ocean Conservation Research  
Oceana  
Orange County Coastkeeper  
Resource Renewal Institute  
San Francisco Baykeeper  
Santa Barbara Channelkeeper  
Santa Cruz Climate Action Network  
Save Our Shores  
Save The Bay

Sempervirens Fund  
Sierra Club California  
Surfrider Foundation  
The CORE Project  
Tomales Bay Foundation  
Turtle Island Restoration Network  
WILDCOAST

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the author, “California’s coast is integral to our environment, economy, and identity. The federal administration’s proposed 2026–2031 National Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program would open up California’s coast to new drilling and increase fossil fuel emissions and have devastating impacts on marine ecosystems and coastal communities. Senate Joint Resolution 12 affirms the California Legislature’s opposition to the proposed plan and our commitment to protect marine ecosystems, transition to clean energy, and support coastal economies. This resolution makes clear that Californians, as well as leaders across the country, oppose a reckless offshore drilling plan that ignores environmental risks and input from the public.”

Prepared by: Katharine Moore / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116  
3/25/26 16:15:08

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

THIRD READING

---

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

---

**SUBJECT:** 250<sup>th</sup> 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 86  
Author: Gonzalez (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/4/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Cinco de Mayo Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution declares May 3, 2026, through May 10, 2026, as Cinco de Mayo Week.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Cinco de Mayo, or the fifth of May, is memorialized as a significant date in the history of California and Mexico in recognition of the courage of the Mexican people, who defeated a better trained and equipped army at the “Batalla de Puebla”.
- 2) Cinco de Mayo serves to remind us that the foundation of any nation and our state is its people, in their spirit and courage in the face of adversity, in the strength of their drive to achieve self-determination, and in their willingness to sacrifice even life itself in the pursuit of freedom and liberty.
- 3) In 2001, the Latino Caucus saw a need to recognize and honor distinguished Latinos for their contributions and dedication to the economy and cultural life of California and the United States with the annual Latino Spirit Awards. These recipients are outstanding individuals who have greatly contributed to the wonderful music, poetry, literature, journalism, and entertainment of California, the United States, and the world.

This resolution urges all Californians to join in celebrating Cinco de Mayo, the historic day when the Mexican people defeated the French army at the Batalla de Puebla, and to recognize the Latino noncombatants in California who freely gave their votes and resources to defend free institutions, and the Latinos of California

who fought to defend the freedom of the United States in every armed conflict from the Spanish-American War to the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SR 27 (Gonzalez, 2025) – Adopted in the Senate.

SR 74 (Gonzalez, 2024) – Adopted in the Senate.

SR 24 (Gonzalez, 2023) – Adopted in the Senate.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/9/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/9/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/11/26 15:45:14

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SR 87  
Author: Archuleta (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/10/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Armenian Genocide

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution provides that April 24, 2026, be recognized as “State of California Day of Commemoration of the 111th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–1923”.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The Armenian nation was subjected to a systematic and premeditated genocide officially beginning on April 24, 1915, at the hands of the Young Turk Government of the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1919, inclusive, and continued at the hands of the Kemalist Movement of Turkey from 1920 to 1923, inclusive, whereby over 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were slaughtered or marched to their deaths in an effort to annihilate the Armenian nation in the first genocide of modern times, while thousands of surviving Armenian women and children were forced to convert to Islam and be raised as non-Armenians and hundreds of thousands more were subjected to ethnic cleansing during the period of the modern Republic of Turkey from 1924 to 1937.
- 2) California is home to the largest Armenian American population in the United States, and Armenians living in California have enriched our state through their leadership and contribution in business, agriculture, academia, government, and the arts, many of whom have family members who experienced firsthand the horror and evil of the Armenian Genocide and its ongoing denial.
- 3) The State of California has been at the forefront of encouraging and promoting a curriculum relating to human rights and genocide in order to empower future generations to prevent the recurrence of genocide.

This resolution provides that April 24, 2026, be recognized as “State of California Day of Commemoration of the 111th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–1923”.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SR 33 (Perez, 2025) – Adopted in the Senate.

SR 83 (Wilk and Portantino, 2024) – Adopted in the Senate.

SR 28 (Portantino, 2023) – Adopted in the Senate.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

The Consulate General of the Republic of Türkiye in Los Angeles

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/24/26 14:20:15

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SR 88  
Author: Blakespear (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/12/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Modern Biotechnology

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes and celebrates the 20th anniversary of the California Biotechnology Foundation and commemorates the 50th anniversary of modern biotechnology that honors California's scientists, innovators, educators, and policymakers whose leadership continues to advance medicine, strengthen the state's economy, and improve lives throughout California and around the world.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) California is widely recognized as the birthplace of modern biotechnology with emerging groundbreaking scientific discoveries in the early 1970s, including recombinant DNA and genetic engineering, which launched a new era of medicine and scientific innovation.
- 2) The California Biotechnology Foundation was established in 2006 pursuant to Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code as a nonprofit organization dedicated to education and outreach and serves as a trusted resource to policymakers and stakeholders on the value and impact of biotechnology.
- 3) As these dual anniversaries are celebrated and California's life science industry enters the next era, the California Biotechnology Foundation reaffirms its mission to support innovation and inform legislative policies that translate scientific discovery into real therapies that improve and save lives, thereby ensuring that California's continued leadership delivers economic growth, earlier diagnoses, and better outcomes for patients across the state and around the world.

This resolution recognizes and celebrates the 20th anniversary of the California Biotechnology Foundation and commemorates the 50th anniversary of modern biotechnology that honors California's scientists, innovators, educators, and policymakers whose leadership continues to advance medicine, strengthen the state's economy, and improve lives throughout California and around the world.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SR 111 (Blakespear, 2024) – Adopted in the Senate.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/25/26 16:15:09

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SR 89  
Author: Alvarado-Gil (R), et al.  
Introduced: 3/17/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Profound Autism Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes March 17, 2026, as Profound Autism Day in California, and urges all citizens to support efforts to increase research, improve services, and ensure the dignity and care of individuals living with profound autism.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The term “autism” was first coined in 1911 by psychiatrist Eugen Bleuler, and later refined in 1943 by Dr. Leo Kanner, whose landmark work identified behaviors distinct from other mental disorders and established a foundation for autism-specific research.
- 2) In 2021, the Lancet Commission formally introduced the designation of “profound autism” to describe individuals who require care and assistance 24 hours a day, seven days a week with daily activities, providing families and clinicians with a vital tool to advocate for those with the most intensive needs.
- 3) The federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported in 2023 that 26.7% of eight-year-old children identified with autism spectrum disorder meet the criteria for profound autism.
- 4) Despite their significant needs, a 2019 study revealed that only 6% of clinical autism research studies included participants with profound autism, leaving a critical gap in medical and behavioral understanding.
- 5) In 2025, 15 states across the nation recognized Profound Autism Day to foster awareness and support for individuals with severe, high-needs autism.

This resolution recognizes March 17, 2026, as Profound Autism Day in California, and urges all citizens to support efforts to increase research, improve services, and ensure the dignity and care of individuals living with profound autism.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/23/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/23/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/25/26 16:15:10

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SR 90  
Author: Gonzalez (D)  
Introduced: 3/17/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Khmer New Year

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes April 14, 2026, to April 16, 2026, inclusive, as Khmer New Year, and calls upon all Californians to observe the New Year by participating in appropriate activities and programs.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Khmer New Year, or Cambodian New Year, also known as Chaul Chnam Thmey, literally meaning “Enter the New Year,” also known as Moha Sangkranta, literally meaning “Great Sankranti,” or Sangkranta, is the traditional celebration of the solar New Year in Cambodia.
- 2) The Khmer New Year coincides with the traditional solar New Year in several parts of India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Laos, and Thailand. A three-day public holiday marks the New Year, which usually starts on April 13 or April 14, at the end of the harvest season when farmers enjoy the fruits of their labor before the rainy season begins.
- 3) The Cambodian people have contributed to communities by participating in American politics, by establishing local and international businesses, by developing new art forms and community organizations through their rich cultural heritage, and by raising a new generation of Americans with promise to advance the future of the State of California and the nation.

This resolution recognizes April 14, 2026, to April 16, 2026, inclusive, as Khmer New Year, and calls upon all Californians to observe the New Year by participating in appropriate activities and programs.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SR 35 (Gonzalez, 2025) – Adopted in the Senate.

SR 84 (Gonzalez, 2024) – Adopted in the Senate.

SR 25 (Gonzalez, 2023) – Adopted in the Senate.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/25/26 16:15:10

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

**THIRD READING**

---

Bill No: SR 91  
Author: Gonzalez (D)  
Introduced: 3/17/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Cambodian Genocide Memorial Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes the week of April 17 to April 23, 2026, inclusive, as Cambodian Genocide Memorial Week, and calls upon all Californians to observe the week by participating in appropriate activities and programs.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) April 17, 2026, will mark the 51st anniversary of the Khmer Rouge regime, led by Pol Pot. The Khmer Rouge seized power, which led to the Cambodian Genocide.
- 2) The genocide and other crimes against humanity committed against the people of Cambodia, including various religious groups and ethnic minorities, during the Khmer Rouge regime led to the deaths of over 1.7 million Cambodians, which was 21% of the nation's population.
- 3) After the overthrow of the Khmer Rouge regime in 1979, over 140,000 Cambodians came to the United States as refugees, a group of special humanitarian and foreign policy concern to the United States because of the well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion and thus in need of protection in accordance with the United Nations 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.
- 4) The State of California has the largest population of Cambodians in the United States, and the City of Long Beach is known around the world as home to the largest Cambodian community outside of Southeast Asia.

- 5) In 1994, the United States Congress passed the Cambodian Genocide Justice Act, committing the American government to the pursuit of justice for the victims of the genocide and affirming the policy of the United States to bring members of the Khmer Rouge to justice for their crimes against humanity.
- 6) Cambodian Genocide Memorial Week will honor the survivors and their descendants for their courage and contributions to our state and country. This week will serve as a way to remember those who lost their lives in Cambodia and in genocides around the world.

This resolution recognizes the week of April 17 to April 23, 2026, inclusive, as Cambodian Genocide Memorial Week, and calls upon all Californians to observe the week by participating in appropriate activities and programs.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

HR 32 (Lowenthal, 2025) – Adopted in Assembly.  
SR 37 (Gonzalez, 2025) – Adopted in Senate.  
HR 87 (Lowenthal, 2024) – Adopted in Assembly.  
SR 85 (Gonzalez, 2024) – Adopted in Senate.  
SR 23 (Gonzalez, 2023) – Adopted in Senate.  
HR 27 (Lowenthal, 2023) – Adopted in Assembly.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/25/26 16:15:11

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: AB 2156  
Author: Rivas (D) and Limón (D), et al.  
Amended: 3/20/26 in Assembly  
Vote: 27 - Urgency

---

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 14-0, 3/24/26  
AYES: Rubio, Valladares, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Blakespear, Cervantes,  
Dahle, Hurtado, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab,  
Weber Pierson  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-0, 3/23/26 - See last page for vote

---

**SUBJECT:** Holidays: Farmworkers Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill designates March 31 as Farmworkers Day and requires the Governor to annually proclaim March 31 as Farmworkers Day.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Recognizes various state holidays including:
  - a) January 1<sup>st</sup> (New Year);
  - b) Third Monday in January (Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day);
  - c) February 12<sup>th</sup> (Lincoln Day);
  - d) Third Monday in February (Washington Day);
  - e) March 31<sup>st</sup> (Cesar Chavez);
  - f) April 24, known as “Genocide Remembrance Day”;
  - g) Last Monday in May (Memorial Day);
  - h) June 19, known as “Juneteenth;”

- i) July 4<sup>th</sup>;
  - j) September 9 (Admission day);
  - k) Fourth Friday in September (Native American Day);
  - l) Second Monday in October (Columbus Day);
  - m) November 11<sup>th</sup> (Veterans Day);
  - n) December 25<sup>th</sup>;
  - o) Good Friday from 12 noon until 3 p.m.
- 2) Specifies that if the above holidays are in conflict with the provisions of a memorandum of understanding, the memorandum of understanding shall be controlling without further legislative action.
  - 3) Designates August 26 of each year as California Farmworker Day and requires the Governor to annually proclaim August 26 as California Farmworker Day.

This bill:

- 1) Deletes the designation of March 31 as Cesar Chavez Day and instead designates March 31 as Farmworkers Day.
- 2) Deletes the Requirement that the Governor proclaim March 31 as Cesar Chavez Day and instead requires the Governor to proclaim March 31 as Farmworkers Day.
- 3) Contains an urgency.

## **Background**

*Author's Statement.* According to the Author's office, "the farmworkers rights movement has been rooted in the lasting values of dignity and justice. To honor the movement's rich California history and the steadfast dedication behind it, we are putting forward legislation to designate the following 2026 state holiday in California as Farmworkers Day."

*New York Times Investigation.* On March 18, 2026, the New York Times published the results of an investigation that outlined a series of allegations against César Chávez describing a pattern of sexual abuse and misconduct during his time as leader in the farmworker movement. According to the report, Chávez allegedly abused at least two young girls in the 1970s. One account describes inappropriate contact when the young girl was around 12 years old, followed by rape at age 15.

Another young girl described repeated sexual encounters over several years starting when the girl was about 13 years old.

Among the most significant accounts are allegations from Dolores Huerta, co-founder of what eventually became the Farmworkers Union, who issued a public statement in response to the report by The New York Times. In her statement, Dolores Huerta confirmed that she experienced sexual coercion by Chávez in the 1960s. She described that Chávez exerted power and control over her in ways that led to nonconsensual encounters resulting in two pregnancies. Dolores Huerta framed her experience in terms of survival rather than victimhood, stating that she now understands herself “as a survivor” of abuse and coercion, and emphasizing that power dynamics and loyalty to the farmworker movement contributed to her decision not to report earlier. In her own words, Dolores Huerta wrote:

I have never identified myself as a victim, but now I understand that I am a survivor – of violence, sexual abuse, of domineering men who saw me, and other women, as property, of things to control. The knowledge that he hurt young girls sickens me. My heart aches for everyone who suffered alone and in silence for years. There are no words strong enough to condemn those deplorable actions [Chávez] did. Cesar’s actions do not reflect the values of our community and movement. The farmworker movement has always been bigger and far more important than any one individual I have kept this secret long enough. My silence ends here.

*Advocate Response.* Following these allegations, advocates have emphasized that listening to survivors, believing their accounts, and offering meaningful support can play a critical role in the healing process. In public statements, the Rape, Abuse, & Incest National Network (RAINN), describes the allegations as “grave and deeply distressing” noting that when prominent figures are accused of such profound betrayals of trust, the effects can reverberate across entire communities and may retraumatize survivors of sexual violence.

RAINN further underscored and reminded the public that there is no “right” time or “standard way” for a survivor to come forward. The organization emphasized that survivors, “cite personal or family reasons for not disclosing rape, and others are deterred by the stigma they perceive within their community or because they fear the outcome of reporting. The calculus is even harder when the person who committed the rape is such a prominent figure, which can lead survivors to fear they will not be believed or will be blamed for bringing down someone who is

admired in their community. Ultimately, we need to trust survivors to make the decision that is right for them.”

*Response by State and Local Jurisdictions.* In response to allegations involving César Chávez, states and local jurisdictions—particularly across California and the Southwest—have undertaken a range of actions that reflect both immediate responses and long-term considerations regarding the commemoration of Chávez’s legacy. In the short term, several jurisdictions have canceled or suspended official César Chávez Day events, while government leaders and organizations have issued statements emphasizing support for survivors.

Concurrently, several state and local governments are pursuing or considering the renaming of César Chávez Day to more broadly honor farmworkers, with legislative proposals and executive actions already underway in some areas. For example, the City of Los Angeles issued a proclamation to rename the holiday to Farmworkers Day, reflecting a broader commemorative focus.

At the local level, cities have begun evaluating and, in some cases, removing Chávez’s name from public spaces, including streets, parks, schools, and civic buildings, as well as taking down statues, murals, and other commemorative displays. For example, the City of Fresno voted to restore original street names, reversing a prior renaming to “César Chávez Boulevard.”

Beyond these immediate and symbolic responses, institutions such as museums, universities, and state agencies are engaging in broader cultural and historical reassessments, reconsidering how Chávez is represented in educational materials and public exhibits. Collectively, these actions seem to reflect a shift toward recognizing the broader farmworker movement while reevaluating the role of individual figures within it.

*Farmworkers in California.* With approximately \$50 billion in agricultural annual revenue, California is the leading agricultural state in the United States. California produces more than 350 commodities; including about one-third of the nation’s vegetables and nearly two-thirds of the nation’s fruits and nuts.

According to the Center for Farmworker Families, between one-third to one-half of all farmworkers in the United States reside in California, or approximately 500,000-800,000 farmworkers. The Salinas Valley, the “Salad Bowl of the Nation,” employs more than 50,000 farmworkers. However, this number could be much higher given the difficulty with tracking data on immigrant farmworkers.

Approximately 75% of all farmworkers in California are undocumented. Roughly, one-third of farmworkers are women.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor statistics, agriculture is considered one of the most dangerous industries in the nation. Common injuries involve exposure to the elements, health-related symptoms related to pesticide exposure in both farmworkers and their children, and farm equipment injuries. Even though farmworkers work in one of the most dangerous industries, they receive very little benefits and protections.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

AB 268 (Kalra, Chapter 358, Statutes of 2025) added Diwali to the list of state holidays, and authorizes public schools and state employees to take certain type of leave in recognition of Diwali, as specified.

SB 721 (Hueso, Chapter 496, Statutes of 2021) designates August 26 of each year as California Farmworker Day and requires the Governor to annually proclaim August 26 as California Farmworker Day.

AB 1655 (Jones-Sawyer, Chapter 753, Statutes of 2022) adds June 19, known as “Juneteenth,” to the list of state holidays and authorize state employees to elect to take time off with pay in recognition of Juneteenth, as specified.

AB 2644 (Reyes, Chapter 130, Statutes of 2018) requires the Governor to annually proclaim April 10 as Dolores Huerta Day, set apart that date as a date having special significance, and encouraged all public schools and educational institutions to conduct exercises remembering the life of Dolores Huerta.

AB 7 (Bonta, Chapter 29, Statutes of 2015) requires the Governor to annually proclaim October 25 as Larry Itliong Day, designated that date each year as having special significance, and encouraged all public schools and educational institutions to conduct exercises remembering the life of Larry Itliong and the contributions he made to the state.

SB 984 (Polanco, Chapter 213, Statutes of 2000) established a paid holiday for state employees each March 31, which would be designated as “Cesar Chavez Day.”

SB 1373 (Torres, Chapter 1011, Statutes of 1994) requires the Governor to annually proclaim March 31 as Cesar Chavez Day, and included March 31, known as Cesar Chavez Day, in the list of state holidays.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

California Federation of Teachers  
Eleni Kounalakis, Lieutenant Governor

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

**ASSEMBLY FLOOR:** 70-0, 3/23/26

**AYES:** Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

**NO VOTE RECORDED:** Bauer-Kahan, Bonta, Calderon, Elhawary, Hadwick, Lee, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Schiavo

Prepared by: Felipe Lopez / G.O. / (916) 651-1530  
3/25/26 16:17:24

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 133  
Author: Johnson (R), et al.  
Introduced: 2/11/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution commemorates February 26, 2026, as Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) February 26, 2026, is recognized nationally and internationally as Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day, a signature event of Engineers Week dedicated to encouraging girls to explore careers in engineering and technology.
- 2) In 1970, women comprised approximately 3% of the engineering workforce in the United States. According to the National Science Foundation's National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, women accounted for approximately 35% of the overall science and engineering workforce in the United States by 2023, reflecting progress across science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields while underscoring persistent gaps in engineering specifically.
- 3) Despite these gains, women hold only about 16% of engineering jobs nationwide, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, highlighting the ongoing challenge of translating educational participation into workforce representation.
- 4) Numerous organizations and programs across the United States are dedicated to closing the gender gap in engineering by actively encouraging young women and girls to explore STEM fields that have been historically male dominated.

This resolution commemorates February 26, 2026, as Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

ACR 19 (Macedo, Resolution Chapter 19, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 130 (Luz Rivas, Resolution Chapter 26, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 8 (Luz Rivas, Resolution Chapter 14, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/10/26)

California State Association of Counties

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/10/26)

None received

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

3/11/26 15:45:11

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 135  
Author: Patel (D), et al.  
Introduced: 2/12/26  
Vote: 21

---

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 3/5/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

---

**SUBJECT:** School Breakfast Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims March 2, 2026, to March 6, 2026, inclusive, as School Breakfast Week.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Nearly one in six California children live in food insecure households, meaning they do not have consistent access to adequate food.
- 2) More than 66% of California public school pupils qualify for free or reduced-price school meals, yet many of those low-income pupils are not eating the nutritious school breakfast offered due to barriers such as social stigma, late buses or carpools, long cafeteria lines, and tight class schedules.
- 3) Eating breakfast as part of the school day is associated with positive pupil behavioral health and academic performances, such as better test score results, improved concentration in class, lower rates of chronic absenteeism, fewer classroom disruptions, and less frequent visits to the school nurse.
- 4) If California schools increased school breakfast participation such that 50% of the pupils who qualify for free or reduced-price school meals participated in their school's breakfast program, an additional 558,903 pupils would receive breakfast every day and school districts would receive more than \$271 million in federal meal reimbursements for their school nutrition budgets.

This resolution proclaims March 2, 2026, to March 6, 2026, inclusive, as School Breakfast Week.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 26 (Weber Pierson, Resolution Chapter 39, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 143 (Bennett, Resolution Chapter 31, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 33 (Robert Rivas, Resolution Chapter 36, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/17/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/17/26)

None received

**ASSEMBLY FLOOR:** 73-0, 3/5/26

**AYES:** Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

**NO VOTE RECORDED:** Ahrens, Castillo, Chen, Irwin, Macedo, Celeste Rodriguez, Sharp-Collins

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/18/26 13:52:46

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 136  
Author: Harabedian (D), et al.  
Introduced: 2/13/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Engineers Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes the week of February 22, 2026, to February 28, 2026, as Engineers Week.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Engineers Week celebrates its rich history as one of the largest science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) outreach events of the year with the 2026 theme “Transform Your Future,” underscoring how engineers shape communities, opportunities, and the world we live in.
- 2) Engineers practice in a number of important specialties, including civil, mechanical, electrical, structural, geotechnical, chemical, control systems, fire protection, industrial, petroleum, environmental, and traffic engineering, providing a complete range of engineering services to both the private and public sectors in California.
- 3) Professional engineers are leaders in the development of efficient, environmentally sustainable, and technologically advanced designs that enhance water quality, wastewater management, flood control, infrastructure resiliency, seismic safety, hazardous site remediation, and transportation systems, including highways, railways, waterways, and airports.

This resolution recognizes the week of February 22, 2026, to February 28, 2026, as Engineers Week.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

ACR 29 (Irwin, Resolution Chapter 24, Statutes of 2025).

ACR 127 (Irwin, Resolution Chapter 27, Statutes of 2024).

ACR 9 (Irwin, Resolution Chapter 15, Statutes of 2023).

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/9/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/9/26)

None received

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

3/11/26 15:45:12

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 138  
Author: Hadwick (R), et al.  
Introduced: 2/13/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** California Association of Future Farmers of America

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes and commends the California Association of Future Farmers of America for its nearly 100 years of service to students, educators, and the agricultural industry and honors members, advisors, alumni, and supporters of the association for their dedication to developing future leaders and sustaining California's agricultural legacy.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) California has a rich and successful agricultural history, one that has made the Golden State the nation's agricultural leader for many years. The California Association of Future Farmers of America (California Association FFA) has been an integral part of this remarkable agricultural tradition since 1928.
- 2) Future Farmers of America (FFA) is an outstanding student leadership organization that promotes excellence in agricultural education throughout California, and the California Association FFA stands as one of the largest state FFA associations in the nation, providing leadership development opportunities to more students than all but one state FFA association in the nation.
- 3) The California Association FFA currently serves more than 108,000 student members in 366 chapters statewide, making it the largest youth leadership organization in California.
- 4) The Sacramento Leadership Experience, developed and presented by the California Association FFA, serves as a capstone civic engagement and public service leadership conference within California Association FFA's statewide leadership system. More than 85,000 students have participated in the

California Association FFA State Leadership Conference, the largest career technical student organization conference in the state.

- 5) Through supervised agricultural experience programs, entrepreneurship, and community service initiatives, California Association FFA members have logged more than 5 million hours of work-based learning, generating an estimated \$40 million in economic and community service impact.
- 6) Throughout its history, the California Association FFA has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to leadership development, workforce preparation, and community service, reflecting the highest ideals of public engagement and educational excellence.

This resolution recognizes and commends the California Association of Future Farmers of America for its nearly 100 years of service to students, educators, and the agricultural industry.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/10/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/10/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/11/26 15:45:12

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 139  
Author: Calderon (D), et al.  
Introduced: 2/13/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Sleep Apnea Awareness Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims the month of March as Sleep Apnea Awareness Month in California.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) is a common, serious, and chronic sleep-related breathing disorder characterized by repeated interruptions of breathing during sleep, leading to fragmented sleep and reduced blood oxygen levels.
- 2) OSA affects an estimated 75 to 80 million adults in the United States, and leading sleep medicine experts estimate that up to 90% of cases remain undiagnosed, leaving millions of individuals untreated and at an elevated risk for adverse health and safety outcomes.
- 3) Custom-fitted oral devices, including mandibular advancement devices and newer FDA-cleared oral appliance therapies and similar treatments, work by repositioning the jaw and airway structures during sleep to reduce airway collapse.

This resolution proclaims the month of March as Sleep Apnea Awareness Month in California.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/25/26 16:19:10

**\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\***

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 144  
Author: Hadwick (R)  
Introduced: 2/19/26  
Vote: 21

---

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 3/5/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

---

**SUBJECT:** National CRNA Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution commends certified registered nurse anesthetists for their expertise, dedication, and service to the people of California, acknowledges their essential role in ensuring access to high-quality anesthesia and perioperative care, particularly in rural and underserved communities, and celebrates National CRNA Week 2026.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Certified registered nurse anesthetists (CRNAs) are highly trained, advanced practice registered nurses specializing in anesthesiology who provide expert care to patients before, during, and after surgical, obstetrical, trauma, and procedural services across the continuum of care.
- 2) CRNAs contribute to improved patient outcomes by providing timely, evidence-based anesthesia and perioperative care, reducing delays in treatment, and ensuring continuity of care for patients who might otherwise be required to travel long distances for essential services.
- 3) CRNAs demonstrate leadership in clinical practice, education, health care delivery innovation, and policy advocacy, helping to address California's evolving health care access challenges and advancing equitable care for all populations.

This resolution commends certified registered nurse anesthetists for their expertise, dedication, and service to the people of California, acknowledges their essential

role in ensuring access to high-quality anesthesia and perioperative care, particularly in rural and underserved communities, and celebrates National CRNA Week 2026.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 12 (Umberg, Resolution Chapter 75, Statutes of 2025)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

**ASSEMBLY FLOOR:** 73-0, 3/5/26

**AYES:** Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

**NO VOTE RECORDED:** Ahrens, Castillo, Chen, Irwin, Macedo, Celeste Rodriguez, Sharp-Collins

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/18/26 13:52:47

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 145  
Author: Caloza (D), et al.  
Introduced: 2/20/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Women in Construction Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims March 1, 2026, to March 7, 2026, inclusive, as Women in Construction Week and requests that the Governor issue a proclamation calling on the people of the great State of California to observe the week with appropriate programs and education activities.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The focus of Women in Construction Week is to highlight women as a visible component of the construction industry. The continuous progress of our economy requires full participation and support of all citizens, regardless of gender, race, or ethnic background.
- 2) Rising costs of higher education and evolving employer workforce training needs make apprenticeship an increasingly important career pathway without the burden of student loans. Apprenticeships are a critical pathway for women to participate fully and equally in California's growing economy.
- 3) Women face many barriers to entering and staying in the construction field and have historically been excluded from apprenticeship opportunities that lead to meaningful careers with family-supporting wages.

This resolution proclaims March 1, 2026, to March 7, 2026, inclusive, as Women in Construction Week and requests that the Governor issue a proclamation calling on the people of the great State of California to observe the week with appropriate programs and education activities.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 30 (Smallwood-Cuevas, Resolution Chapter 29, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 28 (Ortega, Resolution Chapter 30, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 141 (Ortega, Resolution Chapter 43, Statutes of 2024)

SCR 29 (Ashby, Resolution Chapter 21, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/16/26)

American Subcontractors Association of California  
International Interior Design Association

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/18/26 13:52:47

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 147  
Author: Lackey (R), et al.  
Introduced: 2/23/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Special Olympics Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims March 9, 2026, as Special Olympics Day in California, and congratulates Team NorCal and Team SoCal for their accomplishments thus far and wishes them success in the 2026 Special Olympics USA Games.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Special Olympics is the world's largest sports organization for children and adults with intellectual disabilities, providing year-round training and competitions to more than 4 million athletes and Unified Sports partners in 177 countries.
- 2) With the support of the State of California, Special Olympics California provides free year-round services and programs in sports, schools, leadership, and health and wellness to more than 50,000 people with intellectual disabilities and their families in the state.
- 3) The 2026 Special Olympics USA Games will take place from June 20, 2026, to June 26, 2026, inclusive, in Minnesota, happening once every four years, and will bring together Special Olympics athletes from across the country to compete and celebrate in the spirit of inclusion.
- 4) The 2026 Special Olympics USA Games will feature more than 3,000 athletes, 1,500 coaches, 10,000 volunteers, and 75,000 expected fans.

This resolution congratulates Team NorCal and Team SoCal for their accomplishments thus far and wishes them success in the 2026 Special Olympics USA Games.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 41 (Ashby, Resolution Chapter 49, Statutes of 2025)  
ACR 50 (Ahrens, Resolution Chapter 57, Statutes of 2025)  
ACR 155 (Lackey, Resolution Chapter 39, Statutes of 2024)  
SCR 120 (Becker, Resolution Chapter 48, Statutes of 2024)  
ACR 41 (Lackey, Resolution Chapter 49, Statutes of 2023)  
SCR 51 (Becker, Resolution Chapter 57, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/18/26 13:52:48

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 153  
Author: Calderon (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/2/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Irish American Heritage Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution designates March 2026 as Irish American Heritage Month in honor of 102 years of diplomatic relations between the United States and Ireland and commemorates the multitude of contributions that Irish Americans have made to this country and state.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The year 2026 marks 102 years of diplomatic relations between the United States and Ireland, over a century of official meaningful engagement of which both countries are very proud.
- 2) Irish Americans played vital roles in the development of the United States. Nine Irish Americans were signers of the Declaration of Independence, and 23 Presidents of the United States have been of Irish heritage, including John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton, George H. W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Joe Biden.
- 3) Irish Americans have also played a major role in California politics as governors, legislative leaders, city mayors, and other public officials, who have worked tirelessly to build California into the state that it is today.
- 4) There is significant economic reciprocity between California and Ireland, including Ireland as the seventh largest source of foreign direct investment through wholly foreign-owned enterprises in California, and there is work underway to further build these relationships.

- 5) Today, over 35 million Americans claim Irish heritage, and they continue to contribute to the politics, economy, and culture of the United States and California.

This resolution, in honor of 102 years of diplomatic relations between the United States and Ireland and the multitude of contributions that Irish Americans have made to make this a better country and state for all people, designates March 2026 to be Irish American Heritage Month in California, and calls upon the people of the state to observe the month of March with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities, especially on March 17, because everyone is Irish on St. Patrick's Day.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

ACR 51 (Haney, Resolution Chapter 34, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 149 (Gallagher, Resolution Chapter 41, Statutes of 2024)

SR 77 (McGuire, 2024) – Adopted in Senate.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 3/24/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
3/25/26 16:19:11

\*\*\*\* **END** \*\*\*\*